DEFINITIONS OF THE VARIABLES USED
The present study is an investigation into the relationship between job involvement and job satisfaction, locus of control, education and personality characteristics with reference to need achievement. It is, therefore, essential to provide operational definitions of variables involved so that suitable tools could be selected to quantify responses on them and establish meaningful relationships between them. This chapter is accordingly devoted to the purpose of defining important variables used in the investigation and specifying how they are treated here.

Job Satisfaction  Job Involvement

Job involvement and job satisfaction are the nuclei variables against which the gamut of chosen personality and environmental variables in relation to need achievement are being sought, in order to establish the relationship
between them. A person with job involvement is most likely to actively strive for certain standards of excellence.

In the scale-continent of many creeds and divergent views, there are but few issues which are agreed upon by all. The need for increasing productivity is one such issue on which there is no divergence of views. Our Government has accepted the rapid industrialization of the country as a measure of increasing national wealth. Although a few industrialists evince interest in the application of psychological findings to industrial situations, managements in general in this country continue to feel that the road to higher productivity is only through technology. Many of our top-rank industrialists still fail to realise that between a blue-print and its actualization is the human being, who alone can translate those blue prints into operations and actualities. Between the plan and its realization is the man more complete than any other plan. This implies, scientific study of work processes paving the way for improved methods of operation, installation
of efficient machinery for improved quality of products and the creation of an atmosphere of human relations within the workshops which generate the "we feeling" so essential in cooperative efforts. There are a few studies which have dealt with the relationship between job satisfaction and job involvement. Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968) found that job involvement was positively related to satisfaction with motivator variables and not with hygiene variables. Mukherjee (1969) on the other hand found in the Indian context that there was a lack of relationship between job involvement and each of the motivator variables studied. Since no study in the Indian context has directly explored the relationship between job involvement and perceived importance of job factors among white collar employees, it was decided to take up this problem for investigation.

Our investigation, therefore, aims at establishing the relationship between job involvement and the perceived importance of various job factors. How important a job is to an employee's self image is the essential pre-requisite to job
involvement. Therefore, it was hypothesized that persons with higher job involvement would assign greater importance to factors which will help them in gratifying their higher order needs.

Job satisfaction has been defined variously and measured in a number of ways. This has resulted in a confusion that surrounds the concept of satisfaction. Locke (1969)\(^3\) noted that although a number of studies have been conducted to identify correlates of job satisfaction few attempts have been made to understand what job satisfaction really is. Generally satisfaction is conceptualized as a personalistic evaluation of conditions existing on the job, or outcomes that arise as a result of having a job (Sandlet, 1974)\(^4\). Thus, the feelings aroused by various content and context factors on the job are termed job satisfaction.

Why people feel satisfied or dissatisfied with their job has been explained in various models e.g. value-percept discrepancy model (Locke 1969 1976); instrumentality-valance model (Vroom, 1964)\(^5\) met expectations model (Porter and Steers
1973)\(^6\); and in terms of contribution/inducement ratio (March and Simon, 1958). All these models generally speaking, conceive of feelings of satisfaction as based upon a subjective evaluation of the difference between what is there in the job and what ought to be there. The models of satisfaction and the findings on its antecedents may help us to identify some of the conditions that lead to work identification. The issue of the causes as well as the effect of job satisfaction has been attacked in a different manner by Herzberg and his colleagues (1959)\(^7\). They opened up new areas of research on job attitudes with their dual factor theory of job satisfaction.

According to Korman (1971)\(^8\) three major theories of job satisfaction have served as implicit or explicit reference points for most of the research in the area; they are the need fulfilment theory of Vroom (1964), the social reference-group theory of Hulin (1966)\(^9\) and the two-factor theory of Herzberg. The need fulfilment theory conceptualizes job satisfaction as being basically a direct function of the extent to which
the job situation serves the individual's personal needs. In terms of this viewpoint, the greater the discrepancy between an individual's personal needs and the degree to which the job situation provides satisfaction of them, the less the job satisfaction; the smaller the discrepancy, the greater the job satisfaction. This point of view, which has been supported by some studies (Morse 1953)\textsuperscript{10} is derived largely from Lewin's (1936)\textsuperscript{11} more general field theory of behaviour.

Although it has a somewhat similar framework to the need fulfilment theory reference group theory takes as its point of departure the norms of the group to which the individual looks for guidance rather than his personal needs and interests. In terms of this theory, job satisfaction is determined largely by the degree to which the job situation meets the need standards of an individual's reference group. The greater the difference between the job situation and the reference-group's norms, the less the job satisfaction; the smaller the difference, the greater the job satisfaction. This point of view for which
there is some empirical support (Hulin 1966) is derived largely from Helson's (1948) more general adaptation level theory of behaviour.

The two-factor theory in contrast to the above two theories states that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are reactions to different kinds of job aspects; job satisfaction is regarded mainly as a function of challenging, stimulating work activities or work content ('motivation' factor); while job dissatisfaction is mainly a function of environmental factors like supervision, company policy and working conditions (hygiene factors). Briefly it contends that certain variables in the job situation, the so-called 'motivation' factors lead to over-all job satisfaction, but play an extremely small part in producing job dissatisfaction; while other variables the so called 'hygiene' factors lead to over-all job dissatisfaction but usually play only a small part in producing job satisfaction. This point of view, which is confirmed by some studies (Friedlander and Waston 1964) is derived largely from Maslow's (1954) general hierarchy of needs model of behaviour.
Locke (1970)\textsuperscript{15} Sutermeister (1971)\textsuperscript{16} Evans (1969)\textsuperscript{17} and Wanous and Lawler (1972)\textsuperscript{18} reviewed various operational definitions of job satisfaction found in the literature. Four of these measures derived from the Porter Need Deficiency Questionnaire (PNDQ) of Porter (1961)\textsuperscript{19} were of particular interest in this study. The first operational measure of job satisfaction was defined as the sum of the workers' fulfillment in relation to various job factors. Fulfillment of a particular facet was measured by the subject's response to the "How much is there Now?" question. Thus, job satisfaction was operationalized as:

\[
Js_1 = (is\ now).........(1)
\]

A second operational definition was derived from the expectancy model of motivation (Vroom 1964)\textsuperscript{20}. In the expectancy theory, job satisfaction is analogous to job valance which was defined as a cumulative multiplicative function of job instrumentality times outcome valences. Wanous and Lawler (1972)\textsuperscript{21} extended this analogy to the PNDQ instrument by noting the correspondence between
outcome valence and the "How important is the facet?" question, and the correspondence between job instrumentality and the "How much is there now?" question, thus, job satisfaction could also be operationalized as:

\[
\text{Facets} \\
J_{s_2} = (\text{Importance} \times \text{Is now}) \ldots (2)
\]

A third operational measure of job satisfaction was defined as need deficiency. Porter defined need deficiency as the difference between the subject's response to the "How much should there be?" question and response to the "How much is there now?" question. Thus, job satisfaction was operationalized as

\[
\text{Facets} \\
J_{s_3} = (\text{Should be} - \text{Is now}) \ldots (3)
\]

Low or negative scores represent high job satisfaction while high scores indicate dissatisfaction. Wall and Payne (1973)\textsuperscript{22} however, noted several methodological problems associated with using the need deficiency measure to predict criterion variables. First,
because of the fixed point rating scale, there is a logical constraint of having the respondent's deficiency score (Should be - Is now) inversely related to the existing level (Is now) of each facet. Second, there is a psychological constraint that nearly all subjects report that there "should be" more of the facet associated with the job than there "Is now" associated with the job. Because of these two constraints the variation is need deficiency scores may merely reflect a variation in the existing level of each facet rather than perceived need satisfaction. To control for the confounding variation in existing levels of each facet, Wall and Payne suggested that the need deficiency scores (Should be - Is now) be correlated with the criterion variables, statistically holding the "Is now" scores constant. Therefore, in the present study the relationships between job performance and the need satisfaction were examined through both direct correlations with the need deficiency measure and also partial correlations with the need deficiency measure and also partial correlations with need deficiency holding the sum of "Is now" scores constant. Evans
(1969)\(^{23}\) and Locke (1969)\(^{24}\) suggested a fourth operational measure of job satisfaction whereby the deficiency scores were multiplied by the importance score. They argued that satisfaction with more important facets should produce a greater range of effect than satisfaction with less important facets. Thus, job satisfaction could also be operationalized as:

facets

\[ Js = (\text{Importance}) \times (\text{Should be} - \text{Is Now}) \]

\[ ......(4) \]

Evans (1969)\(^{25}\) and Wanous and Lawler (1972)\(^{26}\) reported that different operational measures of job satisfaction had specific implications with respect to how strongly the sum of facet satisfaction was correlated with other overall measures of job satisfaction. The selection of a particular operational measure of job satisfaction also implied that different causal relationships would exist between satisfaction and performance. These implications suggested several hypotheses.

There are at least four possible explanations
of the fact that different measures of satisfaction are positively interrelated:

(1) It is possible that characteristics of individuals condition their reactions to job in terms of different aspects of work situation and with reference to satisfaction from it. One such possibility is that persons have developed different adaptation levels or standards of judgments as a result of differences in the amount of the kind of experience in work situations. As a result of these differences, some people might be "easily satisfied", reporting satisfaction if the work situation meets certain minimal requirements, whereas others have much higher thresholds.

(2) It is also possible that the positive interrelationships among measures of satisfaction are due to response sets. On many satisfaction measures, a tendency to choose the first alternative, or to choose the "yes" or agree response,
results in high scores indicating a high level of satisfaction. There is conclusive evidence that people vary in the extent to which they will agree with a statement regardless of its content (Jackson and Messick, 1958; McGee, 1962) which lends support to the idea that acquiescence, as it has been called, might to be basis for the generalized satisfaction with the job. The role of acquiescence can be eliminated by changing half of the items so that an "agree" response connotes dissatisfaction. However, another form of response set - social desirability - cannot be so easily handled. Since, in many situations, reporting a high level of job satisfaction may be construed as a socially desirable response, it is possible that individual differences in the tendency to give such responses may be the basis for associations between specific satisfaction measures. If, in fact, that is the case, we would expect to find a relationship between job satisfaction
scores and measures of the strength of the tendency to give socially desirable responses such as those developed by Edwards (1957) and Crowne and Marlowe (1960).

(3) A third possibility is that work situations providing the same type of reward tend also to provide similar types of other rewards. For example, jobs which are highly paid also tend to offer greater variety of stimulation, higher status, and many other frequently mentioned sources of rewards. Positive correlations between persons' satisfaction with different aspects of the work role may be due to the fact that situational conditions which determine these attitudes are associated with one another.

(4) Finally, it is possible that the measures of satisfaction with different aspects of work role are associated because they are functionally interdependent. Changes
in satisfaction with one aspect, e.g. supervision, may result in changed satisfaction with another aspect, e.g. the content of the work, and vice versa.

The research necessary to determine which of the explanations is correct has not yet been carried out. Since all are intuitively plausible, it is possible that each is contributing to some portion of the common variance among measures of satisfaction.

At present, there appears to be conditions under which both general and specific satisfaction measures are useful. In the review of the literature which follows later in this chapter, we will find that most studies dealing with the determinants of job satisfaction, use specific measures,

---

*It should be noted that general measures of job satisfaction fall into two distinct types. They may be obtained by combining workers' responses to a large number of questions, each of which deals with the specific aspect of jobs, or by asking workers one or more questions concerning how much they are satisfied with jobs as a whole.
whereas those dealing with the relationship of job satisfaction to job behaviour tend to use more general measures. The reasons for this are simple. If one is interested in the effects of a specific work role variable, such as the amount of wages, on job satisfaction, it is likely that these effects will be more evident through workers' manifestation of satisfaction with wages than with their satisfaction with jobs as a whole, or other aspects of jobs. For example, Smith and Kendall (1963) reported that mean annual earnings are correlated more highly with satisfaction with wages than with either satisfaction with supervision or people. On the other hand, there is as yet no convincing empirical evidence that the relationship between specific measures and behavioural indices such as absence, turnover, or performance will be any different from that obtained through the use of general measures of comparable reliability.

Needs and Need-Satisfaction

The biggest impetus to study of needs in organizational set up was provided by Maslow.
He conceptualized needs as being arranged in a hierarchical order. At the lowest level are physiological needs followed by safety, belongingness, esteem and self-actualization needs. This hierarchy implies that unless the lower order needs are satisfied a person would not attach importance to higher order needs. It is hypothesized that increased satisfaction of needs at a particular level gives rise to their decreased importance which in turn results in increased importance of the next higher need. About self-actualization, the highest order need, the process is different. Maslow proposed that increased satisfaction of self-actualization leads to increase in its strength and motivation potential. The concept of need hierarchy had a profound effect on studies of motivation and job attitudes in organizations. It was found that jobs that provided opportunities for satisfaction of higher order needs improved the work motivation of job holders and lessened their desire to leave the organization. Satisfaction of higher order needs also related to attitudes of intrinsic motivation and job involvement (Maurer, 1969; Lawler, 1973; Robinowitz, 1975).
Prominent among other needs that have been studied in relation to job behaviour are achievement (McClelland, 1951) and autonomy (Wickert, 1951, Ross and Lander, 1957; Lawler and Hall, 197032).

Intrinsic Motivation

Lawler (1969)33 has defined intrinsic motivation as the degree to which a job holder is motivated to perform well because subjective rewards or feelings that he expects to receive or experience as a result of performing well. Some other concepts that are quite similar to intrinsic motivation are ago-involvement (French and Kahn, 196234; Vroom, 1962), work role involvement (Maurer, 196835), and occupational involvement (Locke, 197036). In all these conceptualizations an individual is considered to be intrinsically motivated if his self-esteem is affected by his job performance. According to Lawler intrinsic motivation would exist when higher order needs are tied to performance. To some extent, then, intrinsic motivation depends on the satisfaction of higher order needs, meaningful feed back on performance, and the
perception of job as providing scope for the job holder to make use of his valued abilities (Lawler, 1969).

The concept of intrinsic motivation can help understand the concept of work identification in the sense that work identification can also imply the degree to which one's self-esteem is affected by how well one performs one's job or how ego-involved one is, in one's job (Gurin, Veroff and Feld, 1960, French and Kahn, 1962; Lawler, 1969). In this sense the concept of job involvement comes extremely close to the attitude of work identification.

Job Involvement - Concepts and Measurements

The term, 'Job Involvement' has been frequently used both in experimental and field studies. The bulk of the experimental work has been concerned with its effects on perception, retention, motor responses, problem solving, level of aspiration, and the like. The concern of field studies has been with the relationship of job involvement to quality and quantity
of performance, absenteeism, grievances, and so on. In this wide range of use, different interpretations and measurements have been introduced. The concept of job involvement has not been characterised by a great conceptual precision. However, two related definitions by Lodahl and Kajner (1965) seem to include the most frequent conceptions of job involvement; (a) "the degree to which a person's work is his total self-image", and (b) "the degree to which a person's work performance effects his self-esteem". Bass (cited in Weissenberg and Gruenfeld, 1968) has found that the following conditions lead to the strengthening of job involvement. Opportunity to make more of the job decisions, the feeling that one is making an important contribution to company success, recognition, achievement, self-determination and freedom to set one's own work pace. On the same lines Lodahl and Kejner (1965) defined job involvement as the degree of the importance of one's work in one's total self-image and also viewed job involvement as a value orientation towards work, similar to the process of socialization and is not always easily influenced by immediate job situation. It also appears that job involvement is quite
similar to Hulin and Blood's construct of "acceptance of middle class work values". Thus at one place they emphasize "psychological identification" whereas, at another they emphasize "performance-self-esteem" contingency. This has led to a controversy over the definition. The latter definition brings the concept of job involvement close to the concept of intrinsic motivation (Lawler, 1969). In some of the studies on job involvement, "psychological identification is the basis theme (e.g. Lawler and Hall, 1970) whereas in other emphasis is laid on the performance - self-esteem (e.g. Gurin, Veroff and Feld, 1960).

There are still other studies which choose a middle path by accepting both the performance-esteem relationship and psychological identification in the theorizing of job involvement (e.g. Patchen, 1965; Maurer, 1969).

We concur with Lawler and Hall (1970) who accept "psychological identification with one's work", and "the degree to which the job situation is
central to the person and his identity" as definitions of job involvement.

Guion (1958)$^{43}$ proposed that it is characterized by employee's perception of the job as being of extreme importance. These values are described by Hulin and Blood as including "positive effect for occupational achievement, a belief in the intensive value of hard work, a striving for the attainment of responsible positions".

Dublin (1956, 1960)$^{44}$ conceptualized job involvement as the degree to which the total job situation is a "central life interest", i.e. the degree to which it is perceived to be a major source for satisfaction of important needs. A number of different tools have been used for measuring central life interest type of involvement. Dublin (1956), for instance, devised a 40 item questionnaire for sampling a person's total life experiences in which the respondent must choose between a job oriented and a non-job oriented, or how much total time an employee devotes to his work
and his perception of the importance of his job in his life. Finally, a number of items in Lodahl and Kajner's (1965) job involvement scale, seem to measure central life interest type of involvement (e.g. the most important things that happen to me involve my work; I live, eat, and breathe my job).

Wickert (1951) suggested that the participation type of involvement could be measured by asking the employee the degree to which he is actively participating in his job. Vroom (1959, 1962) indicated that it could also be measured by asking the employee how much he participates "psychologically" in his job (e.g. in general, how much say or influence do you have on what goes on in your job?). In a third interpretation, French and Kahn (1962) conceived job involvement as the degree to which the employee perceived that his job performance is central to his self-concept, i.e., the degree to which it affects his self-esteem. Siegal (1969) used a similar definition stating that job involvement is the importance of work to a person's self-esteem or sense of worth. Inverson and Render (1956) also reported numerous studies which used
job involvement in terms of the relationship of performance to valued characteristics.

Different approaches are used for measuring the self-esteem type of involvement. In one approach, based on the Zeigarnik effect, the employee is asked how often he thinks about an unfinished problem after working hours. The assumption behind this measurement is that an unfinished problem is central to self-concept, if it persists in thought. Another approach cited by Vroom (1959) and Inverson and Render (1956) is to ask the individual whether a task requires the use of an ability or personality characteristics that he values. Another conceptualization of job involvement is mentioned by Vroom (1962) which refers to the degree to which the employee perceives that his job performance is consistent with characteristics that are central to his self-concept. It should be noted that while Vroom considered the consistency of performance with the existing self-conception, French and Kahn emphasized consistency with the valued self-conception. Self consistency type of involvement was used in numerous studies,
particularly those dealing with consistency theory (e.g. Aronson and Carlsmith, 1962). It was generally measured by asking whether the level of performance was consistent with self-concept. More specifically, the person might be asked whether the abilities required by his job performance are consistent with the amount of ability that he possesses (Vroom, 1964). In summary, the literature shows three different conceptualizations for the construct of job involvement. A person is involved (1) when work to him is a central life interest, (2) when he actively participates in his job, (3) when he perceives performance as consistent with his self-concept. The present study is designed to find out if the above conceptualizations are factorially different and if there is basis for explaining the differences.

**Work Values**

Many studies have demonstrated the intimate relationship that exists between and individual's satisfaction with his work and his general satisfaction or life adjustment. Work satisfaction has been seen
both as a part of the complex work of feelings subsummed under "general satisfaction", which besides work, includes an individual's, affective responses in other areas of life and which can be unravelled only through a series of clinical interviews in depth, or as a more or less distinct area of feelings confined to work situation which is amenable to measurement by psychometric methods.

Work satisfaction thus has been conceived of as an individual's subjective experience of his work situation - his responses, on the level of feelings, towards different facets of his work role. Though a spate of research studies have succeeded in identifying major elements of the work role (pay, supervision, co-workers, etc.) which has a bearing on the individual's work satisfaction, a generally accepted methodology for the measurement of these dimensions has not yet been agreed upon. Since Hoppock's monograph on job satisfaction in 1935, a substantial amount of research has been conducted on this topic.

Need Achievement

Whatever may be the nature of
the motive, it is non-controversial that individuals involve themselves in a lot of thinking and action related to "competition with certain standard of excellence" or are at least reader to do so, when the occasion arises. Hence following the lines of McClelland (1958) and Rosen (1956) the investigator decided to accept this extract from Rosen as his guideline:

"By achievement motivation we mean an anticipation of an increase in affect aroused by cues in situations involving standards of excellence. The behaviour of people highly motivated for achievement is persistent striving activity, aimed at attaining a high goal in some area involving competition with a standard of excellence. In relation to these standards of excellence the achievement oriented person directs his efforts towards obtaining the pleasure of success and avoiding the pain of failure (1956)".

Engagement in some competitive activity (other than pure cases of aggression) where winning or doing as well or better than others is actually
stated or implied, will, therefore, be taken as an indication of the presence of this motive in this study (McClelland, D.C. 1958).

However, some clarification should be made to distinguish this motive from some other closely related but different concepts like achievement motivation, achievement value and aspiration.

Achievement motive is the enduring characteristics or disposition to strive for achievement goals. It is strengthened as a result of successive reinforcement for attaining a certain standard of excellence. "When this motivational disposition has been sufficiently acquired, the presence of achievement cues in the situation will elicit the expectancy of satisfying an already acquired achievement motive. Atkinson uses the term, 'achievement motivation' or need for achievement to refer to such temporarily aroused state (Mukherjee, 1974; page 54).

Mukherjee (1974) summarises differences between achievement motive and achievement values.
They are:

1. Achievement motive is a motivational disposition while achievement value involves expectations regarding goal striving behaviour and certain kinds of values concerning competence.

2. Achievement motive is a psychological construct while achievement value is largely socio-cultural.

3. Need-achievement in itself does not determine in which area he will strive for excellence. "The delineation of the area in which such excellence should or may take place depends upon certain cultural values. Area of competence to which are attached great importance by the existing cultural values will be determined not by the individual's level of achievement motivation but by his achievement values. Such achievement values provide a definition of goals, focus the
attention of the individual on achievement and prepare him to translate motive into action.

For Rosen Mukherjee, p.53-54) "achievement values and achievement motivation while related, represent genuinely different components of the achievement syndrome" not only conceptually but also in their origins. "According to him acquisition of achievement values takes place in that stage of the child's cultural training when verbal communication of fairly complex nature is possible". Achievement motivation or the need to excel on the other hand, has its origin in parent-child interaction beginning early in the child's life when many of these relations are likely to be emotional and verbalized.

Locus of Control

The human individual has a tendency to look for predictability and control over his environment. Surrounding uncertainties and variations in
personal experience can produce deviates. However, these may also contribute to ingenuity and creativity. Unique and innovative minds grow among those who can come to perceive differences between others and themselves, and who continue to hold the assumption that they are free agents, the markers of their own destinies. Whether people or other species for that matter, believe that they are actors and can determine their own fates within limits is of critical importance to the way in which they cope with the exigencies of life and engage in challenges.

Based on empirical researches it has been found that there are people who develop unshakeable belief that valued reinforcements occur only by change, and that man is not the master of his fate. In contrast, some others, believe that humans get their due deserts and that man is responsible for his fate. These two concepts put together constitute a major construct in psychological enquiry known as Locus of Control.
As suggested by Lefcourt (1976) persons with such contrasting perspectives differ considerably in degree to which they are able to assimilate and learn from their experiences: The fatalists perceive no contingency between action and outcome, while those espousing internal control beliefs readily perceive such contingencies.

Weiner (1974) has added a new dimension to locus of control construct through his conceptualization of causal attribution. Causal attribution is concerned with the perception of causal attribution, whether a person attributes the outcomes to external or internal 'Causes'. He has further classified internality - externality on stability-variability dimension providing a total of four categories of factors to which outcomes can be attributed.

These are:

i) internal-stable which do not easily change, for example, ability;
ii) internal-variable that can vary or change, for example, effort;

iii) external-stable, for example, difficulty of task; and

iv) external-variable, for example, luck or change.

The interaction of locus of control and stability has a different significance for attribution of positive outcomes (success) and negative outcomes (failure). It is proposed that persistence in achievement activity will result, if:

i) Success is attributed to an internal-variable factor (effort). If a person perceives that his effort has resulted in the desired outcome, he may like to remain engaged further in that activity:

ii) Failure is attributed to variable factors (internal and external both).
If a person perceives that his failure is due to factors which can vary (e.g. effort), he, still, will have some hope for improvement through increased striving. If he attributed his failure to stable factors such as ability or task difficulty, he is likely to give up his efforts because, on the one hand, his ability level can not change so easily and, at the same time, the level of task difficulty remains a hindrance. Thus, he feels that no good is likely to come out of persisting in the activity.

The largest body of empirical data about perceived control derives from Rotter's social learning theory. In Rother's theory perceived control occupies a central place within a systematic formulation (Rotter, 1954, 1955, 1960, 1971; Rotter, Chance and Phares, 1972) where perceived control is referred to as a generalized expectancy of internal or external control of reinforcement. The generalized expectancy of
internal control refers here to the perception of events, whether positive or negative, as being consequence of one's own actions and thereby potentially under personal control. The generalized expectancy of external control, on the other hand, refers to the perception of positive or negative events as being unrelated to one's own behaviour and thereby beyond personal control (Lefcourt, 1976 p.19).

The general hypotheses that locus of control is associated with cognitive activity of the individuals - i.e., persons holding internal control expectancies should be more cautious and calculating about their choices, involvements, and personal entanglements than those with external control orientations has been supported in a number of empirical investigations.

Another cognitive function that has been found to be associated with locus of control is attention. Studies made by Rotter and Mulry (1965)^55, Phares (1957)^56 suggest that internals devote more attention to decisions about skill
related matters than the externals. Julian and Katz (1968) have also reported that internals require more time to make decisions as the difficulty of decision-making increased.

There are some studies in the field of industrial and organizational psychology relating locus of control to various aspects of organizational life. Organ and Green (1974) have found that locus of control was significantly related with role ambiguity and job satisfaction. Mitchell, Cmyser, and Weed (1975) have also reported significant relationship between job satisfaction and locus of control.
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