

**Impact
Factor
2.147**

ISSN 2349-638x

Refereed And Indexed Journal



**AAYUSHI
INTERNATIONAL
INTERDISCIPLINARY
RESEARCH JOURNAL
(AIIRJ)**

Monthly Publish Journal

VOL-III

ISSUE-XI

Nov.

2016

Address

- Vikram Nagar, Boudhi Chouk, Latur.
- Tq. Latur, Dis. Latur 413512
- (+91) 9922455749, (+91) 9158387437

Email

- aiirjpramod@gmail.com

Website

- www.aiirjournal.com

CHIEF EDITOR – PRAMOD PRAKASHRAO TANDALE

Impact Of Locus Of Control On Job Satisfaction

G. M.Sunagar

Asst. Professor

Vijayanagar College of Education,Hubballi-31

girishsunagar@yahoo.co.in

Introduction:

Locus of control is a term in psychology which refers to a person's belief about what causes the good or bad results in his or her life, either in general or in a specific area such as health or academics. Understanding of the concept was developed by Julian B. Rotter in 1954, and has since become an important aspect of personality studies.

Locus of Control:

Locus of Control refers to the extent to which individuals believe that they can control events that affect them. Individuals with a high internal locus of control believe that events result primarily from their own behavior and actions. Those with a high external locus of control believe that powerful others, fate, or chance primarily determine events. Those with a high internal locus of control have better control of their behaviour and tend to exhibit more political behaviors than externals and are more likely to attempt to influence other people; they are more likely to assume that their efforts will be successful. They are more active in seeking information and knowledge concerning their situation than do externals. The propensity to engage in political behavior is stronger for individuals who have a high internal locus of control than for those who have a high external locus of control.

Locus of control is the degree to which one believes that the rewards and major events in one's life are controlled either by one's own actions (these people are 'internals') or by others (such people are 'externals'). In organizational settings, rewards or outcomes include promotions, favorable circumstances, salary increases and general career advancement. Locus of control is regarded as relatively stable personality characteristics and is related to job satisfaction and stress. Job satisfaction and locus of control have been found to have positive relationship. Those who believe that they will be able to master most demands by doing what is necessary, or discovering what to do and how to do it, are less likely to be threatened or helpless or hopeless in stressful situations. This is in contrast with chronically anxious individuals who believe that they are incapable of mastering the situation.

Internal Locus of Control:

If one person perceives that an event or achievement is contingent on his own behaviour or his own relatively permanent characteristics, he is termed to have 'Internal control' (Rotter, 1966).

Here he assumes that he is the master of his fate and the “Captain of his soul”, doing mainly what he wants to do and achieving the results by his own efforts and hence he is said to have an internal locus of control.

- Decharms designates internally controlled individuals as origins.
- Internals are more likely to seek information.
- Internals are more sensitive and alert.
- Internals show more incidental learning.
- Internals pay more attention to relevant cues when there are uncertainties in the situation.
- Internals are more responsive to informational requirements.
- Internals pursue goals by paying careful attention to demands of the task.

These are the findings of various anatomic researches over locus of control. It is important to warn people against lapsing in the overly simplistic view notion that internal is good and external is bad (two legs good, four legs bad?). There are important subtleties and complexities to be considered.

For example:

- Internals can be psychologically unhealthy and unstable. An internal orientation usually needs to be matched by competence, self-efficacy and opportunity so that the person is able to successfully experience the sense of personal control and responsibility. Overly internal people who lack competence, efficacy and opportunity can become neurotic, anxious and depressed. In other words, internals need to have a realistic sense of their circle of influence in order to experience 'success'.
- Externals can lead easy-going, relaxed, happy lives.

External Locus of Control:

When a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent on his action, then, in our culture, it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance, fate as under the control of powerful others, or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him. When an individual interprets the event in this way – this is a belief in “external control (Rotter, 1966)”.

Job Satisfaction:

The concept of job satisfaction is a many faceted one. Some researchers consider it as a generalized affective orientation to all aspects of the work situation. Such a view expresses the resultant of a whole host of orientations to specific aspects of the job. Job satisfaction is the sum total of the individual attitudes towards job (Vroom 1964)

Job satisfaction is a widely studied concept. It has been variously used as synonym of industrial morale and attitudes. Such an approach has been subjected to severe criticism from many researchers (Argyris, 1964; Blum and Naylor 1968).

Need Satisfaction is not to be confused with job satisfaction though both are closely interrelated. Need Satisfaction refers to the process of fulfillment of various needs of

the individuals; while job satisfaction is a generalized attitude resulting from many specific attitudes in three areas, namely; specific job factors, individual adjustment and group relationship. Though need satisfaction is a basic condition for job satisfaction, the two are not to be equated. Job satisfaction is much wider and complex process and is not entirely the function of the satisfaction of various needs of the individual.

According to Pramod Kumar and Mutha (1975) "Job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes possessed by an employee towards his job. These attitudes are related with specific factors such as wages, conditions of work, advancement opportunities, prompt settlement of grievances, fair treatment by employers and other fringe benefits". Job satisfaction may be defined as an attitude, which a result from balancing and summation of many specific likes and dislikes experienced in connection with the job.

According to Dixit (1993) "Job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes of an employee towards his job". These attitudes are related with specific factors such as salary, service conditions, advancement opportunities and other benefits.

Job satisfaction is the degree to which people like their jobs. It is a general attitude toward the job; the difference between the amount of rewards employees receive and the amount they believe they should receive. A person with a high level of job satisfaction holds positive attitudes towards the job, while a person who is dissatisfied with his or her job holds negative attitudes about the job.

Job satisfaction and job performance are positively correlated (when job satisfaction increases, job performance increases). However, for one person, satisfaction may increase because performance increases, whereas, for another, performance may increase because satisfaction increases. It is impossible to tell whether job satisfaction causes increased job performance or that job performance causes increased job satisfaction based on correlation alone.

The following is a list of alternative explanations of a correlation (Pearson, 2010):

- **Reverse causation** - The causal direction is opposite what has been hypothesized; for example job performance causes an increase in job satisfaction rather than the other way around.
- **Reciprocal causation** -The two variables cause each other; for example high job satisfaction causes high job performance, which then increases job satisfaction.
- **Common-causal variables** -Variables not part of the research hypothesis cause both the predictor and the outcome variable; for example individual disposition may cause both satisfaction and job performance.
- **Spurious relationship** -The common-causal variable produces and "explains away" the relationship between the predictor and outcome variables; for example, individual differences in disposition as described above.
- **Extraneous variables** -Variables other than the predictor causes the outcome variable but do not cause the predictor variable; for example, pressure from a supervisor causes high performance.

- **Mediating variables** -Variables caused by the predictor variable in turn cause the outcome variable; for example experience could cause high performance which then could cause satisfaction (performance would be the mediating variable).

Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction:

In today's competitive environment organizations thrive and survive on their human resources. Values, attitudes, perceptions and behaviour, which form these resources, influence employee performance. It is a key factor in realizing Organizational and individual goals that in turn greatly depends on individual's self-motivation and job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction can be influenced by a variety of factors, for example the quality of one's relationship with their administrator, the quality of the physical environment in which they work, degree of fulfillment in their work, etc. Numerous research results show that there are many factors affecting the job satisfaction. More so there are particular demographic traits (age, education level, tenure, position, Marital Status, years in service, and hours worked per week) of teachers that significantly affect their job satisfaction.

There is no strong acceptance among researchers, consultants, etc., that increased job satisfaction produces improved job performance. Infact, improved job satisfaction can sometimes decrease job performance. For example, you could let workers sometime sit around all day and do nothing. That may make them more satisfied with their "work" in the short run, but their performance certainly does not improve. The individual's willingness to get a result, of the endeavour and expectation of maintaining the result will push to show the highest performance.

Locus of Control has Impact on Job Satisfaction:

The rationale for relationship of locus of control and performance usually follows the arguments that individuals who attribute responsibility for their performance to themselves, tend to assume that they can cause certain changes in their environment, which in turn leads to an increase in their motivation. Anderson *et. al.* (1976) have demonstrated this relationship in a stress setting. This line of research seems to suggest that the locus of control laid its impact on performance through its action with decision or activity patterns. Anderson (1976) showed the results of his study indicate that internal locus of control orientation is a pre-requisite of success for entrepreneurs and will be an important moderator of success of achievement and other types of professional training.

Conclusion:

Locus of control is the degree to which one believes that the rewards and major events in one's life are controlled either by one's own actions (these people are 'internals') or by others (such people are 'externals'). Job satisfaction and devotion to the job, affected each other reciprocally, and they have great impact upon performance. The

most significant of the factors affecting performance are economical, technical, socio-political, cultural and demographical ones.

Reference:

- Bullock, R.D. (1952) *Social Factors Related to the Job Satisfaction*. Bureau of Business Research. P. 14
- Fisher D. (1984). Mood and emotions while working: missing pieces of job satisfaction? *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 21, 185±202
- Fletcher, B.C. and Payne, R.L. (1982) Levels of reported stressors and strains amongst schoolteachers, some U.K. data, *Educational Review*, 34, pp. 267-278.
- Levenson, T. (1992) *Locus of Control Scale*, New Delhi: Psy-Com Services
- Miller, C.A. (2003) Locus of control and at-risk youth: A comparison of regular education high school students and students in alternative schools. *Education*.
- Rupp, M (1978) Locus of Control among Hungarian Children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 359-366
- Tudor, R and Thomas, T (1977) Relationship Between Locus of Control and Job Involvement. In Buch, M.B. (1991) *Fourth Survey of Research in Education* (1983 – Vol. 1&2, New Delhi: NCERT

