
Retrospective Theses and Dissertations

1985

Subordinate Locus of Control, Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction

Stephanie A. Smith
University of Central Florida

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/rtd>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Smith, Stephanie A., "Subordinate Locus of Control, Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction" (1985).
Retrospective Theses and Dissertations. 4752.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/rtd/4752>

SUBORDINATE LOCUS OF CONTROL,
LEADERSHIP STYLES AND JOB SATISFACTION

BY

STEPHANIE A. SMITH
B.A., University of Central Florida, 1982

Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Science degree in
Industrial/Organizational Psychology in the
Graduate Studies Program of the
College of Arts and Sciences
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
1985

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between management style and the personality variable "locus of control" on subordinate job satisfaction among employees of a Communications Center for a large municipal law enforcement agency. Unlike many of the past studies that investigated the relationship between employee internality and job satisfaction, this current study found that Internals and Externals did not differ in general satisfaction when both had perceptions of high considerate supervisory behavior.

It was also hypothesized that locus of control would have a high negative correlation with general satisfaction. This hypothesis was not supported.

The last hypothesis of this study involved the degree to which Internal and External subordinates would differ from one another when they perceived their supervisor to be high or low on both supervisory dimensions (consideration and initiating structure). A t-test for independent samples showed that the difference (on satisfaction) between those individuals with an Internal locus of control and those with an External locus of

control was not significantly different when they perceived their supervisor to be high on both the consideration and initiating structure dimensions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people without whose help this thesis would not have been possible.

I'd like to thank my committee chairperson and members, Dr. Janet Turnage, Dr. Edwin Shirkey, and Dr. Jonathan Smith for their assistance and insight whenever requested. Thanks also goes to Dr. Burton Blau who helped in the initial stages of the thesis.

I wish also to thank Mrs. Gina Sanders who proved to be not only an excellent typist, but a tremendous source of strength and encouragement. Appreciation is also extended to Captain Thode of the Orange County Communication Center for his support of this project and to the employees at the Communication Center that agreed to participate in the study.

My greatest appreciation goes to my parents and fiance' for their encouragement and understanding not only during the writing of this paper, but always.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES vi

INTRODUCTION 1

METHOD 22

 Subjects 22

 Instruments 23

 Procedures 30

RESULTS 32

DISCUSSION 46

APPENDICES

 A. Supervisory Behavior Description 57

 B. Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire 62

 C. Social Reaction Inventory 65

REFERENCES 68

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Frequency Data For Internals and Externals Differing In The Level Of Consideration, Initiating Structure and Satisfaction	33
2.	Comparison Of Mean Satisfaction Scores For The Two High Leadership Dimensions	35
3.	Correlations Among Variables and Descriptive Statistics	40
4.	2 X 2 ANOVA For Main Effect Of Independent Variable (Consideration) on General Satisfaction	42
5.	2 X 2 ANOVA For Main Effect Of Independent Variable (Consideration) on Extrinsic Satisfaction	43
6.	2 X 2 ANOVA For Main Effect Of Independent Variable (Consideration) on Intrinsic Satisfaction	45

INTRODUCTION

The problem of assuring that employees in an organization achieve and maintain satisfaction has consistently been a major concern shown by many organizations. In an attempt to discover the variables that are related to employee satisfaction, many studies have been conducted. Although a vast number of variables have been shown to be important in determining employee satisfaction, two of the most widely known are locus of control and leadership.

Cravens and Worchel (1977) note that in spite of the numerous empirical and experimental studies demonstrating the limited effectiveness of any specific leadership behavior, theories still persist on the values of specific styles of leadership. These authors also note that some studies demonstrate that leadership performances over different situations are uncorrelated and, because of this, they propose a contingency model which argues that both leadership style and situations are important determinants of effective group behavior. Thus, most of the studies of leadership have focused directly on leadership behavior and/or situation and the effect of either or both on group effectiveness. However, it should be noted that Cravens and Worchel (1977) address the issue

of satisfaction and its relationship to leadership. These authors note that information relating to group members' satisfaction with their leader may not validly reflect the group members' performance. It should be noted that in this case satisfaction with the leader is examined to discover its relationship to performance. Graen, Dansereau and Minami (1972) also note that the main issue on which the reviews of two leadership dimensions (structuring and consideration) agree, is that some reliable relationship exists involving satisfaction and possibly performance and that these relationships are complex. A review of the literature revealed few other studies that noted the relationship between the perception of the leader and satisfaction.

Leadership, in addition to being viewed as a specific behavior variable or as a situational variable, has been viewed as an interactional process. While most of the interactionist perspectives stress that leadership is a function of both situational and personality factors, the strength of the reaction against the "trait approach" appears to have suppressed the study of personality factors.

Some researchers, on the other hand (Kerr, Schriesheim, Murphy & Stogdill, 1974), have pointed to the need for more study of personality factors related to

leadership. Several researchers, including Dessler (1974) and Evans (1974), have reported that personality characteristics of subordinates may act as moderator variables in the relationship of initiation of structure to performance. While these studies have demonstrated the importance of the personality characteristics of subordinates, only the study by Evans provided any information about the effect of the subordinates' personality characteristics on their perception of the leader's style of management.

Runyon (1973) also notes the importance of the subordinates' personality characteristics and argues that the interaction between management style and employee personality has been largely neglected. Cravens and Worchel (1977) have also noted the importance of subordinate personality. These authors note that "there is some justification for regarding the follower as the most crucial factor in any leadership event and research directed at the follower will eventually yield a handsome payoff. Not only is it the follower who accepts or rejects leadership, but it is the follower who perceives both the leader and the situation and reacts in terms of what they perceive. And what he perceives may be, to an important degree, a function of his own motivation, frames of reference and readiness." (p. 150)

In their review of the literature, Durand and Nord (1976) revealed only four studies where the followers' personalities have been related to their perceptions of a leader. The types of subordinate personality characteristics found to be related to perceptions of leaders were authoritarianism, need for achievement, machiavellianism and locus of control. Personality variables that have been observed by Cravens and Worchel (1977) include: need for approval, need for individual security, need for affiliation and self confidence. Other studies have found that the subordinate personality factors that are important are authoritarianism and need for independence (Yukl, 1977) and situational attributes such as task clarity and role conflict (House, 1971).

Locus of control is a personality factor that has been widely studied both within and outside of an organizational context and has been related to several attitudinal, motivational and behavioral variables. The general theory of locus of control arose from observation and research in clinical psychology. Both the measurement and theory have been refined so that the concept is very useful.

People attribute the cause or control of events either to themselves or to the external environment. Those who ascribe control of events to themselves are said

to have an internal locus of control and are referred to as Internals. People who attribute control to outside forces are said to have an external locus of control and are termed Externals.

Rotter (1966) and his colleagues developed the concept of locus of control from Rotter's social learning theory. In a review by Spector (1982), it is proposed that the concept may have been developed to explain the seeming tendency of some individuals to ignore reinforcement contingencies. These individuals' failure to respond as predicted to rewards and punishments was attributed to a "generalized expectancy" that their own actions would not lead to attainment of rewards or avoidance of punishment. The tendency for Internals to believe they can control events and Externals to believe they cannot lead to a number of predictions about the differences in the two behavioral types.

Various studies of locus of control in organizations have linked the variable to several factors such as satisfaction with co-workers, group cohesiveness (Daily, 1978), perception of job characteristics and job satisfaction (Silvers & Deni, 1983), hierarchical level (Oliver, 1983; Mitchell, Smyser & Weed, 1975), work characteristics (Kimmons & Greenhaus, 1976), stress (Lester, 1982), successful work experience (Andrisani &

Nestel, 1976), personal effectiveness (Heisler, 1974) and overall job satisfaction (Lester & Genz, 1978). Most of these studies showed that Internals were more satisfied with their jobs, less satisfied with co-workers, in more professional positions, showed less stress, and were more effective in their jobs than the External individual. It should be noted that the study done by Andrisani and Nestel (1976) showed that a person's locus of control changes over time as a result of experience.

As can be noted from the studies mentioned, locus of control in an organizational context has distinguishing characteristics that have direct and powerful effects on organizations in several ways. First, because Internals tend to believe that they can control the work setting through their behavior, they should attempt to exert more control than would Externals, provided that control is perceived to lead to desired outcomes or rewards. If a situation cannot provide desired outcomes, the Internal should not differ from the External in attempts at control. For some individuals, however, control itself might be rewarding, leading some Internals to attempt control for its own sake.

more control
= more
initiative?

The results of the research summarized by Spector (1982) suggest that locus of control may be an important personality variable in organization research and theory.

It may be useful as a moderator in tests of expectancy theory and predictions of turnover, and it may help to explain behavior in a number of organizational situations. Furthermore, on a practical level, locus of control may be useful as a selection device for many specific jobs and settings. It should be noted that many studies relate locus of control to management style and these studies will be discussed later.

Although all of the research discussed up to this point has been concerned with the subordinate's locus of control, studies have been done to determine whether the leader's locus of control moderates the relationship between perceived leader influence behaviors and certain subordinate outcome variables (Johnson, Luthans & Hennessey, 1984). These authors expected that subordinates would be more satisfied with supervision at high levels of influence when the supervisor is an Internal, because of the congruency of the belief in control and the influence behavior. At low levels of influence, differences in subordinate satisfaction may not appear for internal and external supervisors or may be less pronounced. This study found that locus of control accounted for only a small proportion of the variance in the leader influence behaviors, but contributed to a better understanding of locus of control as a moderator of

the relationship between supervisors' influence behaviors and subordinate satisfaction with supervision. Also, in contrast to the predominant view, Stodgill (1948) in his review of the leadership literature concluded that the personal characteristics of the leader should be relevant to the characteristics, activities and goals of the followers. Although this view may be a valid one, it should be noted that one of the underlying concepts of locus of control theory is that it helps to explain the seeming tendency of some individuals to ignore reinforcement contingencies. Thus, the amount of control over reward contingencies is an important aspect of the theory. Because the leader can exert control over rewards to a large extent, an interest in the leader's locus of control is not thought to be as relevant as that of the subordinate's locus of control. Subordinates have the opportunity to respond to rewards and punishments to a greater extent than leaders because they do not determine reward and punishment contingencies.

The other variable that has been shown to account for many differences in organizational behavior is managerial leadership style. Some of the types of leadership styles that have been studied include: warmth and directive, rewarding and coercive, participative and directive, and considerate and initiating. Runyon (1973) has noted that

all the previous studies of management style concentrated on the effects of autocratic versus participatory management on employee attitudes in a variety of industrial settings.

The effects of leader warmth and directiveness on subordinate performance on a task has been studied by Tjosvold (1984). Fifty-six college students took the role of a subordinate and interacted with a leader as they completed a task. The leader was either directive or nondirective and, nonverbally, either conveyed warmth or coldness toward the participant. Participants with the warm/directive leader were most motivated to complete a subsequent task, and participants with the warm/nondirective leader were the least productive. Participants in the warm condition found the leader helpful, were willing to work again and to meet the leader socially, and were satisfied with their relationship with the leader compared to participants with a cold leader.

Mitchell, Smyser and Weed (1975) have studied the effects of leader participation and directiveness on the subordinate's satisfaction with supervision. The authors of this study hypothesized that different subordinate personality types would differentially evaluate their satisfaction with their supervisor, depending upon whether they were working under a directive or participatory

management style. A significant interaction was found for these variables and this indicated that internals are more satisfied with a participatory management style than are externals; the reverse was found for a more directive style. The differences between these authors' study and the current study will be discussed later.

Runyon (1973) has also investigated the relationship between a subordinate's internal-external score and his/her satisfaction with different types of supervision. Using hourly employees in a manufacturing plant, he divided the subjects into two groups: those who were working for a "participative" supervisor and those who were working for a "directive" supervisor. Internals were significantly more satisfied with a participative management style than were externals. On the other hand, externals were significantly more satisfied with directive supervision than were internals.

One other study (Cravens & Worchel, 1977) asserted that the power a leader shows is manifested in the degree of constraint imposed on group members. These authors believe power can be used to reward group members for behaving or coercing group members to behave in prescribed ways. The use of coercive power involves the threat of punishment and or actual punishment for failure to conform to the leader's demands, whereas the use of reward power

involves the offering of some valuable object or activity for conformance to the leader's demands, whereas nothing other than omission of a desirable consequence is gained for conformity. With the use of reward power, a desirable consequence is gained if the group member fulfills the leader's demands, whereas nothing other than the omission of a desirable consequence is suffered for failure to conform.

As has been noted earlier, many subordinate personality characteristics have been related to the styles of leadership shown by managers. Two dimensions of leadership that have been widely studied are consideration and initiating structure. The two leader behavior dimensions were first isolated by the Ohio State Leadership studies (Fleishman, 1953). They have become widely used terms in psychology and hundreds of studies have examined their affects upon subordinate satisfaction, performance and other criteria. It is important to remember that although more than two dimensions of leadership have been proposed, most formulations include the two Ohio State dimensions.

Before some of the research that has been done with the two leadership dimensions, consideration and initiating structure, are illustrated, definitions of them should be provided. According to Graen, Dansereau and

Minami (1972) the first of these dimensions, initiating structure, consists of leadership activities designed to accomplish the processing function of the organizational unit. These activities include defining members' roles and role relations, programming and implementing unit activities, and the enforcing of the legitimate demands of the organization. In short, the first dimension refers to performing those activities expected of an incumbent of the organizational role of the unit leader. Within the Ohio formulation, this dimension is labeled "Initiation of Structure." Also, these authors believe that the other dimension consists of leadership activities designed to keep the appropriate patterns of role behavior occurring over time. These activities include: relating to members feelings, ideas, and behaviors, and responding to the particular situation of each member. According to the Ohio State terminology, this dimension is labeled "Consideration."

Tjosvold (1984) has noted that most research and thinking about leadership has concentrated on whether a leader is seen as initiating and structuring (production-oriented) or considerate (people-oriented). This author also notes that these distinctions have not been consistently related to subordinate productivity and satisfaction. A review of the literature (Kerr,

Schriesheim, Murphy & Stogdill, 1974) involving the leader dimensions "consideration" and "initiating structure," found that the following situational variables significantly moderate the relationship between leader behavior predictors, and satisfaction and performance criteria: subordinate need for information, job level, subordinate expectations of leader behavior, perceived organizational independence, leader's similarity of attitudes and behavior to managerial style of higher management, leader upward influence and characteristics of the task, including pressure and provision of intrinsic satisfaction. These authors note that through the years the Ohio State research has sustained its share of criticisms, perhaps the most serious of which is the contention that the studies fail to take situational variables into account and lack a conceptual base. Critics, they say, have argued that the effect of the studies has been to support a behavioral theory in which optimality is achieved by combining high consideration with high initiating structure, regardless of situation, in a way that is analogous to the 9-9 leadership style on the Managerial Grid (Blake & Mouton, 1964). Therefore, these authors believe that the situational variables that were discovered in the literature review would challenge

the criticisms and would more accurately reflect the character of the Ohio State research.

With regard to the two dimensions' (consideration and initiating structure) relationship with satisfaction and performance of subordinates, it is interesting to note that one study (Schriesheim, House & Kerr, 1976) has theoretically examined the various definitions and operationalizations of leader-initiating structure and consideration and has found that leader consideration has systematically been shown to have a positive relationship (sometimes significant, sometime not) with satisfaction and performance of subordinates. Leader-initiating structure, on the other hand, has been found at various times to have significantly positive, significantly negative and insignificant relationships with subordinate satisfaction and with leader and subordinate performance.

Before stating the specific hypothesis of this present study, however, some mention should be given as to how this study will be different from past studies done on subordinate locus of control and leadership style perceptions.

The study conducted by Runyon (1973), mentioned earlier, investigated the moderating effect of locus of control on the relationship between supervisory style and satisfaction with supervision. Runyon administered

questionnaires containing the Internal-External scale to 110 hourly manufacturing employees. He also administered a single-item measure of satisfaction with supervision and a measure of supervisory style of the subject's supervisor. This present study, however, was concerned with overall job satisfaction and not just satisfaction with supervision. This might be viewed as an inappropriate means of studying satisfaction according to some researchers (i.e., Vecchio, 1981) but unlike that study the "relevant" (i.e., conceptually proximal) criteria under consideration is not just satisfaction with supervision, but overall job satisfaction. It should also be noted that the study by Vecchio supported a contingency approach to leadership based on the initiating structure and consideration dimensions. It should be noted that this present study is different from the study done by Runyon (1973) in that the leadership dimensions under investigation are consideration and initiating structure and not participative and directive. The study done by Mitchell et al. (1975) was also concerned with participative and directive leadership styles and noted the relationship between leadership style and satisfaction with supervision. The current study uses different leadership dimensions and is concerned with the

relationship between subordinate locus of control, leadership style, and overall job satisfaction.

A study done by Abdel-Halim (1981) is different from this present study in that that study examined the moderating effects of each of (a) need for achievement and locus of control, (b) job scope characteristics, both independently and jointly on managers' affective responses to role ambiguity. The results showed that managers with high need for achievement or external locus of control who work on unenriched, low-scope jobs respond most negatively to role ambiguity while no such relationship exists for managers with high need for achievement or internal locus of control who work on enriched, high scope jobs. Thus, this study concentrated on managerial locus of control and need for achievement, and not subordinate locus of control. It has already been noted why this level of locus of control will not be of interest in the present study. Evans (1974) concentrated on the relationship between subordinate internal-external personality and subordinate ratings of both supervisory consideration and initiating structure, but unlike this present study Evans was concerned with the moderating effect of subordinate locus of control on the relationship of the supervisor's behavior and the subordinate's perception of expectancies and instrumentalities in the path-goal motivation model.

This author found that of the three moderators (the subordinate locus of control, the subordinate's position in a web of role relationships, and the supervisor's upward influence) hypothesized, only the first was found to moderate the superior/subordinate relationship as predicted.

Because the two variables discussed earlier (subordinate locus of control and supervisory leadership style) have been shown to account for a great deal of the differences in organizational behavior, this present study focused on them and their relationship to subordinate satisfaction. It was assumed that although there are a number of subordinate personality characteristics that could account for some of the differences in subordinate behavior in organizations, only the dimensions related to control are central to organizational leadership relationships; consequently, the measure of personal orientation to control-locus of control was selected as part of this present study. This study also focused on the supervisor's leadership style. More specifically, the two dimensions, consideration and initiating structure, were examined to discover how various perceptions of these two dimensions relate to the subordinate's locus of control. Secondly, this study attempted to discover how

varying degrees of the two variables contribute to overall job satisfaction.

All the results from the various studies suggest that the appropriate supervisory style may differ depending on the subordinate's locus of control. It is reasonably clear that the two types of individuals prefer different styles and may react differently to them. Therefore, the first hypothesis of this study involved overall job satisfaction. It was hypothesized that Internals would experience greater job satisfaction under considerate management and that Externals would be less satisfied under considerate management. It should be noted that satisfaction is the dependent variable and locus of control and perceptions of supervisory styles are the independent variables. This hypothesis predicts essentially different reactions to managerial style depending upon the degree of internality present in the employee. The Internal subordinate should perceive himself as being better able to control his own destiny. Consequently, he should respond positively to the freedom for personal initiative and responsibility that is characteristic of considerate management. In contrast, the External subordinate should find considerate management frustrating (manager is considerate by giving the subordinate more freedom for personal initiative) and

insufficiently structured. In this case, the subordinate should respond by expressing a preference for a more structured style of management.

The second hypothesis is that the subordinate's locus of control will correlate negatively with overall job satisfaction.

The third hypothesis is that, in the case that an Internal subordinate perceives his/her leader to be high on both the consideration and initiating dimensions satisfaction will not differ significantly from that of the External subordinate who perceives his/her leader to be high or low on both the consideration and initiating dimensions.

This third hypothesis reflects the fact that both Internal and External subordinates should experience the same general level of job satisfaction because both have either high perceptions of their supervisor's consideration and initiating behavior or low perceptions of their supervisor's consideration and initiating behavior. The Internal subordinate with a high perception of a considerate supervisor is able to personally initiate his/her behavior therefore, the level of job satisfaction is high.

The External subordinate on the other hand, should desire a greater level of structure to be provided by their supervisor and consequently experience high job satisfaction when there is a high perception of a supervisor's structuring behavior. With this situation, Internals and Externals should not differ significantly on the level of job satisfaction experienced. Likewise, when either Internals or Externals do not have a high perception of the desired supervisory behavior, the level of job satisfaction will not be high and therefore Internals and Externals will not differ significantly on the amount of job satisfaction experienced.

All these hypotheses are based on the findings (Mitchell, Smyser & Weed, 1975; Runyon, 1973) that internals desire more independence in their work and as a result are more satisfied with their job than externals. It should be noted that job independence is more likely to occur under a considerate supervisor than under a supervisor with high structuring behavior.

In summary the hypotheses of the current study were: Hypothesis 1 - Internals will experience greater job satisfaction under considerate management than would Externals. In other words Externals will be less satisfied under considerate management; Hypothesis 2 - Subordinate locus of control will correlate negatively with general

satisfaction; Hypothesis 3 - In the case that an Internal subordinate perceives his/her leader to be high on both the consideration and initiating dimensions (or low on both dimensions) general satisfaction will not differ significantly from that of the External subordinate who perceives his/her leader to be high (or low) on both the consideration and initiating dimensions.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects participating in this study consisted of 65 subordinates and 8 supervisors in a communications center of a large county law enforcement agency. The subjects are classified as civil employees of three different levels: entry level or complaint officer; middle level or teletype operator; and dispatcher. This group of employees was chosen because of a high turnover rate (22%) and because there is a high degree of upper-level management involvement in determining ways to improve the level of satisfaction experienced by the employees. In an attempt to discover ways to lower the turnover rate in this organization, the commission of this study was approved.

It was assumed that a representative sample was surveyed because the employees work on eight-hour shifts and employees from all the shifts were surveyed. The subjects were composed of both males (N=23) and females (N=42) of various ages. Subjects ranged in age from 18 to 60 years, with a mean of 35; length of service ranged from 0.8 to 14 with a mean of 4.4 years. It should be noted that some of the employees that had initially signed the

Informed Consent Forms two months earlier, later declined to participate in the study.

Instruments

The instruments used in this study were: 1) The Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (Fleishman, 1953); 2) The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, et al., 1967); and 3) Rotter's Social Reaction Inventory (Rotter, 1966).

Briefly, the Supervisory Description Questionnaire contains 48 items which describe how supervisors operate in their leadership role and is filled out by subordinates. It is scored on the two reliable and factorially independent dimensions discussed earlier, consideration and initiating structure. A high score on the consideration dimension characterizes supervisory behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, a certain warmth between the supervisor and the subordinates and consideration of their feelings. A low score indicates that the supervisor is more authoritarian and impersonal in his/her relations with subordinates. The initiating structure dimension reflects the extent to which the supervisor defines or facilitates group interactions toward goal attainment. A high score characterizes supervisors who play a more active role in directing group activities.

Internal consistency reliabilities, reported by Fleishman (1972), using the split-half method range from .89 to .98 for the consideration dimension and .68 to .87 for the structure dimension. Test-retest reliabilities reported by Fleishman (1972) range from .56 to .87 for the consideration dimension, and the range for the structure dimension is from .46 to .75.

Inter-rater reliabilities obtained by Fleishman (1972) for the two dimensions were obtained using the Horst coefficient and Peters and Van Voorhis' unbiased correlation ratios. Horst correlations ranged from .55 to .64 for the consideration dimension and unbiased correlation ratios ranged from .65 to .73 for the consideration dimension. Horst correlations for the structure dimension ranged from .48 to .64.

Correlations between the Supervisory Behavior Description scales and a variety of different criteria obtained in diverse organizations with different types of supervisors and managers, have been reported by Fleishman (1972), as well. Pearson r correlation coefficients for the consideration dimension range from $-.49$ to $.46$. Pearson r correlation coefficients for the structure dimension range from $-.49$ to $.47$. Thus, it can be noted that many significant validities have been obtained, but the pattern is not universal.

Other summaries of this scale and its reliability, validity and scaling adequacy have been provided by Schriesheim and Kerr (1974); Schriesheim and Stogdill (1975) and Schriesheim, House and Kerr (1976). The five alternatives for each item are scored 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4. Thus, the highest possible score for consideration (with its 28 items) is 112, and for structure the highest possible score is 80. The raw scores were converted to percentile scores and compared to the appropriate norm group. Percentile scores of 75 or higher represented a high degree of consideration or structure; percentile scores of 25 or lower represented a low level of consideration or structure; and scores in the middle range of percentiles (26 to 74) represented average levels of consideration and structure.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, et al., 1976) was used to measure employees' satisfaction with their work. The short form consists of 20 items. Each item refers to a reinforcer in the work environment. The respondent indicates how satisfied he/she is with the reinforcer on his/her present job and an overall satisfaction score is calculated from this information. Five response alternatives are presented for each item: "Very Dissatisfied, Dissatisfied, Neither (dissatisfied nor satisfied), Satisfied, Very Satisfied." This form

consists of three scales: Intrinsic Satisfaction, Extrinsic Satisfaction and Overall/General Satisfaction. For purposes of the current study the general scale was used.

Weiss et al. (1976) have reported that Hoyt reliability coefficients obtained for the short form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire are high. For the Intrinsic Satisfaction scale, the coefficients ranged from .84 (for assemblers) to .91 (for engineers). For the Extrinsic Satisfaction scale, the coefficients varied from .77 (electronic assemblers) to .82 (for engineers and machinists). On the General Satisfaction scale, the coefficients varied for .87 (for assemblers) to .92 (for engineers). Median reliability coefficients were .86 for Intrinsic Satisfaction, .80 for Extrinsic Satisfaction and .90 for General Satisfaction.

Weiss et al. (1967) note that evidence for the validity of the short-form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire is available from two sources: (1) studies of occupational group differences; and (2) studies of the relationship between satisfaction and satisfactoriness.

On the Intrinsic Satisfaction and General Satisfaction scales, electronic assemblers had the lowest, and salesmen the highest, mean satisfaction score. On the Extrinsic Satisfaction scale, assemblers were least

satisfied (followed closely by electronic assemblers) and salesmen were again the most satisfied group. Group differences in variability were not statistically significant for any scale. These results parallel those obtained for the long-form MSQ and those generally found in studies of job satisfaction.

Analyses of the relationship between measured satisfaction and measured satisfactoriness are reported in Monograph XXI of the Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation series, "Instrumentation for the Theory of Work Adjustment." These included the cross-correlation between the three MSQ scales and four scales measuring satisfactoriness. For the total group, the highest correlation between a satisfaction scale and a satisfactoriness scale was $-.13$, (between General Satisfaction and General Satisfactoriness). The correlation between General Satisfaction and General Satisfactoriness was $-.11$. These findings show that, for the total group, less than 2% of the variance was common between any satisfactoriness scale. These data support the expectation that satisfaction and satisfactoriness are independent sets of variables, and therefore indirectly support the validity of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire scales as measures of satisfaction (Weiss et al., 1967).

As with the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire, raw scores were converted to percentile scores and compared to the appropriate norm group (given in the administration manual). A percentile score of 75 or higher was taken to represent a high degree of satisfaction; a percentile score of 25 or lower represented a low level of satisfaction; and scores in the middle range of percentiles (26 to 74) indicated average satisfaction.

The Social Reaction Inventory (Rotter, 1966) was used to determine the subordinate's internal-external score. The scale consists of 29 items including six filler items in a forced-choice format. Scores are calculated by summing the total number of externally oriented responses for each pair. Thus, scores range from 0-23. Subordinates were classified as internals if their score on the Internal-External scale was in the bottom one-third of the sample distribution and were classified as external if their scores fell in the top one-third of the distribution. This technique for subgrouping is similar to the procedure used in prior research (Mitchell, et. al., 1975). A summary of studies on scale reliability and its construct validity has been reported by Rotter (1966), and he notes that reliability and discriminant validity estimates range from .69 to .76 using the

Kuder-Richardson method, .79 using the Spearman-Brown method, and .65 using the Split-half method.

Rotter (1966) also notes that while these estimates are only moderately high for a scale of this length, it should be remembered that the items are not arranged in a difficulty hierarchy, but rather are samples of attitudes in a wide variety of different situations. The test is an additive one and items are not comparable. Consequently, split-half, or matched-half reliability tends to underestimate the internal consistency. Kuder-Richardson reliabilities are also somewhat limited since this is a forced-choice scale in which an attempt is made to balance alternatives so that probabilities of endorsement of either alternative do not include the more extreme splits (Rotter, 1966).

Test-retest reliabilities for a one-month period range from .60 to .83 for two different samples. Test-retest reliabilities for a two-month period (using the same sample) ranged from .49 to .61. These somewhat lower reliabilities may be partly a function of the fact that the first test was given under group conditions and the second test was individually administered (Rotter, 1966).

Item analysis of the scale indicated that the items correlated negatively with social desirability.

Therefore, correlations of the 29-item scale with the Marlowe-Crown Social Desirability (Crown & Marlowe, 1964), were obtained. The correlations ranged from $-.07$ to $-.35$. This indicated discriminant validity according to Rotter (1966).

Most significant evidence of the construct validity comes from predicted differences in behavior for individuals above and below the median of the scale or from correlations with behavioral criteria. A series of studies (Rotter, 1966) provides strong support for the hypothesis that the individual who has a strong belief that he can control his own destiny is likely to: (a) be more alert to those aspects of the environment which provide useful information for his future behavior; (b) take steps to improve his environmental condition; (c) place greater value on skill or achievement reinforcements and be generally more concerned with his ability, particularly his failures; and (d) be resistive to subtle attempts to influence him. Copies of all these instruments appear in the Appendix.

Procedure

This study involved the administration of all three questionnaires (at the Civil Defense Building) to groups of 18-25 subordinates at a time. There were three different administration sessions due to the fact that

questionnaires were administered before training sessions (training sessions are held one day a week for three consecutive weeks whenever there are shift changes). There were between 18 to 25 subordinates in each session and all of the subordinates in the sessions reported to the same supervisor(s). There were eight supervisors who were rated on the consideration and initiating dimensions.

Demographic data, including age, sex and tenure of subjects, were collected on the Informed Consent Forms that were administered at the Communications Center two months before the actual questionnaire administration. This form informed prospective subjects of the purpose of the study as well as the role they were to take in the study. Prospective subjects were assured at this time that their identity would remain confidential and that they could withdraw from the study at any time. Subjects were also told that the results of the study would be provided to the Captain in charge of the center.

The data collection period lasted three weeks due to the fact that the questionnaires were administered at the training sessions. Each data collection period lasted about 30-45 minutes. All questionnaires were personally collected after each session.

RESULTS

The technique used for subgrouping Internals and Externals (Mitchell et al., 1975; Kimmons & Greenhaus, 1976) resulted in 26 of the subordinates being classified as Internals (scores of 2-6), 10 subordinates being classified as Externals (scores of 12-16) and 30 subordinates being classified as neither Internal or External subordinates (scores of 7-11). Thus, the range of scores on the Social Reaction Inventory (Rotter, 1966) was from 2 to 16.

The scores on the Consideration scale ranged from 32 to 106. Scores from 84 to 106 are considered high for the consideration dimension and scores from 32 to 65 are considered low for this dimension.

Scores on the Initiating Structure dimension ranged from 26 to 69. Scores from 48 to 69 are considered high in the structuring dimension and scores from 22 to 36 are considered low in the structuring dimension.

For the satisfaction scale, scores ranged from 24 to 100. Scores from 66 to 24 are considered to represent low satisfaction and scores from 84 to 100 are considered to represent high satisfaction. See Table 1 for frequency data for Internals and Externals differing in the levels of perceived supervisor consideration and initiating/

TABLE 1

FREQUENCY DATA FOR INTERNALS AND EXTERNALS
DIFFERING IN THE LEVEL OF CONSIDERATION,
INITIATING STRUCTURE AND SATISFACTION

Consideration		
	<u>Internal</u>	<u>External</u>
High	13	4
Medium	8	2
Low	5	4
Initiating Structure		
High	10	5
Medium	10	2
Low	6	3
Satisfaction		
High	10	1
Medium	9	6
Low	7	3

structuring behavior. Once again it should be noted that overall job satisfaction was the dependent variable in the study and locus of control and perceptions of supervisory styles were the independent variables.

The first hypothesis of this study suggests that Internals would experience greater overall job satisfaction under considerate supervisors and that Externals would be less satisfied under considerate supervisors. A t-test for independent samples was performed comparing mean satisfaction scores of Internals with perceptions of high supervisory considerate behavior (N=13) to mean satisfaction scores of Externals with perceptions of high supervisory considerate behavior (N=4). The t statistic was not significant however at $\alpha = .05$).

Also, a t-test comparing Internals with perceptions of high supervisory structuring behavior (N=10) to Externals with perceptions of high supervisory structuring behavior (N=5), failed to be statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$). Thus, the first hypothesis was not supported by this study. See Table 2 for the mean job satisfaction scores for the two high leadership dimensions for Internals and Externals.

From this table it can be noted that the mean overall job satisfaction score for Internals with perceptions of

TABLE 2
 COMPARISON OF MEAN SATISFACTION SCORE
 FOR THE TWO HIGH LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS

Style of Management	Locus of Control	
	Internal (2-6)	External (12-16)
High Consideration	78.92 (N=13)	71.5 (N=4)
High Initiating Structure	78.16 (N=10)	77 (N=5)

NOTE: Numbers in parenthesis at the top of the table refer to scores on Rotter's Social Reaction Inventory.

high supervisory consideration behavior is higher than the mean satisfaction score for Externals with high perceptions of high supervisory consideration behavior, but this difference was shown not to be statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$.

The table also shows that the mean satisfaction score for Internals with high perceptions of their supervisors' structuring behavior is higher than the mean satisfaction score for Externals with high perceptions of their supervisors structuring behavior, but again, this difference was shown to not be statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$.

The second hypothesis which stated that the subordinate's locus of control would correlate negatively with overall job satisfaction, was not supported by this study. The point-biserial correlation between subordinate locus of control and overall job satisfaction was statistically nonsignificant at $\alpha = .05$.

The third hypothesis (Internal and External subordinates will not differ significantly from one another on the level of satisfaction experienced when they perceive their supervisors as high or low on both the consideration and initiating dimensions) was tested by a t-test for independent samples. This test showed that the difference between those individuals with an Internal

locus of control (N=5) and those with an External locus of control (N=4) was not significantly different on the level of satisfaction experienced at the $\alpha = .05$. This information is considered important because it would determine if there is a difference in the amount of satisfaction experienced by internals or externals when they perceive their supervisors as high in both consideration and initiating structure.

Because of the lack of support for the first two hypotheses of this study additional analysis were performed to try to discover if further information might be obtained. To accomplish this several changes were incorporated.

First, two subscales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Scale, intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction, were used as dependent variables. Secondly, raw scores on the three satisfaction scales and the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire were used for data analysis rather than as the basis for categorizing subjects. Thirdly, Internals and Externals were reclassified based on new cutoff scores. This new reclassification allowed more employees to be included in the analysis of the data (Internals = 37; Externals = 22). The distribution of scores (2-16) was divided in half and the lower half represented Internals (2-8) and the upper half represented

Externals (10-16). Scores of nine were not included in the analysis.

The fourth change in the supplementary analysis was that all of the items on the Social Reaction Inventory that were not work related were omitted. The omission of certain non-work related items was based purely on subjective judgement and resulted in only seven items being included in the analysis (numbers 4, 6, 10, 11, 16, 25 and 28).

The fifth addition in the supplementary analysis was the inclusion of a correlation matrix reflecting the correlations of the seven variables of interest (locus of control - both the seven and twenty-nine item questionnaire, consideration, initiating structure, general satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction and intrinsic satisfaction). The matrix was used to discover which variables would be used in the two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and the matrix was also used to determine possible reasons of non-significant results in the original analysis.

Finally, as a retest of hypothesis one, three 2 X 2 ANOVAs were performed, one analysis for each of the three dependent variables (general satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction and intrinsic satisfaction). These three ANOVAs were used to uncover significant differences in the

various levels of the independent variables (consideration and locus of control) for each of the three new dependent variables (general satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction and intrinsic satisfaction). The initiating structure dimension will not be used because of non-significant correlations for each of the three satisfaction scales, and because the first hypothesis of the study was concerned with differences in perceptions of high considerate supervisory behavior.

Based on the results of these changes additional explanations are offered for the lack of significant results for the first two hypotheses of the study.

The correlation matrix for all of the seven scales shows that locus of control (seven and twenty-nine item questionnaires) has nonsignificant correlations with all the other variables (see Table 3). The matrix also shows that the correlations between initiating structure and all of the other variables are nonsignificant. As would be expected, the correlations between the general satisfaction scale and the two sub-scales are highly positive. The correlation between extrinsic satisfaction and intrinsic satisfaction is also relatively high and

TABLE 3

CORRELATIONS AMONG VARIABLES AND DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

ITEM	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Locus of Control (7-Item)							
2. Consideration	-0.13						
3. Initiating Structure	-0.06	-0.04					
4. General Satisfaction	-0.13	0.31*	0.010				
5. Extrinsic Satisfaction	-0.16	0.51**	0.001	0.84**			
6. Intrinsic Satisfaction	-0.07	0.91**	-0.030	0.90**	0.61**		
7. Locus of Control (29-Items)	0.75	-0.17	-0.010	-0.10	-0.20	0.00	
\bar{X}	1.53	79.64	45.580	76.06	20.63	48.76	7.52
SD	1.37	17.29	8.590	14.28	5.21	9.25	3.77

*p < .05.
 **p < .01.
 N = 65

positive. Table 3 also gives the means and standard deviations for each of the seven variables.

Based on the significant correlations between consideration and all of the three satisfaction scales, 3 two-way analyses of variance were performed to study the relationship between the two independent variables (consideration and locus of control) and the three dependent variables (general satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction and intrinsic satisfaction).

The first analysis of variance (ANOVA) table (relationship of high and low consideration and locus of control to general satisfaction) shows a significant F for consideration at $\alpha = .05$ (see Table 4). Specifically, the mean satisfaction score for high consideration is significantly greater than the mean satisfaction score for low consideration regardless of the locus of control variable. In other words, persons who see their supervisors as considerate are more generally satisfied.

The second analysis of variance (ANOVA) table (relationship of high and low consideration and locus of control to extrinsic satisfaction) also shows a significant F for consideration at $\alpha = .01$ (see Table 5). Once again, the mean extrinsic satisfaction score (under high considerate) was significantly greater than the mean extrinsic satisfaction score (under low considerate).

TABLE 4
2 X 2 ANOVA FOR MAIN EFFECT OF INDEPENDENT
VARIABLE (CONSIDERATION) ON GENERAL
SATISFACTION SCORES

Source	CF	MS	F
Factor A (Locus of Control)	1	61.61	F = .272
Factor B (Consideration)	1	980.45	F = 4.34*
AB (Interaction)	1	127.70	F = .565
Error	43	225.86	
Total	46		

*p < .05

TABLE 5
 2 X 2 ANOVA FOR MAIN EFFECT OF INDEPENDENT
 VARIABLE (CONSIDERATION) ON EXTRINSIC
 SATISFACTION SCORES

Source	CF	MS	F
Factor A (Locus of Control)	1	16.54	F = .668
Factor B (Consideration)	1	334.51	F = 13.51**
AB (Interaction)	1	15.52	F = .627
Error	43	24.74	
Total	46		

**p < .01

regardless of the locus of control variables. In other words, persons who see their supervisors as considerate are more extrinsically satisfied.

The third two-way analysis of variance table (relationship of high and low consideration and locus of control to intrinsic satisfaction) shows no significant F values (see Table 6).

Overall, the results from the three ANOVAs indicate that high consideration leads to higher general and extrinsic satisfaction, but not intrinsic satisfaction, regardless of the locus of control variable.

TABLE 6
 2 X 2 ANOVA FOR MAIN EFFECT OF INDEPENDENT
 VARIABLE (CONSIDERATION) ON INTRINSIC
 SATISFACTION SCORES

Source	CF	MS	F
Factor A (Locus of Control)	1	12.14	F = .11 (N.S.)
Factor B (Consideration)	1	133.64	F = 1.23
AB (Interaction)	1	66.89	F = .61
Error	43	108.01	
Total	46		

**p < .05

*p < .0

DISCUSSION

Hypothesis One, which stated that Internals would experience greater job satisfaction under considerate management and that Externals would be less satisfied under considerate management, was not supported by this study. The most interesting finding of the study was the apparent lack of strength of the Internal-External scale in discriminating between subordinates in terms of their responsiveness to differing managerial styles. The weakness of the Internal-External measure in this regard suggested that it does not have great potential in organizations. A great deal of testing and research must be done however, before this idea can be confirmed.

As was mentioned in the introduction, the fact that the personality of the subordinate may be an important variable in the supervisor-subordinate relationship has important implications. However, this was not the case for the sample studied and it is important to note that Durand and Nord (1976) have found negative correlations of subordinate locus of control and their perception of supervisory consideration. The researchers' work has been mentioned earlier, but it is important to recount their findings briefly at this point due to the results obtained in the present study. Durand and Nord (1976), in their

review of the literature, revealed only four studies where the followers' personalities have been related to their perceptions of a leader. These authors explain this by noting that the tendency of Internals to see their supervisors as more considerate than Externals may be explained by differences in behavior of the various types of subordinates. The Internal is apt to act directly on the environment, consequently, his/her supervisor is aware of the Internal's needs and may respond to them either voluntarily or because of pressure from the subordinate. In contrast, the external subordinate attempts little influence on the environment or his/her supervisor. The supervisor, being unaware of and/or unpressured to respond to the needs of External subordinates, does not help to satisfy the External's needs.

There could be a similar case for the group of subordinates that were sampled in the present study because of the nature of the work performed at the communication center, which consists of processing of all 911 emergency calls. There may be virtually no attempts made by Internals to act directly on the environment. Thus, the supervisor does not respond to the needs of the Internal or External subordinate. This could possibly explain the lack of support for the idea that Internals experience greater job satisfaction under considerate

management than Externals. The lack of support for the first hypothesis of this study also implies that there should be other variables of concern when studying the relationship between subordinate's personality and other organizational variables.

The second hypothesis stated that there would be a negative relationship between locus of control and the supervisor's consideration and structuring behavior, and overall job satisfaction. For the subordinates sampled, however, this was not the case. Although some researchers (Kimmons & Greenhaus, 1976; Mitchell et. al., 1975; and Lester and Genz, 1978) support the hypothesis that Internals are more satisfied with their jobs than Externals, one study (Daily, 1978) reported that for a sample of scientists and engineers from 15 organizations, Internals were less satisfied with co-workers than were Externals. These results were explained by the fact that Externals have greater social orientation.

This result suggests that perhaps there are specific aspects of a job that affect satisfaction. It could well be that other aspects of job satisfaction need to be addressed when trying to determine how subordinate personality variables interact with various organizational variables and job satisfaction.

The results obtained in the supplementary analysis also help to explain the non-significant results for the first two hypotheses. The first hypothesis that stated Internals would experience greater general satisfaction under considerate management and that Externals would be less satisfied under considerate management was not supported because there are no significant general satisfaction mean differences for the locus of control variable. In effect, for the sample studied, it did not matter if the employees were Internals or Externals. Higher consideration leads to greater general satisfaction, regardless of the locus of control variable. Locus of control did not moderate the relationship.

The second hypothesis that stated there was a high negative correlation between locus of control and general satisfaction was not demonstrated. For the sample studied, there was a weak negative correlation between these variables, but the correlation did not reach significance. In addition, when the two satisfaction subscales were added to the study, they were shown not to have significant correlations with the locus of control variable. The non-significant F for the locus of control variable in the first analysis of variance (general satisfaction) also reflects the inability of the locus of

control variable to affect the level of general satisfaction experienced.

Various job types must also be sampled to obtain the consistency needed for more reliable conclusions. It should be noted that many of the studies done have focused only on public utility workers (Kimmons & Greenhouse, 1976; and Mitchell et. al., 1975). It should also be noted that for the sample studied the nonsignificant results that were obtained in the original analysis might have been attributed to the small N's used in the t-test performed. Future researchers should take whatever means available to assure as many subjects in each of the groups (Internals and Externals) as possible.

The inconsistent results noted in other studies (Abdel-Halim, 1981; and Evans, 1974) of the relationship between the Internal-External scale, measures of job satisfaction and perception of leadership style suggest that Internals and Externals either perceive supervisors somewhat differently, or as mentioned earlier, supervisors tend to treat their Internal and External subordinates differently. Thus, it may be difficult to draw firm conclusions from studies relying on perceptions of supervisory behavior by subordinates.

It should be noted that the third hypothesis was supported by the study and is in agreement with a study

conducted by Tjosuold (1984) that provided experimental support for the finding that high structure-high consideration leaders facilitate productivity and satisfaction. When this situation occurs, even subordinates differing in locus of control should experience the same general level of overall job satisfaction and this was proven to be the case for the group of subordinates sampled. Once again, however, it should be noted that not many studies have been conducted to test this idea. Before firm conclusions can be drawn, other important subordinate personality variables as well as other variables that affect job satisfaction and productivity must be examined.

Although the dimensions of leadership (consideration and initiating structure) that were used in this study interact significantly with locus of control and job satisfaction and have been used in many leadership studies, it is important to note once again that these two dimensions have not been consistently related to subordinate production and satisfaction (Kerr & Schriesheim, 1974; Stodgill, 1974).

In addition, the questionnaires that are typically used to measure the two leadership dimensions used in this study have been criticized on several bases. First, they have been criticized on a psychometric basis (Schriesheim

et al., 1976; Schriesheim & Kerr, 1974; and Schriesheim & Stogdill, 1975) and secondly, on the basis that little is known about leader actions that cause subordinate outcomes because the subordinates typically provide the ratings (Kerr & Schriesheim, 1974).

Although these criticisms have been made about the dimensions and the questionnaires used to measure them, one recent study mentioned earlier (Tjosvold, 1984) has provided results that provide experimental support for the general finding that high structure-high consideration leaders facilitate productivity and satisfaction and suggest how leaders might be both oriented toward production and toward people. As noted earlier, it was hypothesized for this present study that the amount of satisfaction experienced by Internals or Externals will not differ significantly when supervisors are perceived as high in both the consideration and initiating dimensions and this hypothesis was supported.

One other study (Sims Jr. & Manz, 1984) has demonstrated the potential for direct measurement of leader behavior through observational methods. The results of this study showed that about 80% of the verbal behavior of the subjects concentrated on non-effort-oriented (i.e., a "methods" approach) as opposed to about 20% effort-oriented or "motivational"

verbal behavior. This study could be thought of as one of the first attempts to meet the criticism that little is known about leader actions that cause subordinate outcomes and that perceptions of supervisory behavior by subordinates are not reliable. The authors of this study (Sims Jr. & Manz, 1984) also note that their study demonstrated the feasibility of videotape technology to "capture" observable leader-behavior. The reliability of the observed leader-behavior measures is one indication that further research can focus on "actual" leader behavior instead of perceived leader behavior.

Other issues that the findings failed to illuminate include: Whether employees should be selected and placed under different supervisors on the basis of their Internal/External scores, and whether the style of supervision preferred by Internals and Externals is quite opposite. If indeed Internals could be proven to prefer more considerate supervisory approaches (as opposed to the more structured supervisory approaches preferred by externals) then these individuals might work best and be more satisfied under a considerate supervisor and Externals would be more satisfied under a more structured supervisor. If employers wanted to reduce the amount of turnover in their organization and increase the level of satisfaction experienced, these factors (locus of control

and supervisory style) should be given more attention. It should be noted, however, that locus of control's utility as a selection device needs empirical validation.

Furthermore, locus of control's stability would have to be demonstrated since it has been shown that a person's locus of control changes over time as a result of experience (Andrisani & Nestel, 1976). Because of this, the role of Internal-External attitudes as a contributor to work experience may affect both one's behavior toward the environment and the environment's affect on the behaviors of individuals therein. Many other intervening variables's however, would have to be included in this analysis before any solid conclusions can be made.

Overall, it must be noted that further research is needed on the two major variables examined in this study (locus of control and managers' leadership style) before the results obtained can be considered completely reliable. Other subordinate personality characteristics and supervisory leadership styles must be considered in order to assess the complex relationship between the supervisor and subordinate in organizations. The direction of future research should also include the examination of both the locus of control dimension and the leadership dimensions in relation to certain obvious variables such as age, education and work experience.

Until such work is undertaken the precise nature of the relationships that may exist remains a matter of speculation.

EXTRA 100% F26

APPENDIX A
SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION

SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION

by

Edwin A. Fleishman, Ph.D.

Advanced Research Resources Organization
Washington, D.C.

Name _____ Date _____
 _____ (Last) _____ (First) _____ (Middle) _____ Position _____
 Company _____

	Raw Score	Percentile	Other
C			
S			

Description
of
Norm Group

INSTRUCTIONS:

You have observed your own supervisor and probably you know pretty well how he or she operates. In this questionnaire, you are simply to *describe* some of the things your own supervisor does with your group.

For each item, choose the alternative which best describes how often your supervisor does what that item says. Remember . . . there are no right or wrong answers to these questions. The items simply *describe* the behavior of the supervisor over you; they do not judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Everyone's supervisor is different and so is every work group, so we expect differences in what different supervisors do.

Answer the items by marking an "X" in the the box (a, b, c, d, or e) next to each item to indicate your choice.

Copyright 1970, 1979 Edwin A. Fleishman, PhD
 Printed in U.S.A. All rights reserved.
 Published by: Management Research Institute
 4330 East West Highway
 Washington, D.C. 20014

Reprinted 1983

1. MY SUPERVISOR IS EASY TO UNDERSTAND. a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never a b c d e
2. MY SUPERVISOR ENCOURAGES OVERTIME WORK. a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all a b c d e
3. MY SUPERVISOR TRIES OUT HIS/HER NEW IDEAS. a. often b. fairly much c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom a b c d e
4. MY SUPERVISOR BACKS UP WHAT PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP DO. a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never a b c d e
5. MY SUPERVISOR CRITICIZES POOR WORK. a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never a b c d e
6. MY SUPERVISOR DEMANDS MORE THAN WE CAN DO. a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom a b c d e
7. MY SUPERVISOR REFUSES TO GIVE IN WHEN PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP DISAGREE WITH HIM/HER. a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never a b c d e
8. MY SUPERVISOR EXPRESSES APPRECIATION WHEN ONE OF US DOES A GOOD JOB. a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never a b c d e
9. MY SUPERVISOR INSISTS THAT PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP FOLLOW STANDARD WAYS OF DOING THINGS IN EVERY DETAIL. a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never a b c d e
10. MY SUPERVISOR HELPS PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP WITH THEIR PERSONAL PROBLEMS. a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom a b c d e
11. MY SUPERVISOR IS SLOW TO ACCEPT NEW IDEAS. a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never a b c d e
12. MY SUPERVISOR IS FRIENDLY AND CAN BE EASILY APPROACHED. a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never a b c d e
13. MY SUPERVISOR GETS THE APPROVAL OF THE WORK GROUP ON IMPORTANT MATTERS BEFORE GOING AHEAD. a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never a b c d e
14. MY SUPERVISOR RESISTS CHANGES IN WAYS OF DOING THINGS. a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all a b c d e
15. MY SUPERVISOR ASSIGNS PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP TO PARTICULAR TASKS. a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never a b c d e
16. MY SUPERVISOR STRESSES BEING AHEAD OF COMPETING WORK GROUPS. a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all a b c d e
17. MY SUPERVISOR CRITICIZES A SPECIFIC ACT RATHER THAN A PARTICULAR INDIVIDUAL. a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never a b c d e

18. MY SUPERVISOR LETS OTHERS DO THEIR WORK THE WAY THEY THINK BEST. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
19. MY SUPERVISOR DOES PERSONAL FAVORS FOR PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP. a b c d e
a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
20. MY SUPERVISOR EMPHASIZES MEETING OF DEADLINES. a b c d e
a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
21. MY SUPERVISOR SEES THAT A WORKER IS REWARDED FOR A JOB WELL DONE. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
22. MY SUPERVISOR TREATS PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP WITHOUT CONSIDERING THEIR FEELINGS. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
23. MY SUPERVISOR INSISTS THAT HE/SHE BE INFORMED ON DECISIONS MADE BY THE PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
24. MY SUPERVISOR OFFERS NEW APPROACHES TO PROBLEMS. a b c d e
a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
25. MY SUPERVISOR TREATS ALL WORKERS IN THE GROUP AS HIS/HER EQUALS. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
26. MY SUPERVISOR IS WILLING TO MAKE CHANGES. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
27. MY SUPERVISOR ASKS SLOWER PEOPLE TO GET MORE DONE. a b c d e
a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
28. MY SUPERVISOR CRITICIZES PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP IN FRONT OF OTHERS. a b c d e
a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
29. MY SUPERVISOR STRESSES THE IMPORTANCE OF HIGH MORALE AMONG THOSE IN THE WORK GROUP. a b c d e
a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
30. MY SUPERVISOR TALKS ABOUT HOW MUCH SHOULD BE DONE. a b c d e
a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
31. MY SUPERVISOR "RIDES" THE PERSON WHO MAKES A MISTAKE. a b c d e
a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
32. MY SUPERVISOR WAITS FOR PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP TO PUSH NEW IDEAS BEFORE HE/SHE DOES. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
33. MY SUPERVISOR RULES WITH AN IRON HAND. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
34. MY SUPERVISOR TRIES TO KEEP THE PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP IN GOOD STANDING WITH THOSE IN HIGHER AUTHORITY. a b c d e
a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never

35. MY SUPERVISOR REJECTS SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
36. MY SUPERVISOR CHANGES THE DUTIES OF PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP WITHOUT FIRST TALKING IT OVER WITH THEM. a b c d e
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
37. MY SUPERVISOR DECIDES IN DETAIL WHAT SHALL BE DONE AND HOW IT SHALL BE DONE. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
38. MY SUPERVISOR SEES TO IT THAT PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP ARE WORKING UP TO THEIR LIMITS. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
39. MY SUPERVISOR STANDS UP FOR PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP EVEN THOUGH IT MAKES HIM/HER UNPOPULAR. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
40. MY SUPERVISOR MAKES THOSE IN THE WORK GROUP FEEL AT EASE WHEN TALKING WITH HIM/HER. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
41. MY SUPERVISOR PUTS SUGGESTIONS THAT ARE MADE BY PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP INTO OPERATION. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
42. MY SUPERVISOR REFUSES TO EXPLAIN HIS/HER ACTIONS. a b c d e
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
43. MY SUPERVISOR EMPHASIZES THE QUANTITY OF WORK. a b c d e
 a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
44. MY SUPERVISOR ASKS FOR SACRIFICES FROM PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP FOR THE GOOD OF THE ENTIRE DEPARTMENT. a b c d e
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
45. MY SUPERVISOR ACTS WITHOUT FIRST CONSULTING THE PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP. a b c d e
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
46. MY SUPERVISOR "NEEDLES" PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP FOR GREATER EFFORT. a b c d e
 a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
47. MY SUPERVISOR INSISTS THAT EVERYTHING BE DONE HIS/HER WAY. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
48. MY SUPERVISOR ENCOURAGES SLOW-WORKING PEOPLE TO GREATER EFFORT. a b c d e
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom

APPENDIX B

MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Section IV-A

MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to give you a chance to tell **how you feel about your present job**, what things you are **satisfied** with and what things you are **not satisfied** with.

On the basis of your answers and those of thousands of other people throughout the nation, we hope to get a better understanding of the things people **like and dislike about their jobs**.

On the back of this sheet you will find statements about your **present job**.

- Read each statement carefully.
- Decide **how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job** described by the statement.

Keeping the statement in mind:

- if you feel that your job gives you **more than you expected**, check the box under "VS" (Very Satisfied);
- if you feel that your job gives you **what you expected**, check the box under "S" (Satisfied);
- if you **cannot make up your mind** whether or not the job gives you what you expected, check the box under "N" (Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied);
- if you feel that your job gives you **less than you expected**, check the box under "DS" (Dissatisfied);
- if you feel that your job gives you **much less than you expected**, check the box under "VDS" (Very Dissatisfied).

Remember: Keep the statement in mind when deciding **how satisfied you feel about that aspect of your job**.

Do this for **all statements**. Please answer **every item**.

Be **frank and honest**. Give a true picture of your feelings about your **present job**.

MANUAL FOR THE MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?

VS means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

S means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

N means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

DS means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

VDS means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

<i>On my present job, this is how I feel about:</i>	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
1. Being able to keep busy all the time	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The chance to work alone on the job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The chance to do different things from time to time	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The chance to be "somebody" in the community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The way my boss handles his men	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The way my job provides for steady employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The chance to do things for other people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The chance to tell people what to do	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. The way company policies are put into practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. My pay and the amount of work I do	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. The chances for advancement on this job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. The freedom to use my own judgment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. The working conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. The praise I get for doing a good job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX C
SOCIAL REACTION INVENTORY

SOCIAL REACTION INVENTORY

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief: obviously there are no right or wrong answers.

Please answer these items carefully but do not spend too much time on any one item. Be sure to find an answer for every choice. Find the number of the item on the answer sheet and black-in the space under the letter a or b which you choose as the statement more true.

In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Also, try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choices.

- 1.a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.
- 2.a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
- 3.a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
- 4.a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
- 5.a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
- 6.a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
- 7.a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
- 8.a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.
- 9.a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

- 10.a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.
- 11.a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
- 12.a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
- 13.a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
- 14.a. There are certain people who are just no good.
b. There is some good in everybody.
- 15.a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
- 16.a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
- 17.a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
- 18.a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
b. There really is no such thing as "luck."
- 19.a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
- 20.a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
- 21.a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
- 22.a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
- 23.a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.
- 24.a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

- 25.a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
- 26.a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.
- 27.a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
- 28.a. What happens to me is my own doing.
b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
- 29.a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

REFERENCES

- Abdel-Halim, A. A. (1980). Effects of person-job compatibility on managerial reactions to role ambiguity. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 26, 193-211.
- Andrisani, P. J., & Nestel, G. (1976). Internal-external control as contributor to and outcome of work experience. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 156-165.
- Blake, R. R., Mouton, J. S., & Bidwell, A. C. (1962). Management grid. Advanced Management-Office Executive, 1, 12-15.
- Cravens, R. W., & Worchel, P. (1977). The differential effects of rewarding and coercive leaders on group members differing in locus of control. Journal of Personality, 45, 150-168.
- Dailey, R. C. (1978). Relationship between locus of control, perceived group cohesiveness and satisfaction with co-workers. Psychological Reports, 42, 311-316.
- Dessler, G. (1974). A test of the path-goal theory of motivation. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 12 62-82.
- Durand, E. D., & Nord, W. R. (1976). Perceived leader behavior as a function of personality characteristics of supervisors and subordinates. Academy of Management Journal, 19, 427-438.
- Evans, M. G. (1974). Extensions of a path-goal theory of motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 172-178.
- Fleishman, E. A. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology. 37, 1-6.
- Graen, G., Dansereau, F., & Minami, T. (1972). Dysfunctional leadership styles. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 7, 216-236.

- Heisler, W. J. (1974). A performance correlate of personal control beliefs in an organizational context. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 504-506.
- House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 321-338.
- Johnson, A. L., Luthans, F., & Hennessey, H. W. (1984). The role of locus of control in leader influence behavior. Personnel Psychology, 37, 61-75.
- Kerr, S., Schriesheim, C. A., Murphy, C. J., & Stogdill, R. M. (1974). Toward a contingency theory of leadership based upon the consideration and initiating structure literature. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 12, 62-82.
21. 43 * Kimmon, G., Greenhaus, J. H. (1976). Relationship between locus of control and reactions of employees to work characteristics. Psychological Reports, 39 815-820.
- Lester, D. (1982). Perceived stress in police officers and belief in locus of control. The Journal of General Psychology, 107 157-158.
- Lester, D., & Genz, J. L. (1978). Internal-external locus of control, experience as a police officer, and job satisfaction in municipal police officers. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 6, 479-481.
28. 24 * Mitchell, T. R., Smyser, C. M., & Weed, S. E. (1975). Locus of control: Supervision and work satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 18, 623-631.
- Oliver, J. E. (1983). Job satisfaction and locus of control in two job types. Psychological Reports, 52, 425-426.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80, 1-27.
- Runyon, K. E. (1973). Some interactions between personality variables and management styles. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57, 288-294.

- Schriesheim, C. A., House, R. J., & Kerr, S. (1976). Leader initiating structure: A reconciliation of discrepant research results and some empirical tests. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 15, 297-321.
- Schriesheim, C. A., & Kerr, S. (1974). Psychometric properties of the Ohio State leadership scales. Psychological Bulletin, 81, 756-765.
- Schriesheim, C. A., & Stogdill, R. M. (1975). Differences in factor structure across three versions of the Ohio State Leadership Scales, Personnel Psychology, 28, 189-206.
- Silvers, M., & Deni, R. (1983). Rating of importance of job factors by office employees as a function of internal-external control scores. Psychological Reports, 53, 323-326.
- Sims, H. P., & Manz, C. C. (1984). Observing leader verbal behavior: Toward reciprocal determinism in leadership theory. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 222-232.
- Spector, P. E. (1982) Behavior in organizations as a function of employee's locus of control. Psychological Bulletin, 91, 482-497.
- Stodgill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. Journal of Psychology, 25 35-71.
- Stodgill, R. M. (1974). Handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press.
- Tjosvild, D. (1984). Effects of leader warmth and directiveness on subordinate performance on a subsequent task. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 422-427.
- Vecchio, R. P. (1981). Situational and behavioral moderators of subordinate satisfaction with supervision. Human Relations, 34, 947-963.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, C. W., & Loiquist, L. H. (1967). Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation XXII: Manual For the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minnesota: Industrial Relations Center.

Yukl, G. (1971) Toward a behavioral theory of leadership. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6, 414-440.