# A Study on Locus of Control Among the Employees of Retail Industry in Bangalore City

**Sumandiran CSP**

**Founder and Director, Coimbatore Research Forum, Coimbatore, India. cberf2018@gmail.com**

**Dr. S. Rajamohan**

**Professor and Director, Alagappa Institute of Management, Alagappa University, Karaikudi, India.**

**Abstract - Locus of Control is a concept in psychology, originally developed by Julian Rotter in the 1950s. People tend to attribute their chances of future successes or failures of either to internal or external causes. Persons with an internal locus of control see themselves as responsible for the outcomes of their own actions. Someone with an external locus of control on other hand sees environmental causes and situational factors as being more important than internal once. Locus of Control has been found to have significantly influenced job performance effectiveness. This paper focuses on the Locus of Control among the Employees of Retail Industry in Bangalore city. LOCO Inventory is used to establish a relationship between locus of control and seven areas – general, success or effectiveness, influence, acceptability, career, advancement, and rewards and Ratio Analysis method was adopted for the 1400 respondents on their Internal, External (Others) and External (Luck) Locus of Control. It was found out that there is a positive correlation among Internality, External (others) and External (Luck) Locus of Control**

**Key words: Locus of Control, LOCO Inventory, Internal Locus of Control, External Locus of Control**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Locus of control refers to a person's belief about what causes the good or bad results in his life, either in general or in a specific area such as health or academics. It also refers to an individual's generalized expectations concerning where control over subsequent events resides. In other words, who or what is responsible for what happens. Locus of control formulation classifies the generalized beliefs, concerning who or what influences things along a bipolar dimension from internal to external control: "Internal control" is the term used to describe the belief that control of future outcomes resides primarily in oneself while "external control" refers to the expectancy that control is outside of oneself, either in the hands of powerful other people or due to fate/chance.

Rotter's conceptualization viewed locus of control as one-dimensional (internal to external) and Levenson's model asserts that there are three independent dimensions: Internality, Chance, and Powerful Others. According to Levenson's model, one can endorse each of these dimensions of locus of control independently and at the same time. From the time of introduction, the locus of control construct has undergone considerable elaboration and several context-specific instruments have been developed. Those with a high internal locus of control have better control of their behavior, tend to exhibit more achievement orientation, and are more likely to attempt to influence other people than those with a high external locus of control.

Those with a high internal locus of control are more likely to assume that their efforts will be successful. They are more active in seeking information and knowledge concerning their situation. Generally, the development of locus of control stems from family, culture, and past experiences leading to rewards. Most internals have been shown to come from families that focused on effort, education, and responsibility. On the other hand, most externals come from families of a low socio economic status where there is a lack of life control.

Psychological research has found that people with a more internal locus of control seem to be better off, e.g., they tend to be more achievement oriented and to get better paid jobs. Sometimes Locus of Control is seen as a stable, underlying personality construct, but this may be misleading, since the theory and research indicates that that locus of control is largely learned. Loco inventory is an instrument to measure locus of control. Loco inventory has been developed for use in organizations. The locus of control orientation are reflected in the way people feel about what happens in the organization and how much control they, other significant persons, or neither (being a matter of luck), have in important organizational matters. These matters relate to success or effectiveness, influence, acceptability, career, advancement and rewards. Levenson has divided the concept of Locus of control in mainly two

 DOI : 10.18231/2454-9150.2019.0467 

parts i.e. External and Internal, in external there are again two parts i.e. Chance or luck and other external factors.

## II. NEED FOR THE STUDY

It was noted during several visits to the Retail firms in Bangalore by the Researcher that there was a need for the study for Locus of Control among the Employees in Retail Industry at Bangalore city. It is evident that Locus of Control determines how people relate to success or effectiveness, influence, acceptability, career, advancement and rewards.

## III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To measure the Locus of Control Inventory (LOCO Inventory) of the Employees working in Retail Industry in Bangalore city
- To analyze the Ratios of LOCO Inventory between Internal Locus of Control, External (others) Locus of Control and External (luck) Locus of Control
- To find the type of Locus of Control present among the Employees of Retail Industry in Bangalore City.
- To find the correlation between Internal Locus of Control, External (others) Locus of Control and External (luck) Locus of Control.
- To suggest the possible ways and means to improve the Locus of Control for better performance of the organization

## IV. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Cromwell et al (1961)[1] appear to be the first to have used the term Locus of Control (LOC) in reference to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. Subsequently, Julian Rotter (1966)[2] conceptualized LOC as a predisposition in the perception of what causes reinforcement (reward, favorable outcome, goal accomplishment). A predisposition for internal LOC (internality) results from the perception that reinforcement is contingent on one's own behavior or one's own relatively permanent characteristics or traits. Perception that reinforcement is due to Luck, Chance, Fate, or factors beyond one's control indicates an external LOC (externality). One of the earlier studies of the LOC construct that Davis and Phares (1967)[3] have showed that internality enhances information seeking, whereas externality reduces information seeking.

Interest in studying the LOC construct has begun by Joe (1971)[4] with problems encountered in individual psychotherapy. Hershey (1972)[5] indicated a psychological application of the locus of control construct in reporting an industry study of the effects of anticipated job loss on employee behavior. Conventional wisdom suggests that management should notify employees of a pending layoff at the last possible moment, to minimize the response of dysfunctional employee behavior. The findings showed no difference in behavior of employees notified at an earlier time. Although locus of control was not the primary focus of the study, the article provided an indirect link to the construct. Hershey concluded that knowledge of an imminent layoff allows employees to take control, or at least maintain a sense of control of their lives (gain a greater sense of internal control).

Late on a slightly different perspective on the concept of internal versus external control of reinforcement was provided by Lefcourt (1976)[6]. Perceived control is a generalized expectancy for internal control of reinforcement. Reactions to unpleasant stimuli are shaped by the individual's perceptions of the stimuli and by the individual's perceptions of ability to cope with the stimuli.

Although Rotter's initial theory focused on the individual as the unit of analysis, the studies conducted by McLaughlin (1977)[7], Suls and Mullen (1981)[8], Trimble and Richardson (1983)[9], Jackson and Tessler (1984)[10], Gurin and Brim (1984)[11], Harrington (1985)[12], Conger and Kanungo (1988)[13], Thomas and Velthouse (1990)[14], Ormel & Schaufeli (1991)[15], Howell and Avolio (1993)[16], Nelson et al (1995)[17] and Cain (1994)[18] focused on primary aspects of LOC as self-efficacy (having the skills), self-esteem (having the confidence), autonomy (having dominion), and instrumentality (contributing to the outcome).

Conger and Kanungo (1988)[19] have identified two different approaches to the development of the empowerment construct—relational and motivational. Empowerment as a relational construct occurs through movement toward participative management, where organizational decision making is shifted to lower levels for inclusion of a larger number of employees. Empowerment as a motivational construct occurs when management enables employees by helping employees perceive they have power and control. The authors suggested that empowerment as a motivational construct involves creating "expectancy belief-states that are internal to individuals". This expectancy belief is derived straight from the construct of locus of control.

Coates et al., (1989)[20] have studied that the complexity of change undeniably affects the workforce and organizational change results in a disorienting dilemma for many employees.

Conger and Kanungo's theory on empowerment provided the framework for Thomas and Velthouse's (1990)[21] refinement of the cognitive elements of empowerment: sense of impact, competence, meaningfulness, and choice.

Hayes (1994)[22] has described the development and validation of the Employee Empowerment Questionnaire (EEQ), a survey instrument for measuring individual perceptions of empowerment. The empirical data showed that the EEQ measures empowerment by examining

 DOI : 10.18231/2454-9150.2019.0467 

employee "perceptions of the work environment, their level of self-efficacy, or their perception of authority to act". These three concepts are embodied in the construct of LOC.

Miller et al. (1994)[23] has suggested that an orientation toward internal locus of control increases the likelihood of an individual's willingness to participate in organizational change. It is ironic that they did not consider the need for autonomy or dominance in their study of the antecedents to willingness to participate in change.

Nelson et al. (1995)[24] have studied that the issue of control becomes relevant only "when an event is of significant magnitude to make uncertainty a source of general concern". Their data suggested that the upheaval of reorganization caused an increase in employees' externality.

Kalechstein & Nowicki, (1997)[25] have stated that the various constructs relating to "control" have undergone development during which new terms and reinterpretations of old notions have been proposed and instruments have been developed. Because of such alternative notions there has often been a lack of attention to building solid theoretical foundations, causing confusion and making interpretation and integration of findings difficult, particularly in relation to studies investigating the relationship between locus of control and achievement.

J. W. Gilley et al (2002)[26] have noted that reductions in performance and productivity are often addressed through interventions designed by HRD professionals meant to improve performance, organizational effectiveness, and facilitate planned organizational change.

Similarly, Holton (2005)[27] recommended including LOC as an individual characteristic dispositional variable in the HRD Evaluation and Research Model, his "comprehensive framework for diagnosing and understanding the causal influences of HRD intervention outcomes". Holton's LOC assumptions paralleled those of Crooker et al., with more positive outcomes predicted for those individuals having an internal LOC.

McCarthy and Garavan (2006)[28] have suggested from the results of a study in which LOC was an independent variable. Individuals with an internal locus of control will report more post feedback behavioral change than individuals exhibiting an external LOC. Although the authors have recommended that HRD professionals design, deliver, and evaluate feedback programs to support employees' performance improvement efforts, they have provided limited insights for planning feedback training and development programs with respect to individuals' LOC.

Fornes et al (2008)[29] have mentioned that this sense of helplessness decreases congruency "between the employee's values and interests and those of the organization" and decreases workplace commitment and can also reduce individual performance and productivity.

## V. METHODOLOGY

This study makes use of both primary and secondary data. It is an empirical study based on survey method. Structured questionnaire was employed to collect data from the employees. Every employee was met in person by availing necessary permission from the industry they belonged, unmindful of the time factor. Most of the employees needed explanation to the questions posted in the questionnaire and the researcher had to be on field to collect the questionnaire duly filled in by the employees of the Retail Industry in Bangalore city.

### 5.1 Study Area

In order to determine Locus of Control all the Retail Industry in Bangalore city of Karnataka State were considered as the study area to achieve the objectives of the present study.

### 5.2 Study Population

The present study has considered all the employees in the Retail Industry in Bangalore city of Karnataka during 2012-2014

### 5.3 Sampling

Primary as well as secondary data were collected. Proportionate Simple Random Sampling method was adopted to select the samples as there are five divisions, namely, East, West, North, South and Central in Bangalore city of Karnataka State. All these five divisions of Bangalore city were considered as the study areas to achieve the objectives of the present study.

The secondary data were collected from several websites such as www.mapsofindia.com, www.fundoodata.com, www.allensolly.com, www.coffeeday.com, www.amaltas.in, www.ccindia.net, www.citizenwatches.co.in, www.ganjam.com, www.globalfranchisearchitect.com, www.indus-league.com, www.koochieplay.com, www.levi.com, www.manipalgroup.com published and unpublished reports available regarding (i) divisions in Bangalore city of Karnataka State, (ii) type of industry, (iii) total number of employees, (iv) location of the industry and so on.

With regard to the collection of Primary data, Stratified Random Sampling method as explained in Table 1.1 was used for the selection of employees in Retail Industry in Bangalore city of Karnataka State and a well defined and pre-tested Questionnaire was used to get information from the employees.

### 5.4 Sampling Design

As per the available information on the list of Retail Industry in Bangalore city of Karnataka State, there were 52 major Retail Industry according to www.fundoodata.com (as on 31st May 2013) and 308 other

 DOI : 10.18231/2454-9150.2019.0467 

Retail Industry from unpublished reports. Hence, a total of 360 Retail Industry were considered as the Universe and a sample of 120 Retail Industry (Sampling Fraction being 33.33 per cent) were randomly selected by using the sampling frame.

These 360 Retail Industry were stratified into three strata, namely

(i) Retail Industry having less than 1001 employees,
(ii) Retail Industry having 1001 to 2001 employees and
(iii) Retail Industry having more than 2001 employees.

From each stratum, Retail Industry was selected at random proportionately by using random number table. Thus, 99, 7 and 14 Retail Industry was selected from Stratum I, Stratum-II and Stratum-III respectively.

Following Table 1.1 presents the Sampling Design for the selection of Retail Industry in Bangalore city of Karnataka State. From each selected Retail Industry, the employees who were available and could spare their time at the time of interview were interviewed. Thus, a total of 1400 employees in Retail Industry in Bangalore city of Karnataka State were interviewed.

**Table 1.1 Sampling Design for the Selection of Retail Industry and Respondents in Bangalore city of Karnataka State**

| Stratum (Number of Employees) | UNIVERSE | SAMPLE RETAIL INDUSTRY | SAMPLE RESPONDENTS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Less Than 1001 | 296 | 99 | 1155 |
| 1001-2000 | 21 | 7 | 82 |
| 2001 and Above | 43 | 14 | 163 |
| TOTAL | 360 | 120 | 1400 |

### 5.5 Pre-Test and Reliability Test

Before finalizing the Questionnaire, a pre-test, was carried out for 15 days among 50 employees in the Retail Industry in Bangalore city of Karnataka in order to study the reliability of the Questionnaire. To determine the internal consistency of statements in the Questionnaire to gauge its reliability, Cronbach's Alpha Test was administered. Data collected from pre-test was analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). Table 1.2 presents the reliability of Questionnaire.

**Table 1.2: Reliability of Questionnaire**

| Sl. No | Questions Related to | No. of Statements | Number of Sample | Cronbach's Alpha | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Value | Percentage |
| 1 | LOCO Inventory | 30 | 50 | 0.8739 | 87.39 |

It could be seen from Table 1.2 that the reliability coefficient (Alpha) which is higher than 0.70 and hence, it is considered acceptable reliability.

### 5.6 Data Processing and Tabulations

After completion of the data collection, SPSS 21.0 version was used to analyze the data. The accuracy of the data entry was rechecked to ensure error-free database. LOCO Inventory, Ratio analysis, Correlation and Descriptive Statistics are used to find the effect of factors on respondents on Locus of Control

## VI. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

### 6.1 LOCO Inventory

LOCO inventory tries to establish a relationship between locus of control and seven areas – general, success or effectiveness, influence, acceptability, career, advancement, and rewards. All the thirty items included in the Loco Inventory, are categorized into one of these seven categories, as depicted in Table 1.3.

**Table 1.3: Distribution of Items in Locus of Control Inventory**

| Sl. No. | Categories | Internality (I) | Externality Others (EO) | Externality Luck (EL) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | General | 1, 27 | 4, 30 | 7, 24 |
| 2. | Success or effectiveness | 3, 10, 16 | 6, 19, 22 | 9, 13, 21 |
| 3. | Influence | 28 | 17 | 26 |
| 4. | Acceptability | 25 | 29 | 18 |
| 5. | Career | 2 | 5 | 8 |
| 6. | Advancement | 23 | 11 | 14 |
| 7. | Rewards | 20 | 15 | 12 |

**Scoring**

The respondents were asked to fill in their responses on the basis of a five-point scale, as given below

Write 4 if you strongly feel this way. Write 3 if you generally feel this way. Write 2 if you somewhat feel this way (and somewhat not). Write 1 if you slightly feel this way. Write 0 if you hardly or never feel this way.

After the respondents have filled in their responses, the scores are transferred to the Loco Inventory Scoring Sheet, to get the total scores on Internality (I), Externality Others (EO) and Externality Luck (EL).

 DOI : 10.18231/2454-9150.2019.0467 

It will be observed that the total scores on each of the three dimensions of locus of control viz., I, EO, and EL will range from 0 to 40.

The total of each of the three dimensions are then multiplied by 2.5, to convert them into a 100-point scale. Table 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6 depicts the tabulated scores of LOCO inventory, obtained from the responses of 1400 respondents in terms of I, EO and EL.

**Table 1.4: Locus of Control (Internality) Inventory Code of the Employees of Retail Industries in Bangalore City**

| Score | Frequency | Per Cent |
|---|---|---|
| **<=17** | 53 | 3.8 |
| **18-21** | 250 | 17.9 |
| **22-28** | 659 | 47.1 |
| **29-32** | 188 | 13.4 |
| **>=33** | 250 | 17.9 |
| **TOTAL** | 1400 | 100.0 |

According to the analysis made with the respondents on the Internality (I), it is evident that, 250 respondents (out of the sample size of 1400 respondents) have scored a score of 33 or above. This implies that 17.9 percent of the respondents are very confident of themselves. They believe in their abilities, but sometimes might not be able to assess the contingencies and difficulties that might come in their way of achieving goals. They can be unrealistic and blame themselves for any failure. 53 respondents have scored an internal score of 17 or less. This implies that 3.8 percent employees fail to put to use their full potential and do not rely on their efforts to achieve goals.

188 respondents have scored an internal score of 29 to 32. This shows that 13.4 percent respondents have high trust in their abilities and will mostly put them to effective use to achieve their goals. 250 respondents have scored an internal score of 18 to 21. This means that 17.9 percent respondents do not believe in themselves and need to take feedback from others to evaluate their strengths. Almost a little less than half of the respondents (659) have scored an internal score between 22 to 28. This implies that 47.1 percent respondents are somewhere in between, with moderate trust in themselves and their abilities, at the same time not taking the blame of failure totally on themselves, but attributing it to contingencies and luck.

**Table 1.5: Locus of Control (Externality Others) Inventory Code of the Employees of Retail Industries in Bangalore City**

| Score | Frequency | Per Cent |
|---|---|---|
| **<=16** | 69 | 4.9 |
| **17-20** | 206 | 14.7 |
| **21-29** | 835 | 59.6 |
| **>=30** | 290 | 20.7 |
| **TOTAL** | 1400 | 100.0 |

Externality Others (EO) means the degree to which an individual relies on significant others (boss, peers and subordinates), to achieve success/failure in the organization. As is evident from the Table 1.5, 290 respondents (out of the sample size of 1400 respondents) have scored an EO score of 30 to 40. This means that 20.7 percent employees exhibit dysfunctional dependence on significant others. 835 respondents have scored an EO score of 21 to 29. This shows that 59.6 percent employees exhibit a realistic dependence on significant others. 206 respondents have scored an EO score of 17 to 20. Moreover, 14.7 percent respondents exhibit an independent orientation. Only 59 respondents have scored an EO score of 16 or below. This shows that 4.9 percent employees exhibit a counter-dependent orientation with significant others

**Table 1.6: Locus of Control (Externality Luck) Inventory Code of the Employees of Retail Industries in Bangalore City**

| Score | Frequency | Per Cent |
|---|---|---|
| **<=10** | 160 | 11.4 |
| **11-20** | 873 | 62.4 |
| **21-30** | 350 | 25.0 |
| **>=31** | 17 | 1.2 |
| **TOTAL** | 1400 | 100.0 |

Externality Luck (EL) is concerned, the simple rule is 'the lower, the better'. Only 160 respondents have scored an EL score of 10 or below. This implies that 11.4 percent of the respondents may not be able to tackle frustration when unforeseen contingencies or situations come up. This might affect them in the achievement of a goal. 873 respondents have scored an EL score of 11 to 20. This means that 62.4 percent of the respondents are more likely to tackle such

 DOI : 10.18231/2454-9150.2019.0467 

frustration, as they do not completely believe in the power of luck, fate, and/or chance. As they exhibit a moderate level of externality luck, they are able to handle such unforeseen situations better than individuals with an EL score of 10 or below. 350 respondents have scored an EL score of 21 to 30. This implies that 25 percent employees are more likely to attribute failure/success to luck, fate, and/or chance, and are more likely to handle unforeseen situations with a 'not my fault' attitude.

### 6.2 Ratio Analysis of LOCO Inventories

The following table 1.7 shows the sum total scores of Internality, Externality (others) and Externality (Luck) of the Employees of Retail Industries in Bangalore city.

**Table 1.7 Sum of Internality, Externality (others) and Externality (Luck) Scores of Employees of Retail Industries in Bangalore City**

| Particulars | Internality Score | Externality (others) Score | Externality (Luck) Score |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total Population Size | 1400 | | |
| Sum Score | 36592.00 | 35711.00 | 23938.00 |

#### 6.2.1 Ratio analysis between internal and external (others) scores

From the Table 1.7, the Sum Score of Internality(I) is 36592; Externality others (EO) is 35711; Externality – Luck (EL) is 23938; Since I/EO calculated for 1400 respondents in the organization is 1.0427, which is greater than 1, the respondents exhibit a higher level of internality than externality (others). This means that they believe in their inner abilities and attribute their success/failure to their own capabilities, rather than the influence of their boss, peers and subordinates.

The employees can largely determine what matters to them in the organization and believe that most of the times, they alone are responsible for getting, or not getting rewards and promotions. Believing in the power of 'self' to achieve success in the organization is their mantra. Their competence and hard work are the two primary determinants of their performance in any endeavor.

#### 6.2.2 Ratio analysis between internal scores and external (luck) scores

Moreover since I/EL calculated for 1400 respondents in the organization is 1.5286 (calculated with the values determined from Table 1.7), which is greater than 1; the respondents yet again exhibit a higher level of internality than externality (luck). This means that they believe in their inner abilities and attribute their success/failure to their own capabilities, rather than luck, chance and/or fate.

The employees can largely determine what matters to them in the organization and believe that most of the times, they alone are responsible for getting, or not getting rewards and promotions. This shows a 'never-say-die' attitude of employees towards difficult and tenuous tasks and also their readiness to defer gratification. As per the theory of Lefcourt & Wine, employees in the process-based organization are likely to be receptive to information and are more observant.

#### 6.2.3 Ratio analysis between internal scores and external (others & luck) scores

I/(EO + EL) calculated from the Table 1.7 for 1400 respondents in the organization is 0.6135, which is less than 1. Contrary to the observation in the first and second ratios, where respondents exhibited a higher level of internality than externality (others) and externality (luck), this ratio brings to the fore a higher level of externality (others & luck) than internality.

### 6.3 Analysis of Mean and Standard Deviation for I, EO and EL

Table 1.8 shows mean and standard deviation values of Internality, Externality (others) and Externality (Luck) of the Employees of Retail Industry in Bangalore City of Karnataka State.

**Table 1.8: Mean and Standard Deviation of Internality, Externality (others) and Externality (Luck) of the Employees of Retail Industry in Bangalore City**

| Particulars | Internality Score | Externality (others) Score | Externality (Luck) Score |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total Population | 1400 | | |
| Mean | 26.1371 | 25.5079 | 17.0986 |
| Standard Deviation | 5.70502 | 6.00904 | 6.12792 |

#### 6.3.1 Analysis of Internality scores

According to Levenson (1972), the norms for internality are: Mean = 28 Standard Deviation = 5. From the Table 1.8 the Mean of internal scores of respondents has been calculated as 26.1371 and standard deviation is 5.705. Since a deviation of –2.5 to +2.5 is acceptable, therefore the sample size exhibits an acceptable level of internality. This means that they believe in their inner abilities and attribute their success/failure to their own capabilities and can largely determine what matters to them in the organization and believe that most of the times; they themselves are responsible for getting, or not getting rewards and promotions.

#### 6.3.2 Analysis of External (others) scores

The norms for externality (others) are: Mean = 24 Standard Deviation = 5 (Levenson 1972). The Mean of external (others) scores of respondents has been calculated as

 DOI : 10.18231/2454-9150.2019.0467 

25.5079 and Standard deviation is 6.0090 from the table 1.8.

Since a deviation of –2.5 to +2.5 is acceptable, therefore the sample size exhibits an acceptable level of externality (others). This means that the respondents believe in the influencing power of their superiors, peers and subordinates. Instead of being unrealistic and unreasonable about achieving a goal, they at times, leave the bearing of an outcome to external others.

### 6.3.3 Analysis of External (luck) scores

The Standard Norms derived from Levenson (1972) for externality (luck) are: Mean = 15 Standard Deviation = 5. Table 1.8 depicts the Mean of external (luck) scores of respondents as 17.0986 and Standard deviation 6.127. Since a deviation of –2.5 to +2.5 is acceptable, therefore the sample size exhibits an acceptable level of externality (luck). This means that the respondents to some extent believe in the power of luck, chance and/or fate. They believe that some matters in the organization are somewhat a matter of pure luck and are therefore better prepared to handle unforeseen circumstances.

Mean is also used to identify the type of locus of control present in the employees. After analyzing the data it is found that most of the employees from sample of 1400 belong to internality with the highest mean of 26.131. As the mean of internality is higher than other two dimensions i.e. Externality (Luck) and Externality (Others) we can say that most of the employees have internal locus of Control. After internality second dimension is Externality (Others) with the mean of 25.508. Externality (Luck) stood last with the mean of 17.098.

### 6.4 Correlation between I, EO and EL

From the analysis and as shown in Table 1.9, it is quite evident that there is a positive correlation between Locus of Control Internality, Locus of Control – Externality Others and Locus of Control – Externality Luck. The Correlation between Externality Others and Externality Luck is more positively correlated with a value of 0.683, followed by the correlation values of Internality and Externality Luck with 0.595. Internality and Externality Others has a correlation value of 0.587.

The Correlation is significant at 0.01 level.

**Table 1.9 Intercorrelation Matrix of I, EO and EL of the Employees of Retail Industry in Bangalore City**

| | Internality Score | Externality Others Score | Externality Luck Score |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Internality Score** | 1 | 0.587** | 0.595** |
| **Externality Others Score** | 0.587** | 1 | 0.683** |
| **Externality Luck Score** | 0.595** | 0.683** | 1 |

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

## VII. CONCLUSION

The Researcher found that there exists more of external locus of control among the employees of retail sector in Bangalore. (As per Ratio Analysis) The researchers were able to identify that internal locus of control has significantly positive impact on job satisfaction of employees. While in case of external locus of control there is a positive relation between externality (others) & externality (chance) and job satisfaction level of employees but it is not significant. As this research was done on the basis of series of

existing literature still same can be done by carrying out primary research in private and public sector units; and it will in turn give more depth detail of an impact of type of locus on performance level of employees based on type of sector to which they belong.

## REFERENCES

[1] Cromwell, R. L., Rosenthal, D., Shakow, D., & Zahn, T. P, Reaction time, locus of control, choice behavior, and descriptions of parental behavior in schizophrenic and normal subjects. Journal of Personality, 29, 1961, pp.363-380.

[2] Rotter, J. B, Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80(1, Whole No. 609), 1966.

[3] Davis, W. L., & Phares, E. J, Internal-external control as a determinant of information seeking in a social influence situation. Journal of Personality, 35, 1967, pp.547-561.

[4] Joe, V. C. (1971). Review of the internal-external control construct as a personality variable.Psychological Reports, 28(2), 619-640.

[5] Hershey, R. (1972). Effects of anticipated job loss on employee behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56(3), 273-275.

[6] Lefcourt, H. M. (1976). Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

[7] McLaughlin, K. E. (1977). Locus of control change in college students: A future role for student development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 160 933) Ipswich, MA.

[8] Suls, J., & Mullen, B. (1981). Life change and psychological distress: The role of perceived control and desirability. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 11(5), 379-389

[9] Trimble, J., & Richardson, S. (1983). Perceived personal and societal forms of locus of control measures among American Indians. White Cloud Journal of American Indian Mental Health, 3(1), 3-14.

[10] Jackson, M. E., & Tessler, R. C. (1984). Perceived lack of control over life events: Antecedents and consequences in a discharged patient sample. Social Science Research, 13(3), 287-301.

 DOI : 10.18231/2454-9150.2019.0467 

[11] Gurin, P., & Brim, O. G. (1984). Change in self in adulthood: The example of sense of control. In O. G. Brim (Ed.), Life-span development and behavior (Vol. 6, pp. 281-334). New York: Academic Press

[12] Harrington, C. (1985). Successful women: A psychological investigation of family, class, and education origins. Report of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. New York: Columbia University

[13] Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. Academy of Management Review, 13(3), 471-482.

[14] Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An interpretive model of intrinsic task motivation. Academy of Management Review, 15, 666-681.

[15] Ormel, J., & Schaufeli, W. B. (1991). Stability and change in psychological distress and their relationship with self-esteem and locus of control: A dynamic equilibrium model. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 60(2), 288-299.

[16] Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 891-902.

[17] Nelson, A., Cooper, C. L., & Jackson, P. R. (1995). Uncertainty amidst change: The impact of privatization on employee job satisfaction and well-being. Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 68(1), 57-71.

[18] Cain, R. A. (1994). Perception of power/control among African Americans: A developmental approach. Western Journal of Black Studies, 18(3), 164-174.

[19] Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. Academy of Management Review, 13(3), 471-482.

[20] Coates, J. F., Jarratt, J., & Mahaffie, J. (1989). Workplace management 2000: Seven themes shaping the U.S. work force and its structure. Personnel Administrator, 34(12), 51-55.

[21] Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An interpretive model of intrinsic task motivation. Academy of Management Review, 15, 666-681.

[22] Hayes, B. E. (1994). How to measure empowerment: The employee empowerment questionnaire can help. Quality Progress, 2, 41-46.

[23] Miller, V. D., Johnson, J. R., & Grau, J. (1994). Antecedents to willingness to participate in a planned organizational change. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 22, 59-80.

[24] Nelson, A., Cooper, C. L., & Jackson, P. R. (1995). Uncertainty amidst change: The impact of privatization on employee job satisfaction and well-being. Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 68(1), 57-71.

[25] Kalechstein, A. D., & Nowicki, S., Jr. (1997). A meta-analytic examination of the relationship between control expectancies and academic achievement: An 11-year follow-up to Findley and Cooper. Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 123, 27–56.

[26] Gilley, J. W., Eggland, S. A., & Maycunich Gilley, A. (2002). Principles of human resource development (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

[27] Holton, E. F., III. (2005). Holton's evaluation model: New evidence and construct elaborations. Advances in Developing Human Resources, 7(1), 37-51.

[28] McCarthy, A., & Garavan, T. (2006). Postfeedback development perceptions: Applying the theory of planned behavior. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 17(3), 245-267Burke, L. A., & Hutchins, H. M. (2007). Training transfer: An integrative literature review. Human Resource Development Review, 6(3), 263-296.

[29] Fornes, S., Rocco, T. S., & Wollard, K. K. (2008). Workplace commitment: A conceptual model developed from integrative review of the research. Human Resource Development Review, 7(3), 339-357.

 DOI : 10.18231/2454-9150.2019.0467 