

**The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Locus of Control amongst Call
Centre Representatives in a Call Centre in Durban, KwaZulu-Natal**

By

Pamela Jaskiaya Jeannette Chetty

Student Number: 205523822

Supervised by Dr M.A. Moola

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Social Science in the School of Psychology

University of KwaZulu-Natal

Durban, South Africa

November 2008

Declaration

I declare that this dissertation is my own unaided work. All citations, references and borrowed ideas have been duly acknowledged. It is being submitted for the degree of Masters in Social Science (Industrial Psychology) in the Faculty of Humanities, Development and Social Science, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa. None of the present work has been submitted previously for any degree or examination in any other University.

Pamela Jaskiaya Jeannette Chetty

Student name

27th November 2008

Date

Acknowledgements

- I would like to thank god, Jesus Christ in giving me the strength, knowledge, wisdom and perseverance.
- I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr M.A. Moola for his guidance and assistance throughout this research. His encouragement throughout this year was invaluable. Dr Moola has helped me view things pragmatically, which was critical and essential to the success of this research.
- I am grateful to Miss Shanya Pillay in helping me with this research. Her time, support and input are highly appreciated. Thank you Shanya, for your encouragement and support throughout this research.
- I would like to thank my family, especially my mum in supporting me throughout this year. She has indeed made priceless dedication and commitment to the success of this research.
- I would further like to thank Anisha Ramsaroop (University of KwaZulu- Natal, Westville campus) in assisting me to obtain the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Rotters Locus of Control Inventory.
- Lastly, I would like to thank the manager and employees who have participated in this research study. Their time and contribution have enabled me to gather information, which formed the basis of my research.

Abstract

Call centres are typically characteristic of a highly repetitive, monotonous, and low skilled nature of work, which has resulted in low levels of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction or no satisfaction for call centre representatives. This has been the motivating factor in determining if a relationship exists between call centre representatives' job satisfaction and their locus of control orientation.

A sample of 103 call centre representatives from a call centre in KwaZulu-Natal participated in this research. The results of the research suggest that there is no significant relationship between call centre representatives' job satisfaction and their locus of control orientation.

The findings suggest that irrespective of a call centre representative's locus of control orientation, the nature of work in a call centre itself is such that it leads low levels of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction and no satisfaction. The results further suggest that there is no relationship between call centre representatives' job satisfaction, gender, qualifications and tenure.

Similarly, no relationship has been found between call centre representatives' locus of control orientation, gender, qualifications and tenure. These findings indicate that further research is required to understand job satisfaction within the call centre, as there is limited research within the South African context.

Table of contents	Page
Declaration	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iii

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background of the research.....	1
1.2 Objectives and hypotheses of the research.....	3
1.3 Broader issues investigated in the research.....	4

Chapter 2: Literature review

2.1 Introduction.....	5
2.2 Job design of call centre work.....	5
2.3 Human resource practices in call centres.....	8
2.4 Locus of control and job satisfaction.....	12
2.5 Monitoring within the call centre.....	13
2.6 The customer-call centre representative interaction.....	15
2.7 Theoretical framework.....	18
2.7.1 Herzberg’s two-factor theory of motivation.....	18
2.7.2 Rotter’s locus of control theory.....	20

Chapter 3: Research design and methodology

3.1 Research approach.....	23
3.2 Sample.....	23
3.3 Research measuring instrument.....	23
3.3.1 The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.....	24
3.3.2 The Rotter’s Locus of Control (I-E) Scale.....	25
3.4 Procedure and ethical issues.....	26
3.5 Data analysis.....	26

Chapter 4: Results	28
Chapter 5: Discussion of the results	44
Chapter 6: Conclusion and recommendations	49
References	50

Appendices

Appendix 1: Letter of Informed Consent

Appendix 2: Biographical Questionnaire

Appendix 3: The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Appendix 4: The Rotter's Locus of Control (I-E) Scale

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background of the research

Job satisfaction has been an extensively researched area (Buitendach & De Witte, 2005). Job satisfaction refers to “an evaluative judgment one makes about ones job or job situation” (Weiss as cited in Mohr & Zoghi, 2008, p. 276). However, it is important to note that job satisfaction in South African call centres has not been researched widely and is a new form of work organisation (Gordi, 2006; Dormann & Zijlstra, 2003).

A call centre can be defined as a “work environment in which the main business is mediated by computer and telephone-based technologies that enable the efficient distribution of incoming calls (or location of outgoing calls) to available staff, and permit customer-employee interaction to occur simultaneously with the use of display screen equipment and the instant access to, and inputting of information” (Holman, 2003, p. 116).

According to Gordi (2006) call centres “have become an integral part of most organisations’ today, playing a pivotal role in the service delivery chain” (p. 13). Further, in the past ten years the call centre industry had been growing at a remarkable rate (Miller & Fisher, 2005). Lewig & Dollard (2003) have indicated that the call centre industry is expanding at a rate of 40% per year around the world. Given this, call centres in South Africa have created many job opportunities (Benner, 2006; Coetzee, 2006).

While the discussion above does outline some of the positive aspects associated with call centres there has been significant research to suggest that the call centre environment holds many negative outcomes for employees. Example, research by Miller & Fisher (2005) has identified call centre jobs as highly repetitive and monotonous. In addition, Holman (2003) pointed out that jobs at the call centre can be characterised by high stress levels which are often caused by the high demands placed on call centre representatives’ (CSRs). A call centre representative can be defined as “those individuals’ who are employed to work in the call centre and deal with customers concerns and requests telephonically” (Gordi, 2006, p. 17).

The studies above suggest that the call centre may offer little or no job satisfaction for the call centre representative. Rose & Wright (as cited in Gordi, 2006) support this view and have stated that “call centre representatives’ are generally associated with low levels of job satisfaction because of the fairly low skilled nature of work” (p. 1). Further Holman (2003) states, “it is these workplace experiences that have led some to label call centres as “electronic sweatshops” or the “dark satanic mills of the twenty-first century” (p. 115). It is apparent that the nature of work in the call centre industry can be a potential source of job dissatisfaction or no satisfaction for the call centre representative.

Among the many explanations associated with varying levels of job satisfaction in the call centre much research indicates that an individual’s locus of control orientation may in fact contribute to these varying levels of job satisfaction. In particular Carrim, Basson, & Coetzee (2006) have indicated “given the significance of work in an individual’s life, it seems vital to understand the relationship between job satisfaction and personality variables such as locus of control in call centres” (p. 66).

Therefore this research has explored the relationship that may exist between job satisfaction and locus of control orientation amongst call centre representatives’. Locus of control as developed by Rotter refers to “whether people believe that outcomes are controllable, in other words whether outcomes are believed to be contingent on one’s behaviour” (Deci & Ryan, 1987, p. 166).

Given the above, Rotter’s theory of locus of control and Herzberg’s two-factor theory of motivation has been used in this research to underpin locus of control and job satisfaction respectively. These theories have been further explained in the theoretical framework. Lastly, research has indicated that studies in South African call centres are at a minimum thus more research is necessary (Levin as cited in Gordi, 2006; Milner, fisher & Latif, 2007).

1.2 Objectives and hypotheses of the research

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether a relationship exists between job satisfaction and locus of control amongst call centre representatives. Job satisfaction was the dependent variable and locus of control was the independent variable in this study. This implies that job satisfaction is dependent upon locus of control orientation. Tenure and qualification were split into dichotomous variables.

1.2.1) Objectives:

- To determine if a relationship exists between job satisfaction and locus of control.
- To determine if call centre representatives locus of control orientation influences job satisfaction levels.

- To determine if:
 - Job satisfaction is influenced by gender; tenure or qualifications for call centre representatives.
 - Locus of control is influenced by gender; tenure or qualifications for call centre representatives.

1.2.2) Hypotheses:

- **H1:** A relationship exists between locus of control and job satisfaction amongst call centre representatives.
- **H2:** Call centre representatives with an external locus of control experiences job satisfaction.
- **H3:** Call centre representatives with an internal locus of control experiences job dissatisfaction.
- **H4:** A relationship exists between job satisfaction, gender, tenure and qualifications.
- **H5:** A relationship exists between locus of control, gender, tenure and qualifications.

1.3) Broader issues investigated in the research

Call centre representatives play a vital role in the call centre industry (Malhotra & Mukherjee as cited in Gordi, 2006). One of the key issues then would be how work practices; in particular human resource practices impact on job satisfaction for the call centre representative (Holman, 2003). Thus human resource practices have been reviewed in this research. Further Milner et al. (2007) have indicated that call centre representatives are closely monitored in that every call is measured. Holman (2003) supports this view and has shown that “call centre representatives have little control over the timing of their work, the methods they use and what they can say” (p. 120).

These studies imply that autonomy and job variety may be limited for the call centre representative, which may have a negative impact on job satisfaction. Thus, job design in the call centre and monitoring has been discussed as this seemed to affect job satisfaction. Apart from the employer’s demands, customer demands can be another source of job dissatisfaction for call centre representatives thus formed part of the broader areas that were investigated in this research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

“Call centres hold a grip on public imagination” (Houlihan, 2004, p. 75). In that work in a call centre can be characterised by a highly repetitive and monotonous nature. Further, call centres are often referred to as “electronic panopticons and human battery farms” (Holman, 2004, p, 223). Electronic panopticon refers to “a technological practice of surveillance that facilitates objectification and subjectification and occasionally domination of the labouring subject” (Foucault as cited in Winiiecki, 2004, p. 79). Human battery farms refer to the call centre as a work environment that is characterised by a low skilled nature of work that offers little or no job variety and autonomy for call centre representatives. This implies low levels of job satisfaction or no job satisfaction for the call centre representative.

Therefore in reviewing the literature various factors in relation to job satisfaction will be reviewed. These include job design, human resource practices, locus of control in relation to job satisfaction, monitoring and the customer-call centre representative interaction. Lastly, the theoretical framework will be discussed.

2.2 Job design of call centre work

According Hackman & Oldham (as cited in Batt & Moynihan, 2002) “the large literature on work design showed that enhanced job characteristics such as autonomy, variety and ability to complete a whole task are significant predictors of worker satisfaction” (p. 19). Thus job design may be a predictor of job satisfaction. Further work in a call centre is designed around a very technical nature, which may imply low levels of job satisfaction for the call centre representative (Grebner, Semmer, Faso, Gut, Kallin & Elfering, 2003). The research by Grebner et al. (2003) suggests that the nature of work in the call centre is highly systematic which may also imply that autonomy and job variety is very limited.

Deery & Kinnie (2004) support this view and have suggested that call centre representatives are expected to interact with their customers at a very high standard whilst at the same time work with intricate computer systems where their pace and quality of work is monitored. In addition, research conducted by Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli (2003) showed that “call centre operators use interactive display terminals during telephone calls and thus perform multiple tasks with frequent interruptions. Yet communication skills and efficiency are expected” (p. 394). This implies that the call centre representative’s nature of work is at a high pace and highly repetitive although a high standard and quality of work is expected.

Further Rose & Wright (as cited in Gordi, 2006) state, “the impact of call centre workplace upon employee satisfaction or well-being is beginning to attract the attention of researchers” (p. 13). Holman (2003) supports this view by stating “the design of a CSR’s job is another salient feature of call centres that, like performance monitoring, has attracted much attention. A reason for this is that some CSR jobs do seem to be an expression of an advanced form of Taylorism and as such have been criticized for being a primary cause of job-related stress. However, not all jobs are designed in this manner with most falling on a continuum running from Tayloristic to empowered” (p. 120). Taylorism essentially involves the “division of labour, the structure of control over task performance and the implicit minimum interaction employment relationship” (Littler, 1978, p. 185). In other words Taylorism involves an authoritarian and mechanistic approach to work (Nyland & Mcleod, 2007).

Given this Holman (2003) indicates that at the Taylorist end of the continuum jobs are low skilled and routine; calls are of a limited time and are followed according to a script. In addition Dieckhoff et al. (as cited in Zapf, Isic, Bechtoldt & Blau, 2003) state, “depending on business, a CSR talks to between 60 and 250 clients per 8 hour shift. The more customers talked to, the less time is available for each of them and the more routine (and boring) these conversations may become for the CSR” (p. 312).

Further Zapf et al. (2003) found that the call centre representative is monitored by means of an automatic call distribution (ACD) system, which dictates when a call should be answered and monitors the pace of each call. Sprigg, Smith & Jackson (2003) support these views have indicated that call centre representatives have an allocated time on each call.

These studies are suggesting that the call centre representative has to work in a tightly controlled, highly pressurised work environment, which may result in a lower level of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction or no satisfaction. Further, research showed that undesirable working conditions such as a tightly controlled work environment, high pace of work and work over load will result in low job performance and job satisfaction (Dwyer & Fox, 2006; Mulki, Jaramillo & Locander, 2008). Given this the Taylorist design of jobs that involves low skill levels may be associated with low levels of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction or no satisfaction. Further Rose & Wright (2005) in their research showed that low skilled jobs might not lead job satisfaction. On the other hand at the empowered end of the continuum, a call centre representative has more influence over how the job is done by using ones knowledge and skill and calls are not handled in accordance to a script (Holman, 2003). This implies that at the empowered end of the continuum the call centre representative experiences a higher level of autonomy, therefore may experience a higher level of job satisfaction.

In support of this view Holman (as cited in Deery, Iverson & Walsh, 2004) “examined the impact of job design characteristics and human resource practices on job satisfaction. He found that intrinsic job satisfaction, satisfaction with features of the job that relate to the nature and quality of the work itself was higher for employees who had greater control over the timing and methods of their work, were engaged in a wide variety of tasks and who had more extensive opportunities to solve customer related problems” (p. 206). It can be noted that an employee may experience job satisfaction if a job offers a degree of autonomy and job variety (Gruneberg, 1979; Carrim et al., 2006). As interpreted, jobs at the Taylorist end of the continuum offers little or no autonomy and tight supervision; therefore externally oriented individuals may experience job satisfaction, as they prefer to work in a controlled environment. At the empowered end of the continuum there is a greater degree of autonomy and less supervision therefore internally oriented individuals may experience job satisfaction.

Given the differences between the Tayloristic design of jobs and jobs at the empowered end of the continuum it is important to note that call centres primarily engage in Tayloristic job designs (Batt & Moynihan, 2002). In addition “self-managed teams and off-line teams may be used to increase variety and participation in Tayloristic jobs when it is perceived that there is little room for achieving these aims through the redesign of the core job task” (Batt as cited in Holman, 2003, p. 121).

In other words call centres can be described as having “coercive employment systems. This appears to contrast with the high levels of customer service and satisfaction which are often required for them to be successful” (Kinnie, Hutchinson, & Purcell, 2000, p. 967). The studies above suggest that call centre representatives may be subjected to management’s control in order to provide good customer service and satisfaction, which may be associated with low levels of job satisfaction, no satisfaction or dissatisfaction for the call centre representative.

Having discussed the design of call centre work it was inevitable that call centres offer jobs that are highly repetitive, monotonous and low skilled, which implies little or no job variety and autonomy for the call centre representative. Thus, job design of call centre work can result in high dissatisfaction levels. Significantly Malhotra & Mukherjee (2003) suggested that “there is a need to redesign these frontline jobs in call centres by adding more variety, providing greater autonomy, allowing more participation by employees, implementing 360 degree feedback, providing more role clarity thereby reducing monotony and role stress in their work. Also performance based rewards and promotional opportunities need to be carefully considered” (p. 963). Further Holman (2003) supports this view and has noted “call centre managers can take a proactive approach to employee well-being and try to reduce stress through the design of call centre work” (p. 129).

2.3 Human resource practices in call centres

Human resource (HR) practices in the call centre have shown to affect job satisfaction significantly by the way in which work is organised (Holman, 2003; Shah & Bandi, 2003; Batt & Moynihan, 2002). Example the call centre primarily focuses on a routine nature of work, which may imply dissatisfaction for the call centre representative. This routine nature of work is entrenched in one of the models from which call centre HR practices are aligned. There are two types of models on which human resource practices are based. This includes the mass service model and the high commitment service (HCS) model (Holman, 2003). Below is a table that tabulates the differences that exist between the two models.

Table 1: *Call centre models: mass service and high commitment service (Holman, 2003, p. 122)*

Mass service	High commitment service
Customer segment: Mass market	Specialist, high- earning private customers businesses
Market: High volume, low added value	Low-volume, high added value
Strategy: Cost-minimization	Customization of service, cross-selling, bundling of services
Product/service: Simple, one or few product or services on offers; standardized services	Complex and/or multiple products and services on offer; customized service
Customer/ worker interaction: Encounter	Relationship or pseudo-relationship
Job design: Taylorist, e.g. low control and variety, low skill, high use of scripts, short call times	Empowered, e.g. high control and variety, little scripting, long calls.
Work design: Low interdependence, work groups, off-line groups	High interdependence, high use of semi-autonomous work groups, off line groups
Performance monitoring: High levels of monitoring, emphasis on quality and quantity, higher tendency to use monitoring to discipline and control	Low levels of monitoring, emphasis on quality, use of monitoring for developmental purposes
Human resource practices: Low cost, recruitment-minimal criteria, relatively low rates of pay, low percentage of total pay that is commission based, training-mainly induction training, career-little career structure, poor promotion prospects, job security-low, high use of temporary contracts in core workers	High cost, use of selection tests and competency models, relatively high rates of pay, higher percentage of total pay that is commission based, good additional benefits, induction training and continuing training, better promotion prospects, high job security, lower use of temporary contracts in core workers
Management/ supervisor relations with CSR's: Hierarchical, low trust	Supportive, facilitative, high trust

From the table above it is apparent that the mass service model is aligned with the Tayloristic design of jobs and the high commitment service model is aligned with jobs that offer empowerment for the call centre representative. This suggests that the mass service centre model may be associated with lower levels of job satisfaction as compared to the high commitment service model. Example Taylor & Bain (as cited in Shah & Bandi, 2003) have indicated that the mass service centre model commonly known as the traditional type of call centre, the nature of work is such that call centre representatives are given little or no opportunity to training programmes. This may imply dissatisfaction, as the call centre representative in getting no exposure to new forms of knowledge may remain obsolete in having to perform the same type of work on a daily basis. Bagnara & Marti (2001) support this view and have shown that, “call centres are the largest work group with no training programme” (p. 235). Further research conducted by Callaghan & Thopmson (2002) in call centres showed that “training that has taken place is often perfunctory, focusing on achieving work target or, learning from others” (p. 236). These studies are suggesting that call centres by not investing in training are seeking to maximise profit and at the same time contributing to the dissatisfaction of call centre representatives.

Furthermore Holman (2003) indicated that by call centres aligning their HR practices with the mass service centre model they are essentially using cheaper labour with low skill as well as using minimum resources for the purpose of recruitment and training. As a result the high dissatisfaction noted in call centres can be attributed to these factors. Carrim et al. (2006) have indicated that “employees are more likely to experience job satisfaction when they are able to use their skills and knowledge on the job, perform enriched and varied tasks, experience positive employee management relations, and when the organisation adopts a participative approach to decision making recognises and rewards employee talents and instills the values and principles with which employees can identify” (p. 68). It is suggested that individuals are more likely to experience job satisfaction if they are more involved in their jobs. However, employee involvement is not encouraged in the mass service centre model but may exist in the high commitment service model.

The high commitment service model places emphasis on good customer service and thus employee involvement. Further according to Holman (2003) “the strategy is to generate high profit margins and sales revenues by providing a customised service to a specialised customer segment. To do this, the organisation needs to devote resources to recruiting, training and keeping a skilled workforce (e.g. through effective recruitment and continuous training)” (p. 123). Further Van de Broek (2003) notes that recruitment processes are important in an organisation in retaining staff and lowering turnover. These studies suggest that employees through recruitment and training may be retained more successfully in a call centre and may experience a higher level of job satisfaction as there may be more involvement as opposed to the mass service call centres. However, it is important to consider that call centres can combine the two models.

Holman (2003) indicated that “some mass service call centres adopt some high commitment work practices (e.g. self-managed work teams in mass service call centres) and some HCS call centres adopt some mass service work practices (e.g. high levels of performance monitoring in HCS call centres). Indeed, it is probable that most call centres are a hybrid of mass service call centres and HCS call centres, which have been labeled mass customized bureaucracies” (p. 124). In addition research conducted by Batt & Moynihan (2002) showed that the mass customisation model involves “automation and process re-engineering found in mass production models, coupled with some level of attention to service quality and customer loyalty found in the professional service model [high commitment service model]” (p. 18). This study suggests that the mass customisation model is striving towards good customer service that is part of the high commitment service model as well as mass production that is part of the mass service centre model, although little or no attention is being given to employee well being. Thus this may result in lower job satisfaction, dissatisfaction or no satisfaction for the call centre representative.

Given this Holman & Fernie (as cited in Holman, 2003) in their research study “compared levels of well-being between a mass service type call centre, an HCS type call centre, and hybrid call centres. Against expectations, however, anxiety was lower at the mass service call centre. It was argued that CSR’s were managing their anxiety by leaving the mass service call centre. CSR’s at the other call centres, which had better terms and conditions, were more likely to stay and ‘sweat it out’” (p. 127). Turnover at a hybrid and HCS centre may be lower, but this does not mean that call centre representatives are experiencing job satisfaction.

However Babin (as cited in Pettijohn, Pettijohn & Taylor, 2008) indicated that job satisfaction could be related to lower levels of turnover. This study suggests that job satisfaction may be experienced if turnover is low. Having discussed the different models from which call centre HR practices are aligned it is apparent that call centre representatives generally do not experience job satisfaction. Further research by Holman (as cited in Fisher, Milner & Thatcher, 2007) indicated that the majority of call centres in South Africa utilise the mass service centre model. This could be one of the reasons that a high dissatisfaction rate is noted in call centres.

2.4 Locus of control and job satisfaction

Research quoted by Gordi (2006) suggests that a possible way to deal with the high turnover rate in call centres is to redefine the recruitment process. Coldwell, Billsberry, Van Meurs, & Marsh (2008) support this view by indicating that the “fit between individuals and the organization they work for has a significant bearing on employee acquisition and retention” (p. 616). Therefore the high turnover rate in call centres may be attributed to the recruitment process of call centre representatives. In this regard Cable & Judge (as cited in Coldwell et al., 2008) support these views and “demonstrated that the value of congruence between employees and employers is positively related to job satisfaction” (p. 616).

Given this it is important to note that recruitment practices can influence employees’ job satisfaction and thus may lower turnover. In addition, an individual’s personality traits, such as locus of control, can be important for the employee in terms of job satisfaction (Carrim et al., 2006; Johnson, 2003). There may be consensus to suggest that locus of control may influence job satisfaction. This can be likened to the work of Rotter who theorised on locus of control. Rotter distinguished between “internal and external control on the basis of peoples beliefs about the relationship between behaviour and outcomes” (Deci & Ryan, 1987, p. 166). Externally oriented individuals believe that outcomes in their life are not within their control whilst internally oriented individuals believe that outcomes are within their control (Rotter, 1966). Given this, locus of control in terms of this research refers to the beliefs that call centre representatives hold about themselves that may influence job satisfaction.

Further research by Labuschagne, Bosman & Buitendach (2005) indicates “ones external work locus of control is associated with high levels of job insecurity and low levels of job satisfaction” (p. 26). “Internally oriented individuals rely on a self-generated role definition, impose their own role expectations and are less bothered by tension producing elements in their work environment” (Olukayode, 2005, p. 103). Further, “internally oriented individuals will be more satisfied than externals with their jobs and thus will have lower turnover intentions than externals” (Olukayode, 2005, p. 104). Research by Pratt (n.d.) suggested, “externals seem to prefer low power positions and operate best when their routine is planned for them” (p. 35).

These research studies suggest that externally oriented individuals may be more suited to work within a call centre especially within the mass service centre model, as there is a lesser degree of autonomy and independence. This is because work is highly routine and monotonous. Externally oriented individuals may experience a higher level of job satisfaction within this work environment. On the other hand internally oriented individuals may be more suited to work within the high commitment service model, as skill is required and there may be a higher level of independence and autonomy and therefore experience a higher level of job satisfaction.

2.5 Monitoring within the call centre

Call centres “are nurseries of a new form of work” (Wickham & Collins, 2004, p. 1). Further Gordi (2006) has found that the call centre is characteristic of a stressful work environment, which may result in “emotional burnout” and result in lower or no job satisfaction (p. 14). Research conducted by Ferreira & Saldiva (as cited in Bakker et al., 2003) indicates that call centre representatives work in an environment that is pressurising and noisy. In addition Kinnie et al. (2000) have found that call centres have long working hours and use shift work as a means to achieve their target as well as meeting customer demands. It can be noted that although customer demands are given priority, little or no consideration is given to the call centre representative. This may imply lower levels of job satisfaction or no job satisfaction. As a result, call centre jobs can be characterised as “ ‘dead-end [jobs] with low status, poor pay and few career prospects” (Deery & Kinnie, 2004, p. 3). These research studies have indicated only some of the conditions of which call centre representatives are subjected to.

Monitoring is another condition to which call centre representatives are faced with. Deery & Kinnie (2004) indicate that “computer technology plays a critical part in this process; work can automatically be allocated to telephone operators to minimize waiting time, the speed of work and the level of downtime can continuously be measured and the quality of the interaction between the service provider and the customer can be assessed remotely at management’s discretion” (p. 3). This type of monitoring in the call centre can be referred to as an “information panopticon” which implies that a manager will not have to be present to monitor the call centre representative (Deery & Kinnie, 2004, p. 3). Given this, it is apparent that the call centre representative is under tight surveillance and control (Wickham & Collins, 2004). This implies a low level of job satisfaction or no job satisfaction for the call centre representative.

In addition Frenkel, Tam, Korczynski & Shire (1998) found that call centre representatives work in isolation from each other. It can be noted that call centre representatives who work in isolation may produce a more conducive environment to be monitored. Rose & Wright (2005) support this view and have indicated that a call centre work environment is typically characterised by control. This study shows that management may be more focused on monitoring the call centre representative to ensure productivity and at the same time does not consider the effect monitoring would have on job satisfaction.

Further Holman (as cited in Rose & Wright, 2005) has found that monitoring in the call centre can be “intrinsically threatening to employees because the information gained by employers may affect either employees’ remuneration or their relationship with their colleagues and supervisor” (p. 140). It is being suggested that monitoring can be a factor that leads to low job satisfaction, no satisfaction or dissatisfaction amongst call centre representatives. In addition, Bagnara & Marti (2001) showed that extensive monitoring in call centres could be a contributing factor of stress for the call centre representative. This study supports the view that monitoring may be associated with lower job satisfaction, dissatisfaction or no satisfaction for call centre representatives.

2.6 The customer-call centre representative interaction

Research conducted by Batt (as cited in Wood, Holman & Stride, 2006) indicates that “the customer-worker interaction in a call centre is important. It is a significant factor in defining the organization of work and human resource practices” (p. 101). The call centre places emphasis on the quality of service for their customers (Zapf et al., 2003). Call centres are in other words focused on the satisfaction of their customers. This may be advantageous for the call centre as there is “lower cost in the area of field work because even sophisticated services may be rendered by phone; more satisfied customers because, ideally, the call centre can be contacted 7 days a week, 24 hours a day” (Zapf et al., 2003, p. 312). Companies benefit from call centres by means of reducing cost and at the same time advancing customer satisfaction (Bakker et al., 2003; Lewig & Dollard, 2003).

However, it is important to note that although the long hours of work may be beneficial to the call centre and the customer, it places the call centre representative at a disadvantage. Although customers benefit from the good service and organisations benefit from reduced cost the call centre representative is caught between these two goals. This can impact negatively on job satisfaction for the CSR. Holman (as cited in Bakker et al., 2003) supports this view and has indicated that call centre representatives may not benefit in any way. This study suggests that call centres may be more committed to customer satisfaction rather than employee satisfaction.

Further research by Grandey, Dickter & Sin (2004) have found that interaction with customers at the call centre has caused stress for the call representative. Hela (as cited in Carrim et al., 2006) supports this view and has indicated that “call centre agents usually leave their work stations only at allocated breaks because their work is conducted using a telephone and computer. Agents are not encouraged to take the initiative in resolving customer queries. Most call centres have targets that need to be met on a daily basis. This places agents in a difficult situation, as they have no time to handle a difficult call from a client. In order to meet their targets agents have to cut the customers call short ” (p. 68). Saltzman & Mehotra (2001) recommend that “call centre managers must balance the service level with the number of agents deployed to answer the phone” (p. 88).

In addition Armony & Maglaras (2004) in their research on call centres, have found that there is often a shortage of resources and as a result customers have to wait a long time, which becomes frustrating. Carrim et al. (2006) indicate that as a result of customers having to wait they react emotionally which impacts negatively on job satisfaction for the CSR. Research conducted by Grandey et al. (2004) indicated that angry customers would have negative consequences for the CSR. The call centre representative has to decide how to deal with the angry customer.

According to Holman (2003) “in response, the employee can either display his or her ‘true’ emotions or he or she can try to display the required emotions” (p. 126). Grandey et al. (2004) supports this view and has indicated that “if customers do verbally attack employees, a ‘spiral of incivility may occur’ where the hostile customer arouses anger in the employee who must regulate his or her response or risk venting at the customer” (p. 399). This places call centre representatives in a difficult situation, as they have to maintain organisational expectations and standards (Lewig & Dollard, 2003). Furthermore Grandey et al. (2004) found that call centre representatives are continuously monitored to ensure these standards are met. Having discussed the negative outcomes for call centre representatives in dealing with customers, especially under circumstances where their pace and quality of work is monitored, it is important to note that this implies a negative impact on job satisfaction.

Further research conducted by Hochschild (as cited in Holman, 2003) has indicated ways in which the call centre representative can deal with angry customers. Two methods are discussed. These include surface acting and deep acting. “Surface acting involves displaying the required emotions, but there is little attempt to feel those emotions, example an employee may smile down the phone. Deep acting involves trying to feel and display the required emotions, example by re-appraising the situation so that its emotional impact is lessened” (Hochschild as cited in Holman, 2003, p. 126). This study indicates that the call centre representative has additional work and stress in hiding his or her true feelings towards the customer. This implies a lower level of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction or no satisfaction for the CSR.

Zapf et al. (as cited in Holman, 2003) supports this view and have indicated that in having to hide the call centre representatives true feelings this would have negative consequences such as depression and anxiety. This study reveals the unusual expectations the call centre has for the CSR. Further Holdsworth & Cartwright (as cited in Carrim et al., 2006) has found that “agents are often not given time to recover from these emotionally charged calls” (p. 68). This could be due to the limited time a call centre representative has to complete target for the day.

Research conducted by Deery et al. (2004) in call centres add to this by indicating “the type of work system that is constructed and developed to serve the customer will have an effect on job satisfaction and worker well-being, where services are provided by way of an engineering or mass-production model it could be expected that the lack of discretion and autonomy as well as the extensive use electronic monitoring would result in job dissatisfaction and stress” (p. 205). This study provides support to the view that a call centre representative’s job satisfaction is affected negatively by both customer interaction and tight supervision.

Further research conducted by Dwyer & Fox (2006) indicate “call centres *hope* that call centre employees will resolve complex and time-consuming customer issues, but *reward* them based on having a large number of calls and a shorter length of time on the phone” (p. 140). The call centre representative is highly pressurised on a daily basis, which would inevitably result in low job satisfaction or no job satisfaction. Lastly, Dwyer & Fox (2006) recommend that management should reconsider performance evaluation strategies and the working conditions of the call centre.

In reviewing the various factors that contribute to call centre representatives job satisfaction it is clear that there is consensus to suggest that a high dissatisfaction rate in a call centre seems plausible given the nature of work in the call centre. Studies seem to suggest that negative outcomes associated with call centre work outweigh any benefits for call centre representatives.

2.7 Theoretical framework

Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation and Rotter's locus of control theory have been used as a theoretical underpinning in the concept of job satisfaction and locus of control respectively.

2.7.1 Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation

According to Statt (2004) "One of the most influential theories has been that of Frederick Herzberg. Unlike other theorists, Herzberg's ideas on motivation were specifically work-oriented and grew out of his empirical research on job satisfaction where he interviewed people about their attitudes towards their work" (p. 252). Herzberg's theory particularly focuses on motivation as an underlying factor of job satisfaction. Before proceeding with the literature it is important to distinguish between job satisfaction, dissatisfaction and no satisfaction, which is referred to in this research. "The opposite of job satisfaction would not be job dissatisfaction, but rather no job satisfaction; similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction, not satisfaction with one's job" (Herzberg, 1968, p. 76).

Herzberg's (1968) theory outlines two basic needs at work. These include hygiene needs [factors] and motivator needs [factors]. Hygiene factors are referred to as the "dissatisfiers or maintenance factors. Hygiene factors include company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations and working conditions" (Herzberg, 1968, p. 74). Call centres primarily focus on providing hygiene factors to call centre representatives. Research by Norman (2005) provides support to this view by indicating that remuneration; monitoring and supervision are commonly used in a call centre.

However, Herzberg (1968) in his research showed that hygiene factors would not lead to long-term changes in terms of attitudes to the job. It is being suggested that hygiene factors may in fact not lead to job satisfaction. On the other hand, the satisfier factors were referred to as motivators (Herzberg, 1968). Further Potgieter & Bagraim (2003) have found that "motivators are internal to the employee (intrinsic) and include factors such as responsibility, achievement and opportunities for personal growth" (p. 60).

“According to Herzberg, the way to motivate employees is to provide appropriate levels of motivator factors; hygiene factors, no matter how favourable cannot lead to motivation” (Spector, 2000, p. 180). However in a call centre motivator factors may not be used. Research has shown that there is little or no opportunity for promotion (Carrim et al., 2006). In other words there is little or no opportunity for call centre representatives’ growth. In addition call centre representatives do not feel recognised, as they do not receive any recognition or praise from their supervisors (Carrim et al., 2006). As a result call centre representatives may not feel a sense of achievement and therefore may not feel motivated. This can lead to the call centre representative feeling a lower level of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction or no satisfaction with their job. This study also supports the view that a call centre may use hygiene factors as opposed to motivator factors.

Further call centre representatives on a daily basis perform tasks that are low skilled, highly repetitive and monotonous (Carrim et al., 2006; Frenkel, Tam, Korczynski & Shire, 1998). Thus call centre representatives in having to perform a routine job with low skill may not feel a sense of responsibility and according to Herzberg, will not feel motivated. This implies that job satisfaction can be negatively affected. Given this Rose & Wright (as cited in Gordi, 2006) indicate that call centre representatives do not feel a sense of “intrinsic satisfaction such employees are led to seek extrinsic satisfaction through pay and other compensatory mechanisms” (p. 1). This study suggests that call centre representatives are provided with more hygiene factors such as pay rather than motivator factors. However “Herzberg argued that money should not necessarily be viewed as the most potent force on the job” (Steers, Porter & Bigley, 1996, p. 18). Therefore Herzberg suggested that remuneration cannot be sufficient for an employee. It cannot lead to satisfaction with ones job.

Further Herzberg (1968) had found that “hygiene or maintenance events led to job dissatisfaction because of the need to avoid unpleasantness; the motivator events led to job satisfaction because of the need for growth or self-actualisation” (p. 75). It is apparent that hygiene factors alone cannot lead to job satisfaction. Given this Herzberg (1968) contends that if management prides on providing more hygiene factors as opposed to motivator factors this will have a negative impact on the development for the organisation. This seems plausible as employees will be dissatisfied and will lead to problems such as low performance and can even result in high turnover rates.

Herzberg had therefore recommended that jobs could be redesigned to include more motivator factors. Below is a table that provides the possible motivators that can be incorporated into jobs.

Table 3: Herzberg’s principles of vertical job loading (Fincham & Rhodes, 2003, p. 135)

Principles	Motivators involved
Increasing employees autonomy while retaining accountability	Responsibility and achievement
Increasing the accountability of employees for their own work	Responsibility and recognition
Providing employees with a complete natural unit of work	Responsibility, achievement and recognition
Making performance feedback available to employees	Recognition
Introducing new and more difficult tasks to employees’ work	Growth and learning
Assigning employees specific or specialized tasks at which they can become expert	Responsibility, growth and advancement

From the above table it is noticeable that call centres may need to redesign jobs by adding more motivator factors as opposed to hygiene factors that can lead to job satisfaction. As literature seems to suggest that hygiene factors are primarily provided in a call centre.

2.7.2 Rotter’s locus of control theory

The locus of control concept was derived from Rotter’s social learning theory (Rotter & Hochreich, 1975). Locus of control “is a form of generalized expectancy to explain personality differences in peoples beliefs about the source of reinforcement” (Schultz & Schultz, 2001, p. 431-432). Further Rotter (1966) distinguished individuals as having either an internal or external locus of control orientation.

Internal locus of control “refers to whether the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behaviour or his own relatively permanent characteristics” (Rotter, 1966, p. 1). External locus of control, “on the other hand, indicates that a positive or negative reinforcement following some action of the individual is perceived as not being entirely contingent upon his or her own action but the result of chance, fate or luck; or it may be perceived as under the control of powerful others and unpredictable because of the complexity of forces surrounding the individual” (Anastasi, 1961, p. 588).

For purpose of this research, call centre representatives were investigated in terms of having an internal or external locus of control. Further research conducted by Mitchell et al. (as cited in Pratt, n.d.) “found that internals were more satisfied with their jobs than externals” (p. 29). Carrim et al. (2006) lends support to this view and have suggested that “an internal locus of control is associated with job satisfaction and an external locus of control with job dissatisfaction” (p. 69). This study suggests that internally oriented individuals are more likely to demonstrate job satisfaction as opposed to externally oriented individuals. Research carried out by Spector (as cited in Pratt, n.d.) suggests that internals should demonstrate greater job satisfaction than externals for the following reasons:

- “A dissatisfied internal would tend to leave a dissatisfying job,
- Internals who perform better would benefit from a performance-reward situation,
- Internals tend to be promoted faster” (p. 29).

This study has indicated that internally oriented individuals are more likely to experience job satisfaction, as they appear to be self-motivated. However, it should be noted that in a call centre, call centre representatives are not recognised for their achievement and there is no or little opportunity for promotion. Therefore, an internally oriented individual may experience a lower level of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction or no satisfaction in a call centre.

Research by Olukayode (2005) indicates that “internally oriented individuals are more satisfied with their jobs thus cope better in stressful situations and are more motivated by performance based rewards. Further individuals who have a moderately strong internal locus of control perform better in employment situations” (p. 103). In addition to this study Rotter (1966) found that internals “show more overt striving for achievement than those who felt they had little control over their environment” (p. 21). Rotter & Mulry (as cited in Lefcourt, 1982) indicate that “internals devote more attention to decisions about skill-related matters than do externals” (p. 66). These studies essentially indicate that internally oriented individuals seek achievement, recognition and skill related jobs. Therefore internally oriented individuals may not experience job satisfaction in a call centre.

On the other hand “externally oriented individuals are less satisfied with their jobs, are more alienated from their work settings and are less involved with their jobs” (Olukayode, 2005, p. 103). Further research by Pratt (n.d.) has indicated that, “externals normally opt for more directive forms of management, which accords with their view that control emanates from powerful others” (p. 35). These research studies indicate that externally oriented individuals require more supervision. In a call centre, call centre representatives are closely supervised and monitored. Therefore externally oriented individuals may experience job satisfaction as opposed to internally oriented individuals in a call centre.

Further, Taylor, Schepers & Crous (2006) “suggest that there are a number of intrinsic benefits linked to having a more internal locus of control, while conversely, a number of performance inhibiting factors have been associated with a more external orientation” (p. 63). This study suggests that performance by externally oriented individuals may be better under tight supervision.

Overall, there may be consensus to suggest that externally oriented individuals prefer to work in a supervised work environment and therefore may experience job satisfaction as opposed to internally oriented individuals who may experience low job satisfaction, dissatisfaction or no satisfaction in a call centre work environment.

Chapter 3: Research design and methodology

This chapter provides an overview of the methodology that was used in this research.

3.1) Research approach

This study was quantitative in nature. Quantitative research essentially involves the measurement of variables of interest in numerical quantities (Reaves, 1992). In this study data was gathered through the use of a survey design. A survey design refers to a standardised set of questions that are administered to a sample of individuals (Reaves, 1992).

3.2) Sample

The sample consisted of 103 call centre representatives from the banking industry in a call centre in Durban, KwaZulu- Natal. The sample consisted of both males and females. The type of qualification such as matric, diploma or degree held by the call centre representatives was taken into consideration. Tenure was also investigated in this research. Convenience sampling was employed. Convenience sampling refers to “the collection of information from members of the population who are conveniently available to provide it. Convenience sampling is “quick, convenient and less expensive” (Sekaran, 2003, p. 280). Convenience sampling had been feasible for this study as call centre representatives were difficult to access due to their time limit and workload.

3.3) Research measuring instruments

A biographical questionnaire had been used to obtain biographical details from the call centre representatives. The shortened Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ 20) and Rotter’s Locus of Control (I-E) Scale was used to assess job satisfaction and locus of control respectively.

3.3.1) Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ 20):

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire assesses twenty different areas that pertain to the job. These areas among others include autonomy, job variety, recognition, opportunity for promotion, the nature of work, the work environment and taps into the way company policies are put into place. Further “the MSQ 20 measures extrinsic job satisfaction (e.g. ‘the chance to be somebody in the community’) and intrinsic job satisfaction (e.g. ‘the chance to do things that don’t go against my conscience’)” (Labuschagne et al., 2005, p. 29). Items are rated on a five point likert scale which ranges very dissatisfied to very satisfied (Friedenberg, 1995).

Reliability and Validity of the MSQ 20:

“The alpha coefficients for the MSQ 20 range from 0.87 to 0.95, which supports the internal consistency of the scale” (Labuschagne, et al., 2005, p. 29). Further Buitendach & Rothman (as cited in Labuschagne et al., 2005) “obtained a reliability coefficient for the MSQ 20 of 0.82 for the extrinsic job satisfaction scale and 0.79 for the intrinsic job satisfaction scale” (p. 29). Weiss et al. (as cited in Mitchell, 1994) indicated that “evidence for the validity of the MSQ as a measure of general job satisfaction came from the test’s performance according to theoretical expectation and from construct validation studies based on the theory of work adjustment” (p. 961). Overall these studies suggest that the MSQ is reliable and valid.

Further Mitchell (1994) outlined the scoring of the MSQ as follows:

- “The MSQ is scored by the weighting of response choices
- The range of the scoring weight is from one for the answer of ‘very dissatisfied’ to a scoring weight of five for ‘very satisfied’
- Scale scores are determined by summing the weights for the chosen responses
- These raw scores are converted to percentile scores and then compared to the position this score would hold in comparison to the group norm
- A percentile score of 75 or higher indicates a high degree of satisfaction and a score of 25 or less indicates a very low level of satisfaction” (p.961).

3.3.2) Rotter's Locus of Control (I-E) Scale:

The Rotter's Locus of Control Scale assesses locus of control. According to Kelley (2006) the scale is considered to be most applicable to modern work environments. The Rotter's Locus of Control Scale is a "forced-choice self-report inventory" (Anastasi, 1961, p. 588). Further the scale consists of 29 items (Hodgkinson, 1992). Each item consists of an alternative of which the respondent must choose either *a* or *b* that most closely reflects the belief they hold (Rotter, 1966; Hodgkinson, 1992). See below for an example of such alternatives.

Example:

- "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

One alternative usually implies generally an internal orientation and the other an external attitude" (Shrauger & Silverman, 1971, p. 13). In addition "the scale is arranged such that the respondent receives a point each time he or she selects a statement which is designed to reflect external locus of control beliefs" (Hodgkinson, 1992, p. 312). The scale is scored by, adding up the total number of external statements answered (Hodgkinson, 1992). A high score is reflective of an externally oriented individual (Hodgkinson, 1992). Further Cherlin & Bourque (1974) note the reliability for the scale ranges from 0.69 to 0.73 using the split-half Spearman-Brown and Kuder-Richardson formulas. According to Rotter (1966) "most significant evidence of the construct validity of the I-E scale comes from predicted differences in behaviour for individuals above and below the median of the scale or from correlations with behavioural criteria." (p. 25). These studies suggest that the Rotter's Locus of Control Scale is reliable and valid.

However, it is important to note that the locus of control (I-E) scale has been adapted by Professor Schepers. The adapted version of the scale is known as the locus of control inventory (LCI). This inventory measures three variables, which include internal locus of control, external locus of control and autonomy (Schepers, Gropp & Geldenhuys, 2006). It consists of 88 items (Taylor, Schepers & Crous, 2006).

However, due to the length of the scale and the fact that the call centre representatives' work under a strictly imposed timeframe, management rejected the idea of this questionnaire to be administered. Thus the Rotter's Locus of Control Scale was used.

3.4) Procedure and ethical issues:

Upon receiving acceptance into the organisation, the purpose of the research was explained to the call centre manager. The manager had then explained the procedure to the call centre representatives. A Biographical Questionnaire (appendix 2), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (appendix 3) and the Rotter's Locus of control scale (appendix 4) were given to the participants to complete within a one-week period. A letter of informed consent was also given to participants. This letter outlined the nature and purpose of the study. Confidentiality and anonymity was ensured. Participants were also informed that participation was voluntary (appendix 1). Sekaran (2003) stated that "treating the information given by the respondent as strictly confidential and guarding his or her privacy is one of the primary responsibilities of the researcher" (Sekaran, 2003, p. 260). Thus all ethical issues were considered.

3.5) Data Analysis:

This study posited the need for statistical analysis. The SPSS programme was used in the analysis of the data. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to gain an understanding of the data obtained. Descriptive statistics provide a description of what the data shows. Inferential statistics gives meaning inferred from the actual data. The descriptive statistics used in this research were standard deviation, range and mean. The **mean** is a measure of central tendency. Essentially it is the average score. It is calculated by adding up all the scores and dividing it by the total number of scores. A value will decline the further it moves away from the mean (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 2002).

Further there are two measures of dispersion, which include the **range** and the **standard deviation**. The range is essentially the highest value minus the lowest value. It gives an indication of whether the scores are found clustered together or extended to extreme points. The standard deviation provides enablement to reach a conclusion about scores in the distribution (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 2002).

It is important to note that the mean, range and standard deviation are referred to as **group statistics**, which is presented in the results chapter. Group statistics is a SPSS term commonly used thus no formal definition exists. In addition the inferential statistics included a t-test, correlations and analysis of variance (i.e. Anova). Anova is a statistical technique that compares the variance between groups. It is the analysis of variance. “The analysis of variance provides researchers with a more formal comparison of variation” ((Rosnow & Rosenthal, 2002, p. 316).

Further the **t-test** that was used is a statistical technique that provides a comparison between two sets of numbers or means. This comparison then enables the researcher to decide if the difference between the two sets of numbers or means is significant (Neuman, 2000). In this research the t-test compared two independent groups, thus the **independent samples t-test** was used (Neuman, 2000). Further a **correlation** is a measure of the linear relationship that may exist between two variables. The correlation coefficient can range between -1 to 1 where values close to 1 is indicative of a strong relationship between variables; values close to 0 indicates very little or no relationship between the variables (Neuman, 2000). Having discussed the methodology that was used in this research, the next chapter provides the results that were obtained from the analysis of the data.

Chapter 4: Results

The results obtained from the analysis of the data are presented in this chapter.

Table 1: *Descriptive Statistics of Gender for the Biographical Questionnaire*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Males	64	62.1	62.1	62.1
Females	39	37.9	37.9	100.0
Total	103	100.0	100.0	

* N=103

The table above shows that 62.1% of the sample is male whilst 37.9% of the sample is female. This indicates that majority of the sample is male.

Table 2: *Descriptive Statistics of Qualification for the Biographical Questionnaire*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Post-grad	3	2.9	2.9	2.9
Degree	7	6.8	6.8	9.7
Diploma	33	32.0	32.0	41.7
Matric	60	58.3	58.3	100.0
Total	103	100.0	100.0	

* N=103

The table above shows that 58.3 % of the sample has a matric qualification whilst 32.0% of the sample has a diploma qualification, 6.8% of the sample has a degree qualification and 2.9% of the sample has a post-graduate qualification. These results indicate that majority of the sample has a matric qualification.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Tenure for the Biographical Questionnaire

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1-5years	3	2.9	2.9	2.9
1 year	8	7.8	7.8	10.7
< 1year	92	89.3	89.3	100.0
Total	103	100.0	100.0	

* N=103

The table above indicates that majority of the sample (i.e. 89.3% of the sample) has less than one year service with the call centre.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Rotter's Locus of Control Scale

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation
Locus of control score	3	19	10.83	3.106

* N=103

The table above shows the descriptive statistics for the overall locus of control. The average score is less than 12. According to Rotter's Locus of Control Scale interpretation this indicates that the sample generally has an internal locus of control.

Table 5: Percentage of the Sample with an Internal and External Locus of Control

	Frequency	Percent
Internal locus of control	60	58.3
External locus of control	43	41.7
Total	103	100.0

* N= 103

The table above divides the sample into internal and external locus of control orientation. Respondents with locus of control scores of 0-11 were classified as internal. Respondents with locus of control scores of 12-23 were classified as external. Results show that 58.3% of the sample has an internal locus of control and 41.7% of sample has an external locus of control. This indicates that the majority of the sample has an internal locus of control.

Table 6: Percentage of Sample that was Dissatisfied and Satisfied on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)

	Frequency	Percent
Valid (1.00-2.99) Dissatisfied	52	50.5
Neutral	3	2.9
(3.01-5.00) Satisfied	48	46.6
Total	103	100.00

* N= 103

Using the MSQ the results indicate that 50.5% of the sample was dissatisfied and 46.6% were satisfied. This result shows that the percentage of dissatisfaction was higher than satisfaction. A total of 3 participants (i.e. 2.9%) were neutral on the satisfaction/ dissatisfaction continuum.

Table 7: Frequency Table for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)

	Very satisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
MSQ 1	29.1	8.7	22.3	19.4	20.4
MSQ 2	13.6	15.5	23.3	22.3	25.2
MSQ 3	24.3	22.3	22.3	24.3	6.8
MSQ 4	26.2	19.4	28.2	15.5	10.7
MSQ 5	24.3	19.4	22.3	20.4	13.6
MSQ 6	20.4	17.5	23.3	24.3	14.6
MSQ 7	23.3	12.6	25.2	22.3	16.5
MSQ 8	28.2	15.5	19.4	22.3	14.6
MSQ 9	22.3	10.7	28.2	31.1	7.8
MSQ 10	27.2	10.7	23.3	25.2	13.6
MSQ 11	25.2	21.4	16.5	20.4	16.5
MSQ 12	18.4	31.1	20.4	15.5	14.6
MSQ 13	23.3	23.3	17.5	26.2	9.7
MSQ 14	23.3	28.2	29.1	11.7	7.8
MSQ 15	24.3	21.4	25.2	21.4	7.8
MSQ 16	21.4	21.4	24.3	25.2	7.8
MSQ 17	22.3	24.3	17.5	21.4	14.6
MSQ 18	12.6	19.4	16.5	27.2	24.3
MSQ 19	15.5	30.1	23.3	23.3	7.8
MSQ 20	14.6	18.4	25.2	30.1	11.7

* N= 103

* Items in bold indicate high significant percentages

The table above shows the percentage of responses that ranged from very dissatisfied to very satisfied in relation to questions on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. The following summary includes high, significant percentages noted on the MSQ for dissatisfaction. Results show that 31.1% of the sample is dissatisfied with item 12 on the MSQ which relates to the way in which **company policies** are put into place. 30.1% of the sample is dissatisfied with the **praise** they get from the job (MSQ19). 28.2% of the sample indicated that they are dissatisfied with the **chances for advancement** on the job (MSQ 14). 24.3% of the sample is dissatisfied with the **working conditions** of the job (MSQ 17). 23.3 % of the sample indicated that they are dissatisfied with the **pay and amount of work that has to be done** (MSQ 13). 22.3 % of the call centre representatives are dissatisfied with the **chance to do different things from time to time** (MSQ 3).

21.1% of the sample indicated that they are dissatisfied with item 15 on the MSQ (**the freedom to use my own judgment**) and item 16 on the MSQ (**the chance to try my own methods of doing the job**). Only 8.7% of the sample is dissatisfied with item 1 on the MSQ, which relates to **being able to keep busy all the time**.

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation
MSQ score	1.00	4.75	2.8553	.92535

*N = 103

The low mean for the MSQ indicates that respondents are generally dissatisfied. The standard deviation shows a small deviation from the mean, indicating that majority of respondents have this level of MSQ.

Table 9: Correlation between MSQ and Rotter's Locus of Control Scale

		MSQ score	Locus of control score
MSQ score	Pearson correlation		
	P		
	N		
Locus of control	Pearson correlation	- .101	
	P	.310	
	N	103	

* N=103

The table above shows that the linear relationship between MSQ and overall locus of control is not significant at the 95% level ($p > 0.05$). This indicates that no relationship exists between MSQ and locus of control.

Table 10: Correlation between Internal and External Locus of Control with MSQ

Locus of control score		Locus of control score	
Internal Locus of control	MSQ score	Pearson correlation	-.137
		P	.298
		N	60
External Locus of control	MSQ score	Pearson correlation	.107
		P	.495
		N	43

* N=103

The results show that the correlation between internal locus of control and the MSQ score is not significant at the 95% level ($p>0.05$). The correlation between external locus of control and the MSQ score is not significant at the 95% level ($p>0.05$). This indicates that there is no linear relationship between locus of control and MSQ. Therefore MSQ cannot be determined by either internal or external locus of control.

Table 11: Group Statistics for MSQ, Internal and External Locus of Control

		N	Mean	Standard deviation
Locus of control score				
MSQ score	Internal locus of control	60	2.9250	.91765
	External locus of control	43	2.7581	.93808

* N=103

The group statistics table above shows that those with an internal and external locus of control experience some degree of job dissatisfaction. An observation of the means show that external locus of control respondents have more dissatisfaction (mean=2.75) than internal locus of control respondents (mean=2.92). However, this difference in the mean is not statistically significant.

Table 12: T-Test comparing MSQ with Internal and External Locus of Control

	T-test for equality of means		
	t	df	p
MSQ score (Equal variances assumed)	.902	101	.369

* N=103

With the t-test, the MSQ score in relation to internal locus of control and external locus of control were compared. A p value of 0.369; greater than 0.05 was obtained. This indicates that there is no statistical difference in MSQ between internal and external locus of control at the 95% level ($p > 0.05$). The results of t-test show that there is no relationship between MSQ, internal and external locus of control.

Table 13: Group Statistics for MSQ and Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Standard deviation
MSQ score	Male	64	2.7930	.95813
	Female	39	2.9577	.87129

* N=103

The group statistics show that there is no significant difference between MSQ and gender i.e. males and females.

Table 14: T-Test for MSQ and Gender

	T-test for equality of means		
	t	df	p
MSQ score (Equal variances assumed)	-.875	101	.383

* N=103

The t-test for Gender shows that MSQ between male and female is not significantly different at the 95% level ($p > 0.05$), $p = 0.383$. This indicates that the level of job satisfaction does not differ between males and females.

Table 15: Descriptive Statistics for MSQ and Qualifications

MSQ score

	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Post-grad	3	3.3667	.42525
Degree	7	2.9571	.54039
Diploma	33	3.0364	.97950
Matric	60	2.7183	.93392
Total	103	2.8553	.92535

*N=103

The table above shows no significant difference between MSQ and qualification. This indicates that there is no relationship between job satisfaction and qualification.

Table 16: Anova Test for MSQ and Qualifications

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Between groups	3.065	3	1.022	1.200	.314
Within groups	84.275	99	.851		
Total	87.340	102			

*N=103

The Anova test for qualification shows that MSQ between qualification types is not significantly different at the 95% level ($p > 0.05$), $p = 0.314$. This test shows that no relationship exists between job satisfaction and qualification.

Table 17: Descriptive Statistics for MSQ and Years of Service

	N	Mean	Standard deviation
1-5years	3	3.3833	.15275
1 year	8	2.3500	.91339
<1 year	92	2.8821	.92883
Total	103	2.8553	.92535

*N=103

The table above shows no significant difference between MSQ and years of service. This indicates that there is no relationship between job satisfaction and years of service.

Table 18: Anova Test for MSQ and Years of Service

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Between groups	2.945	2	1.472	1.745	.180
Within groups	84.395	100	.844		
Total	87.340	102			

*N=103

The Anova test for years of service shows that MSQ between years of service is not significantly different at the 95% level ($p > 0.05$), $p = 0.180$. This indicates that there is no relationship between job satisfaction and years of service.

Table 19: Descriptive Statistics for MSQ and Years of Experience

MSQ score

	N	Mean	Standard deviation
>5 years	8	3.3250	.89960
1-5 years	27	3.3315	.76475
1 year	28	2.3821	1.00076
<1 year	40	2.7712	.80047
Total	103	2.8553	.92535

*N=103

The table above shows no significant difference between MSQ and years of experience. This indicates that there is no relationship between job satisfaction and years of experience.

Table 20: Group Statistics for Locus of Control and Gender

Locus of control score	Gender	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Internal locus of control	Male	39	8.90	1.944
	Female	21	8.48	2.337
External locus of control	Male	25	13.76	1.665
	Female	18	13.72	1.487

*N=103

The group statistics for locus of control and gender show no significant difference. This indicates no relationship exists between locus of control and gender.

Table 21: T-Test for Locus of Control and Gender

	Locus of control score		
	T-test for equality of means		
	t	df	p
Internal locus of control	.745	58	.459
External locus of control	.077	41	.939

* N=103

The t-test for gender shows that internal locus of control between males and females is not significantly different at the 95% level ($p > 0.05$), $p = 0.459$. The t-test for gender shows that external locus of control between males and females is not significantly different at the 95% level ($p > 0.05$), $p = 0.939$. This test indicates that no relationship exists between locus of control and gender.

Table 22: Descriptive Statistics for Locus of Control and Qualification

	N	Mean	Standard deviation	
Internal locus of control	Post-grad	2	5.50	3.536
	Degree	4	9.00	1.414
	Diploma	19	8.47	2.547
	Matric	35	9.06	1.662
	Total	60	8.75	2.080
External locus of control	Post-grad	1	12.00	
	Degree	3	14.00	1.000
	Diploma	14	13.43	1.342
	Matric	25	13.96	1.744
	Total	43	13.74	1.575

* N=103

The table above shows no significant difference between Locus of control and qualification. This indicates that there is no relationship between locus of control and qualification.

Table 23: Anova Test for Locus of Control and Qualification

		Sum of	df	Mean	F	p
		squares		square		
Internal locus of control	Between groups	26.127	3	8.709	2.129	.107
	Within groups	229.123	56	4.091		
	Total	255.250	59			
External locus of control	Between groups	5.797	3	1.932	.766	.520
	Within groups	98.389	39	2.523		
	Total	104.186	42			

*N=103

The Anova test for locus of control and qualification indicates that internal locus of control between qualification types is not significantly different at the 95% level ($p > 0.05$), $p = 0.107$. The Anova for external locus of control between qualification types is not significantly different at the 95% level ($p > 0.05$), $p = 0.520$. These results indicate that there is no relationship between qualifications, external and/ or internal locus of control.

Table 24: Anova Test for Locus of Control and Years of Service

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Internal locus of control	Between groups	13.157	2	6.579	1.549	.221
	Within groups	242.093	57	4.247		
	Total	255.250	59			
External locus of control	Between groups	.568	2	.284	.110	.896
	Within groups	103.618	40	2.590		
	Total	104.186	42			

*N=103

The Anova test for years of service shows that the internal locus of control between years of service is not significantly different at the 95% level ($p>0.05$), $p=0.221$. The Anova test for external locus of control between years of service is not significantly different at the 95% level ($p>0.05$), $p=0.896$. These results indicate that there is no relationship between years of service, external and internal locus of control.

Table 25: Descriptive Statistics for Locus of Control and Years of Experience

Locus of control score		N	Mean	Standard deviation
Internal locus of control	> 5yrs	5	7.20	2.588
	1-5yrs	16	9.38	1.628
	1 yr	15	9.00	2.070
	< 1 yr	24	8.50	2.167
	Total	60	8.75	2.080
External locus of control	> 5yrs	3	13.00	1.732
	1-5yrs	11	13.55	1.293
	1 yr	13	13.85	1.864
	<1 yr	16	13.94	1.569
	Total	43	13.74	1.575

*N=103

The descriptive statistics indicate that there is no significant difference between years of experience, internal and/ or external locus of control.

Table 26: Anova Test for Locus of Control and Years of Experience

		Sum of	df	Mean	F	p
		squares		square		
Internal locus of control	Between groups	20.700	3	6.900	1.647	.189
	Within groups	234.550	56	4.188		
	Total	255.250	59			
External locus of control	Between groups	2.829	3	.943	.363	.780
	Within groups	101.357	39	2.599		
	Total	104.186	42			

*N=103

The Anova test for years of experience shows that internal locus of control between years of service is not significantly different at the 95% level ($p>0.05$), $p=0.189$. The Anova test for external locus of control between years of service is not significantly different at the 95% level ($p>0.05$), $p=0.780$. These results indicate that there is no relationship between years of experience, external and internal locus of control.

Chapter 5: Discussion of the results

Overall, the results suggest that there is a higher level of dissatisfaction than satisfaction (i.e. 50.5% of the sample) in the call centre. However, it was found that there is no relationship between call centre representatives locus of control orientation and job satisfaction. The results further suggest that call centre representatives with an internal locus control do not experience job dissatisfaction and call centre representatives with an external locus do not experience job satisfaction.

These results suggest that the failure to find a significant relationship between job satisfaction and locus of control is primarily related to the nature of work in a call centre environment. The nature of work essentially refers to the working conditions, autonomy, job variety, pay, opportunity for promotion, company policies and recognition CSRs' receive. In other words, irrespective of the call centre representatives' locus of control orientation, there is a high dissatisfaction rate in the call centre.

The results obtained in this research indicate that the high dissatisfaction rate is attributed to company policies, praise CSR's get (i.e. recognition), the chances for advancement (i.e. promotion), the working conditions, pay and amount of work, the chance to do different things (i.e. job variety), the freedom to use ones own judgement, the chance to use ones own method of doing the job (i.e. autonomy). See table 7 in results chapter. Essentially, the nature of work in the call centre is the underlying factor that has contributed to the high dissatisfaction rate.

In line with these findings, Oshagbemi (2003) in his research investigated personal correlates of job satisfaction where he had looked at variables such as "age, gender, rank, and length of service" (p. 1210). He suggested that the nature of the "work itself, supervision, pay, working conditions, company policies, procedures and opportunities for promotion" are significant predictors of job satisfaction (Oshagbemi, 2003, p. 1211). Similarly, this research found that factors such as pay, amount of work, autonomy, job variety, recognition, working conditions, chances for promotion and company policies contribute to job satisfaction.

Herzberg (1968) indicated that company policies, working conditions, supervision and pay are hygiene factors that cannot lead to employees being motivated and will not lead to job satisfaction. He contended that motivator factors such as opportunity for individual development and recognition will lead to job satisfaction. Studies have shown that call centres primarily centre on providing employees with hygiene factors as opposed to motivator factors which would account for high dissatisfaction in the call centre (Norman, 2005; Carrim et al., 2006). Similarly this research has found that the call centre does not provide call centre representatives' with motivator factors such as recognition, opportunity for individual growth and chances for advancement. As a result, there is a high dissatisfaction rate in the call centre.

Research generally indicates that jobs that are highly repetitive, tightly controlled, offers little autonomy and job variety tend to lead to dissatisfaction with ones job (Gordi, 2006; Holman, 2003; Bakker et al., 2003; Zapf et al., 2003; Deery et al., 2004). This kind of working environment is characteristic of call centres. Further, Holdsworth & Cartwright (2003) had conducted a study on empowerment, stress and satisfaction within a call centre and had showed that CSR's were more dissatisfied with the nature of their job rather than workers in other job positions. This finding is in line with this research as it was found that the nature of work, which includes the working conditions, autonomy, job variety, pay, opportunity for promotion, company policies and recognition CSRs' receive in a call centre contributes to the high dissatisfaction rate.

The results further suggest that locus of control orientation (both internal and external) is not significantly related to CSR's job satisfaction. In line with this finding Patten (2005) conducted a study on 50 auditors from six different organisations. He investigated whether the auditors' job performance and job satisfaction are related to differences in their locus of control orientation. The results of this study showed that locus of control (both external and internal) did not influence job satisfaction. The working environment was shown to have influenced job satisfaction (Patten, 2005). However, other studies had found that locus of control is related to job satisfaction. Example Siu & Cooper (1998) in their research looked at occupational stress, job satisfaction, quitting intention, the role of locus of control and organisational commitment in Hong Kong companies. They have found that locus of control was positively related to job satisfaction.

Further other studies have found a significant relationship between job satisfaction and locus of control (Carrim et al., 2006; Judge et al. as cited in Davis, 2004; Chen & Silverthorne, 2008). The underlying reason that a significant relationship was found between job satisfaction and locus of control in these studies was that internals experienced job satisfaction as opposed to externals, due to their ability to cope better under stressful work environments (which is characteristic of the call centre environment). In this research although majority of the sample has an internal locus of control orientation (i.e. 58.3% of the sample) the nature of work which includes the working conditions, autonomy, job variety, pay, opportunity for promotion, company policies and recognition CSRs' receive in itself are so dehumanising that has contributed to the high dissatisfaction rate. This implies that although internally oriented individuals have the ability to cope better under stressful working conditions it did not influence their satisfaction with their job.

The findings also suggest that call centre representatives both males and females did not differ with regards to job satisfaction. This finding is consistent with research studies that found no relationship between gender and job satisfaction, which is primarily attributed to the nature of work which includes the working conditions, autonomy, job variety and pay (Burke, Matthiesen, Einarsen, Fiskensbaum & Soiland, 2008; Oshagbemi & Hickson, 2003). Essentially it is the nature of work (particularly within the call centre) for example where autonomy and job variety are very limited that impacts on job satisfaction negatively; therefore there are no gender differences that exist in relation to job satisfaction.

Other studies have however shown that gender differences exist with regard to job satisfaction. For example, Okpara (2004) examined personal correlates such as gender, age and education amongst information technology (IT) managers and found that gender is significantly related to job satisfaction. The results of this study showed that the differences that exist with regards to gender and job satisfaction were attributed to women in the organisation having a higher level of education as opposed to their male counterparts and they were therefore more satisfied. In this research 62.1% of the sample were male and 37.9% of the sample were female. The majority of the sample (i.e. 58.3% of the sample) had a matric qualification and were dissatisfied with their job. Similarly there were no gender differences that were found in relation to job satisfaction in this research.

In addition research has shown that females tend to experience job satisfaction as opposed to males (Clark, 1996; Sloane & Williams, 1996). Other studies have indicated that males experience job satisfaction rather than females (Forgionne & Peeters, 1982; Shapiro & Stern, 1975). Hulin & Smith (as cited in Carrim et al., 2006) contended that the gender differences that exist are primarily attributed to differences in salary, years of experience and qualification. In other words gender differences that may be found in relation to job satisfaction is subjective to various factors such as pay, tenure and level of education. In terms of this research no gender differences were noted in relation to job satisfaction as both males and females were dissatisfied with the nature of call centre work which relates to autonomy, job variety, pay, working conditions, company policies, opportunity for promotion and recognition.

Further, the findings suggest that CSRs' job satisfaction; was not influenced by their length of service. A possible explanation that no relationship was found between job satisfaction and length of service was that majority of the sample (i.e. 89.3% of the sample) had less than one-year service with the call centre. Research conducted by Carrim et al. (2006) in the call centre supports this view by indicating that length of service is not a significant predictor of job satisfaction as it is the nature of call centre work that impacts negatively on job satisfaction as autonomy and job variety are limited. However, a study conducted by Hunt & Saul (1975) found that job satisfaction declines with an increase in tenure as the job may become boring for the employee. Whereas other studies showed that tenure is positively related to job satisfaction (Oshagbemi, 2003; Sarker, 2003; Okpara, 2004). These studies indicated that job satisfaction increases with increases in tenure. In terms of this research the majority of the sample had less than one year work experience in the call centre thus no relationship was found between tenure and job satisfaction.

The results further indicated that CSR's job satisfaction was not related to their qualification. In line with this finding Carrim et al. (2006) showed that education did not influence job satisfaction; it was the nature of work in the call centre that had impacted negatively on job satisfaction. Further it was found that CSR's with a higher qualification experienced dissatisfaction with their jobs, as they have high expectancies of their job (Carrim et al., 2006).

Similarly, Sarmiento, Beale & Knowles (2007) found no correlation between job satisfaction and education. Results of their study showed that if an individual has a high level of education and cannot utilise their skills and abilities the individual would be most likely to be unsatisfied with their job. This implies that education will not impact positively on job satisfaction if the nature of work in itself is not satisfying for the employee. In terms of this research majority of the sample had a matric qualification (i.e. 58.3% of the sample) and showed no significant differences in terms of their satisfaction with their job. In other words irrespective of the CSR's qualification there was a high dissatisfaction noted with the nature of call centre jobs.

However, Okpara (2004) showed that job satisfaction is positively related to ones qualification where higher educated employees had less complaints about their job and were more interested in "performance, productivity and quality" of their work (p. 336). In this research, the majority of the sample had a low level of education (i.e. matric) and have to work in a tightly monitored environment, perform emotional labour and a monotonous and repetitive job. Thus it is plausible that the call centre representative will be less interested in performance, productivity and quality of their work.

Furthermore, the results indicated that the call centre representatives' locus of control orientation is not related to gender, tenure and qualifications. Similarly, other research studies have found no relationship between locus of control, gender, tenure and qualifications (Carrim et al., 2006; Holder & Vaux, 1998). Research by Carrim et al. (2006) indicate that no relationship was found between locus of control, gender, tenure and qualifications due to the fact that majority of the respondents had only a matric qualification. Similarly CSRs' in this research had majority matric qualifications. These findings are in line with research conducted by Rotter (1966) who indicated that both females and males develop locus of control (i.e. generalised expectancies) over time by reinforcements. It is suggested that there should be no significant differences between locus of control and gender. Further, differences in an individual's locus of control orientation will develop over time. Thus a possible explanation that no relationship was found between locus of control, tenure and qualifications could be attributed to CSRs having a minimum education and less than one year work experience in the call centre.

Chapter 6: Conclusion and recommendations

6.1 Conclusion

The discussion of the results in the previous chapter confirmed the dissatisfying nature of work in a call centre. Generally, the findings indicate that although cost is being minimised by call centres for organisations, the work environment and job design significantly impacts negatively on call centre representatives' job satisfaction (Bakker et al., 2003; Lewig & Dollard, 2003; Holman, 2003). The results reveal aspects that are related to autonomy, job variety, pay, amount of work, working conditions, chances for advancement, praise they get from doing their job and company policies are the significant contributing factors to call centre representatives levels of job dissatisfaction. The highly monotonous, low skilled, tightly monitored, long hours, high stress levels and poorly paid nature of work leads to high dissatisfaction within the call centre (Gordi, 2006; Holman, 2003; Zapf et al., 2003).

In addition the results show, in line with findings by Patten (2005), CSR's job satisfaction is not influenced by their locus of control orientation. CSR's locus of control orientation does not appear to affect their job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, as the nature of work in a call centre is so de-humanising, that it leads to the high dissatisfaction rate amongst the CSR's. Furthermore, CSR's locus of control orientation and job satisfaction is not significantly influenced by their gender, qualification or tenure.

6.2 Recommendations

The main limitation of this study was that call centre representatives were drawn from one call centre only. This would limit the generalisation of the findings. Therefore it is recommended that this study should be replicated, using more than one call centre and possibly using other research measuring instruments. The locus of control inventory has been adapted by Professor Schepers. Three variables have been used i.e. internal, external locus of control and autonomy. This inventory can be considered for future research. Further research focusing on locus of control and job satisfaction is recommended, as research is very limited in this area.

References

- Anastasi, A. (1961). *Psychological testing* (6th ed.). New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Armony, M., & Maglaras, C. (2004). Contact centres with a call-back option and real-time delay information. *Operational Research*, 52, 527-545. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Bagnara, S., & Marti, P. (2001). Human work in call centres: a challenge for cognitive ergonomics. *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science*, 2, 223-237. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2003). Dual processes at work in a call centre: an application of the job demands resources model. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 393-417. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Batt, R. & Moynihan, L. (2002). The viability of alternative call centre production models. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 12, 14-34. Retrieved August 15, 2008, from Emerald database.
- Benner, C. (2006). South Africa on call: information technology and labour market restructuring in South African call centres. *Regional studies*, 40.9, 1025-1040. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Buitendach, J.H., & De Witte, H. (2005). Job insecurity, extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment of maintenance workers in a parastatal. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 36, 27-37. Retrieved March 9, 2008, from Sabinet database.
- Burke, R.J., Matthiesen, S.B., Einarsen, S., Fiskerbaun, L., & Soiland, V. (2008). Gender differences in work experiences and satisfactions of Norwegian oil rig workers. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 23, 137-147. Retrieved September 16, 2008, from Emerald database.

- Callaghan, G., & Thompson, P. (2002). We recruit attitude: the selection and shaping of routine call centre labour. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39, 233-254. Retrieved June 27, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Carrim, N., Basson, J., & Coetzee, M. (2006). The relationship between job satisfaction and locus of control in a South African call centre environment. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 30, 66-81. Retrieved March 9, 2008, from Sabinet database.
- Chen, J.C., & Silverthorne, C. (2008). The impact of locus of control on job stress, job performance and job satisfaction in Taiwan. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 29, 572-582. Retrieved September 16, 2008, from Emerald database.
- Cherlin, A., & Bourque, B. (1974). Dimensionality and reliability of the Rotter I-E Scale. *Sociometry*, 37, 565-582. Retrieved April 4, 2008, from Jstor database.
- Clark, A.E. (1996). Job satisfaction in Britain. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 32, 189-217. Retrieved September 16, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Coetzee, D. (2006). *Claremont CBD secure South Africa's biggest call centre investment*. Retrieved March 9, 2008, from website:
<http://www.eprop.co.za/news/article.aspx?idArticle=7110>
- Coldwell, D.A., Billsberry, J., Van Meurs, N., & Marsh, P.J.G. (2008). The effects of person-organizational ethical fit on employee attraction and retention: towards a testable explanatory model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 78, 611-622. Retrieved June 27, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Davis, G. (2004). Job satisfaction survey among employees in small businesses. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 11, 495-503. Retrieved September 18, 2008, from Emerald database.

- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1987). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour* (1st ed.). New York: Plenum Press.
- Deery, S., & Kinnie, N. (2004). Introduction: the nature and management of call centre work. In S. Deery & N. Kinnie (Ed.), *Call centres and human resource management: a cross-national perspective* (pp. 201-221). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Deery, S., Iverson, R., & Walsh, J. (2004). The effect of customer service encounters on job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion. In S. Deery & N. Kinnie (Ed.), *Call centres and human resource management: a cross-national perspective* (pp. 201-221). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dwyer, D.J., & Fox, M.L. (2006). The relationship between job demands and key performance indicators: moderating effects of job resources in call centres. *Journal of Business and Management*, 12, 127-145. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Fincham, R., & Rhodes, P. (2003). *Principles of organizational behaviour* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fisher, J., Milner, K., & Thatcher, A. (2007). *Job characteristics, anxiety, depression and employee well being amongst call centre employees in South Africa*. Retrieved March 9, 2008, from website:
<http://www.wwcs2007.se/WWCSSWeb/22Tu/Tema2/T2.2.2/T2.2.2.3h.pdf>
- Forgionne, G.A., & Peeters, V.E. (1982). Differences in job motivation and satisfaction among female and male managers. *Human Relations*, 35, 101-118. Retrieved September 16, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Frenkel, S.J., Tam, M., Korczynski, M., & Shire, K. (1998). Beyond bureaucracy: work organization in call centres. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9, 957-979. Retrieved March 27, 2008, from Ebscohost database.

- Friedenberg, L. (1995). *Psychological testing* (1st ed.). Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gordi, R. M. (2006). *Job satisfaction of call centre representatives*. Retrieved March 9, 2008, from University of Western Cape, Department of Psychology website: http://etd.uwc.ac.za/usrfiles/modules/etd/docs/etd_init_8719_1175067659.pdf
- Grandey, A.A., Dickter, D.N., & Sin, H. (2004). The customer is not always right: customer aggression and emotion regulation of service employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 397-418. Retrieved March 27, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Grebner, S., Semmer, N.K., Faso, L.L., Gut, S., Kallin, W., & Elfering, A. (2003). Working conditions, well-being and job related attitudes among call centre agents. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 341-365. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Gruneberg, M.M. (1979). *Understanding job satisfaction* (1st ed.). London: MacMillan.
- Herzberg, F. (1968). *Work and the nature of man* (1st ed.). London: Staples Press.
- Hodgkinson, G.P. (1992). Development and validation of the strategic locus of control scale. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13, 311-317. Retrieved April 4, 2008, from Jstor database.
- Holder, J.C., & Vaux, A. (1998). African American professionals: coping with occupational stress in predominantly white work environments. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 53, 315-333. Retrieved September 16, 2008, from Emerald database.
- Holdsworth, L., & Cartwright, S. (2003). Empowerment, stress and satisfaction: an exploratory study of a call centre. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 23, 131-140. Retrieved September 16, 2008, from Emerald database.

- Holman, D. (2003). Call centres. In D. Holman, T.D. Wall, C.W. Clegg, P. Sparrow, & A. Howard (Ed.), *The new workplace: a guide to the human impact of modern working practices* (pp. 115-131). London: John Wiley & Sons.
- Holman, D. (2004). Employee well-being in call centres. In S. Deery & N. Kinnie (Ed.), *Call centres and human resource management: a cross-national perspective* (pp. 223-244). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Houlihan, M. (2004). Tensions and variations in call centre management strategies. In S. Deery & N. Kinnie (Ed.), *Call centres and human resource management: a cross-national perspective* (pp. 75-101). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hulin, C.L., & Smith, P.C. (1964). Sex differences in job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 48, 88-92.
- Hunt, J.W., & Saul, P.N. (1975). The relationship of age, tenure and job satisfaction in males and females. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 18, 690-702. Retrieved August 25, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Kelley, L.L. (2006). *Locus of control and attitudes to working in virtual teams*. Retrieved March 27, 2008, from website:
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6V9V-4JDVP5N1&_user=2822922&_rdoc=1&_fmt=&_orig=search&_sort=d&_view=c&_acct=C000058881&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=2822922&md5=d7f8dbdb260e89caf45ea31fc4aec80d
- Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S., & Purcell, J. (2000). Fun and surveillance: the paradox of high commitment management in call centres. *International Journal of Human Resources Management*, 11, 967-985. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Labuschagne, M., Bosman, J., & Buitendach, J.H. (2005). Job insecurity, job satisfaction and work locus of control of employees in a government organization. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, 3, 26-35. Retrieved March 27, 2008, from Sabinet database.

- Lefcourt, H.M. (1982). *Locus of control: current trends in theory and research* (2nd ed.). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lewig, K.A., & Dollard, M.F. (2003). Emotional dissonance, emotional exhaustion and job satisfaction in call centre workers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 12*, 366-392. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Littler, C.R. (1978). Understanding Taylorism. *The British Journal of Sociology, 29*, 185-202. Retrieved September 9, 2008, from Emerald database.
- Malhotra, N., & Mukherjee, A. (2003). Analysing the commitment-service quality relationship: a comparative study of retail banking call centres and branches. *Journal of Marketing Management, 19*, 941-971. Retrieved June 27, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Miller, K., & Fisher, J. (2005). *Scientific management meets information technology: uses and abuses of call centre technology in South Africa*. Retrieved March 9, 2008, from website: <http://www.wwcs2007.se/WWCS-Web/22Tu/Tema2/T2.2.2/T2.2.2.3h.pdf>
- Milner, K., Fisher, J., & Latif, J. (2007). Perceptions of electronic performance monitoring and burnout in a South African call centre. *Ergonomics SA, 19*, 31-41. Retrieved March 27, 2008, from Sabinet database.
- Mitchell, M.B. (1994). The effect of work role values on job satisfaction. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 20*, 958-963. Retrieved March 27, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Mohr, R.D., & Zoghi, C. (2008). High involvement work design and job satisfaction. *Industrial and Labour Relations Review, 61*, 275-296. Retrieved June 27, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Mulki, J.P., Jaramillo, J.F., & Locander, W.B. (2008). Effect of ethical climate on turnover intention: linking attitudinal and stress theory. *Journal of Business Ethics, 78*, 559-574. Retrieved June 27, 2008, from Ebscohost database.

- Neuman, W.L. (2000). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods* (1st ed.). Boston: Ally & Bacon.
- Norman, K. (2005). Call centre work: characteristics, physical and psychosocial exposure and health related outcomes. Published doctoral thesis. Linkopings University: Sweden. Retrieved August 15, 2008, from Emerald database.
- Nyland, C. & Mcleod, A. (2007). The scientific management of the consumer interest. *Business History*, 49, 663-681. Retrieved September 9, 2008, from Emerald database.
- Okpara, J.O. (2004). Personal characteristics as predictors of job satisfaction. *Information Technology and People*, 17, 327-338. Retrieved September 18, 2008, from Emerald database.
- Olukayode, A.A. (2005). Influence of organizational climate and locus of control on job satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Psychologia: An International Journal*, 13, 102-113. Retrieved March 27, 2008, from Sabinet database.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2003). Personal correlates of job satisfaction: empirical evidence from UK universities. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30, 1210-1232. Retrieved September 16, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Oshagbemi, T. & Hickson, C. (2003). Some aspects of overall job satisfaction: A binomial logit model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18, 357-367. Retrieved November 20, 2008, from Emerald database.
- Patton, D.M. (2005). An analysis of the impact of locus of control on internal auditors job performance and satisfaction. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 20, 1016-1029. Retrieved September 18, 2008, from Emerald database.
- Pettijohn, C., Pettijohn, L., & Taylor, A.J. (2008). Salesperson perceptions of ethical behaviours: their influence of job satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 78, 547-557. Retrieved June 27, 2008, from Ebscohost database.

- Potgieter, T., & Bagraim, J. (2003). *Organizational behaviour: a contemporary South African perspective* (1st ed.). Pretoria: Van Shaick.
- Pratt, B.W. (n.d.). *Locus of control as a moderator of the relationship between attitudes and behaviour*. Unpublished master's thesis. Rand Afrikaans University: Johannesburg.
- Reaves, C.C. (1992). *Quantitative research for the behavioural sciences* (1st ed.). London: John Wiley and Sons.
- Rose, E.D., & Wright, G. (2005). Satisfaction and dimensions of control among call centre customer service representatives. *International Journal of Human Resources Management, 16*, 136-160. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Rosnow, R.L., & Rosenthal, R. (2002). *Beginning behavioural research: a conceptual primer* (4th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Rotter, J.B., & Hochreich, D.J. (1975). *Personality* (Eds.). England: Foresman and Company.
- Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: general and applied Psychology, 80*, 1-28.
- Saltzman, R.M., & Mehotra, V. (2001). A call centre uses simulation to drive strategic change. *Interfaces, 31*, 87-101. Retrieved June 27, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Sarker, S.J. (2003). The relationships of age and the length of service with job satisfaction: an examination of hotel employees in Thailand. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 18*, 745-758. Retrieved September 18, 2008, from Emerald database.
- Sarmiento, R., Beale, J., & Knowles, G. (2007). Performance amongst shop-floor employees. *Management Research News, 30*, 915-927. Retrieved September 18, 2008, from Emerald database.

- Schepers, J.M., Gropp, L., & Geldenhuys, D.J. (2006). The factor structure, metrical properties, and convergent validity of the third edition (1999) of the locus of control inventory. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 32, 1-8.
- Schultz, D.P., & Schultz, S.E. (2001). *Theories of personality* (7th ed.). Stamford, U.S.A: Wadsworth.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research methods for business* (4th ed.). Hoboken, U.S.A: John Wiley and Sons.
- Shah, V., & Bandi, R.K. (2003). Capability development in knowledge intensive IT enabled services. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 418-427. Retrieved June 27, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Shapiro, J., & Stern, L. (1975). Job satisfaction: male and female, professional and non-professional workers. *Personnel Journal*, 54, 388-390. Retrieved September 16, 2008, from Emerald database.
- Shrauger, S., & Silverman, R.E. (1971). The relationship of religious backgrounds and participation to locus of control. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 10, 11-16. Retrieved April 9, 2008, from Jstor database.
- Siu, O., & Cooper, C.L. (1998). A study of occupational stress, job satisfaction and quitting intention in Hong Kong firms: the role of locus of control and organizational commitment. *Stress Medicine*, 14, 49-54. Retrieved September 12, 2008, from Jstor database
- Sloane, P., & Williams, H. (1996). Are overpaid workers really happy: a test of cognitive dissonance. *Labour*, 10, 3-15. Retrieved September 16, 2008, from Emerald database.
- Spector, P.E. (2000). *Organizational and industrial psychology: research and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

- Sprigg, C.A., Smith, P.R., & Jackson, P.R. (2003). Psychosocial risk factors in call centres: an evaluation of work design and well-being. *Research Report, 169*, 1-81. Retrieved August 15, 2008, from Emerald database.
- Statt, D.A. (2004). *Psychology and the world of work* (2nd ed.). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Steers, R.M., Porter, L.W., & Bigley, G.A. (1996). *Motivation and leadership at work* (6th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Taylor, C.M., Schepers, J.M., & Crous, F. (2006). Locus of control in relation to flow. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology, 32*, 63-71.
- Van Den Broek, D. (2003). Recruitment strategies and union exclusion in two Australian call centres. *Industrial Relations, 58*, 515-536. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Wickham, J., & Collins, G. (2004). The call centre: a nursery for new forms of work organization. *The Service Industries Journal, 24*, 1-18. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Winiiecki, D.J. (2004). Shadowboxing with data: production of the subject in contemporary call centre organizations. *New technology, work and employment, 19*, 78-95. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Wood, S., Holman, D., & Stride, C. (2006). Human resource management and performance in UK call centres. *British Journal of Industrial Relations, 44*, 99-124. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from Ebscohost database.
- Zapf, D., Isic, A., Bechtoldt, M., & Blau, P. (2003). What is typical for call centre jobs: job characteristics and service interactions in different call centres. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 12*, 311-340. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from Ebscohost database.

Appendix 1

Letter of Informed Consent

Dear Call Centre Representative

I am an Industrial Psychology Masters student at the University of KwaZulu-Natal. I am currently conducting research in the area of Job Satisfaction and locus of control. The aim of this research is to explore the relationship that exists between job satisfaction and locus of control amongst call centre representatives. I would appreciate your co-operation in completing the attached questionnaires. The questionnaires are easy to understand and instructions are given on the cover page of each questionnaire. The results obtained from the questionnaires will be used for academic purposes only. Confidentiality and anonymity is guaranteed. Your names are not required so results cannot be traced back to you. Participation is voluntary.

I appreciate your co-operation and assistance. If additional information is required don't hesitate to contact me.

Thank you.

Yours Faithfully
Miss P.J.J Chetty
072 346 1294

I hereby confirm that I fully understand the purpose of the research, participation is voluntary and I may withdraw from the research process at any time.

Signature.....

Date...../...../2008

Appendix 2

Biographical questionnaire

The information that is obtained will be used for research purposes only; individual responses are confidential and anonymous (i.e. there is no way responses could be traced back to you).

Please mark (X) in one of the following boxes.

a) Age:

41-50 years

31-40 years

21-30 years

Younger than 21 years

b) Race:

Black Coloured Asian White

c) Gender:

Male

Female

b) Qualification:

Post-graduate Degree

Degree

Diploma

Matric

d) Years of service with the present company:

1-5 years

1 year

Less than 1 year

e) Years of experience in a call centre

More than 5 years

1-5 years

1 year

Less than 1 year

Thank you for your participation.

Appendix 3

The 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 not satisfied with.

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

On the next page 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 in mind,

- If you feel that your job gives you more than you expected, check the box under “Very Sat” (Very satisfied),
- If you feel that your job gives you what you expected, check the box under “Sat” (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 much less than you expected, check the box under “Very Dissatisfied”.

Remember; keep the statement in mind when deciding how satisfied you feel about that aspect of you 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.

Ask yourself, “How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?”

- **V. Sat**-means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.
- **Sat-means**- I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.
- **N**-means I cant decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.
- **Dissat**-means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.
- **V. Dissat**- means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

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

Appendix 4

The Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale

The Rotter's internal-external locus of control scale is a 23-item forced choice questionnaire with 6 filler items adapted from the 60-item James scale. It is scored in the external direction, that is the higher the score the more external the individual.

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 alternative letters *a* or *b*. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you may strongly *believe* to be the case as far as you are 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 is no right or wrong answers. Your answer, either *a* or *b* to each question on this inventory, is to be reported beside the question. Print your name and any other information requested by the examiner on the bottom of page 3, then finish reading these directions. Do not begin until you are told so.

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. For each numbered question make an X on the line besides either the *a* or *b*, whichever you choose as the statement most 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 are concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be *influenced* by your previous choices.

Remember

Select that alternative which you personally believe to be more true.

I more strongly believe that:

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 results from the mistakes they make.
3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't have 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 non-sense.
 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 ones 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 a well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
 b. Many times exam questions tend to be unrelated to the course work that studying is really useless.
11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to 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 many cases 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 the 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 can't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
 b. There is no such thing as 'luck.'
19. a. One should always be willing to admit his 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 the 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.