

# The Relationship Between Locus of Control, Perceived Organizational Support and Job Satisfaction in Emergency Service Workers

**Prisăcaru Adrian**

Professor at the Faculty of Psychology/Ecological University of Bucharest, and associated researcher at the Institute of Philosophy, and Psychology “C.R. Motru” of the Romanian Academy

## **Abstract:**

With this study we provide conclusive evidence on the importance of locus of control and organizational support provided by bosses/colleagues in the workplace for optimal satisfaction and adaptation of emergency department employees. Thus, employees who have a high level of externality (have an externalist orientation) dimension of locus of control, as well as a high level of perceived organizational support from their managers and/or colleagues, will more frequently have higher levels of specific job satisfaction and general job satisfaction. The mentioned personality characteristics, together with other characteristics, can become predictors used in the process of psychological assessment for selection purposes to predict adaptation at work. In this sense, from the data obtained it can be seen that the variation in generic job satisfaction can be explained in 12.6% by the perceived organizational support variable, and the variation in specific job satisfaction can be explained in 63.4% by the externality variable, as a dimension of locus of control.

**Keywords:** emergency services; specific job satisfaction; generic job satisfaction locus of control; perceived organizational support.

## **1. Introduction**

In-depth knowledge of some individual psychological characteristics of staff working in emergency services is a necessity, given the working environment in such organizations, the overload, danger, surprise, stress, burnout, risk, etc. that is at every step. At the same time, in order to maintain balance, motivation, satisfaction, etc., we also need to consider the need to provide programs to develop the psychological resilience of staff or even provide psychological intervention through brief techniques, such as: pre-incident briefing and education; individual intervention (Psychological First Aid.); group intervention; defusing; large group crisis intervention; crisis briefing management; demobilization; family support and post-incident analysis.

As Meier & Spector (2015) <sup>[1]</sup> appreciate job satisfaction is how employees feel at work and about different aspects of work. Moreover, satisfaction refers to the employee's feelings about his or her occupation, job demands relative to previous experiences, and current expectations or alternatives available to him or her. In another approach formulated by Davis, job satisfaction is a combination of positive or negative feelings that workers have about their work. Job satisfaction is the extent to which expectations are and match actual rewards and is closely related to the employee's behavior at work (Bîrcă, 2018) <sup>[2]</sup>.

Armstrong (2003) <sup>[3]</sup> contrasts job satisfaction with dissatisfaction. According to him, job satisfaction refers to the attributes and feelings employees have about their work. Thus, positive and favorable attitudes towards work generate job satisfaction, while negative and unfavorable attitudes lead to job dissatisfaction. We consider that job satisfaction only makes sense in an organizational approach to it. As early as 1956 Whyte Jr. brings to attention the concept of "homo universalis", involved in the production of goods or the provision of public services, with the specification that he is the product of the organization: "the man who bears the imprint of the way the organization is structured and functions, its nature and specific purpose" (apud. Zlate, 2004, p. 35) <sup>[4]</sup>.

With the passage of time, the concept of "homo universalis" diversifies, so that in 1969 Tom Bruns finds four categories, namely: economic man, rational man, self-actualized man and complex man, but also launches the idea of industrial man, given the scale of industry at that time (apud. Vlăsceanu, 2003, p. 147) <sup>[5]</sup>.

Nowadays, the emphasis is on professionalization and training of specialists, the concept of the universal man is no longer topical, i.e. the man who had knowledge in all branches "becoming immobile, focused on ensuring economic security and willing to subordinate his own interests and beliefs to those of the organization", which has led to conformism, to the detriment of creativity and boldness of man towards new aspirations (Zlate, 2004, p. 36) <sup>[4]</sup>.

The satisfaction came from the fact that people were masters of their own domain, and in the factories they were financially stimulated by being paid "in agreement", i.e. they received benefits for how hard they worked, thus motivating them to work harder. Some received a loyalty bonus, as they were "merged" with the organization, and they were given different titles and other incentives, such as the "top worker". As today's "homo universalis universalis" bears the imprint of the organization, the notion of organizational behaviour emerges, characterized by McShane & Von Glinow (2003, p. 4) <sup>[6]</sup> as "organizational behaviour is the study of what people think, feel and do in an organizational context".

Also, Dennis W. Organ & Tomas Bateman (1986, p.107) <sup>[7]</sup> divide organizational behavior in three ways. The first being from the perspective of phenomenological acceptance and a set of psychosocial phenomena, where in order to avoid overlap between organizational and psychosocial behaviors, organizational behavior is only that facilitated by the organization and generated by organizational processes. In other words, organizational behaviour is considered to be only that in which the members attribute to it behavioral-organizational relevance, and workers' satisfaction ensures a positive organizational climate, being one of the relevant factors.

The second way is the scientific acceptance of organizational behavior, which is subject to investigation, being oriented towards generalization. From this arises the problem of evaluating organizational behaviour, so that the evaluation is made taking into account professional efficiency, productivity, profit, development, innovation, adaptation to change and benefits, i.e. satisfaction, quality of life, personal development, physical and mental health.

The third mode refers to the pragmatic acceptance of organizational behavior as a center of interest for other groups. This dimension shows the significance of organizational behavior in other groups, in other words organizational behavior is the branch of interest for the managerial body, acting in competing environments, governments etc.

Also, in 1998 Gary Johns said: "organizational behavior refers to the attitudes and behaviors of individuals and groups in the organization" (apud. Zlate, 2004, p. 38) <sup>[4]</sup>.

Thus, organizational behavior is seen on the one hand in terms of attitudes and behaviors, and on the other

hand in terms of what people think, feel and do, not just as a reaction to a stimulus, but as an externalization and manifestation of psychic interiority triggered by interrelational contexts.

There have been numerous studies on organizational behavior, becoming an academic discipline, characterized as follows: "the field of organizational behavior concerns the knowledge of all aspects of behavior in organizational situations through the systematic study of the individual, the group, and organizational processes, the primary goal of this knowledge being the achievement of organizational effectiveness and individual well-being" (Greenberg & Baron, 1993, p. 4) <sup>[8]</sup>.

From the quote below it is easy to see the interest in organizational behavior from a psychological point of view, beneficial for improving staff satisfaction "the set of adaptive reactions of the individual or group, the overall manifestations of individual or group-organizational psychological activity; the reactions are either directly observable or indirectly inferred; and in either case they can be influenced and directed" (Zlate, 2004, p. 38).

The activities in which the individual or the group is involved particularize organizational environments, and organizational conditions, goals and constraints may or may not have beneficial effects for the individual or the organization, and the degree of motivation and satisfaction supports the power of adaptation to the new.

On the other hand Herbert Simon (1957, p.72) <sup>[9]</sup> considers that the term organization is related to the communication relations in a group, calling this structure "role systems" and "collective behaviour systems", and organizations gain great importance precisely because of their pervasiveness in people's lives, especially since people spend a large part of their time in them and produce important effects in people's personalities "the high specificity of structure and coordination within the organization, as opposed to the diffuse and changing relationships that exist between organizations and between isolated individuals, tends to make an organization an important sociological unit comparable to that of a biological organism".

Thus we deduce that between the two entities, respectively between the organization and individuals, a series of relationships are structured that influence people's lives so much that sometimes, through the tasks they have to perform, it can put their lives at risk.

An example of this would be organizations and emergency workers where danger, surprise, stress, burnout and risk are part of the specifics of their work.

Under these conditions we believe that some personality characteristics, peer support and psychological support provided by specialists can have beneficial effects on workers, so that the perceived stress or the onset of burnout to be postponed as much as possible, and the adaptation of staff to the stressful environment to be as optimal as possible.

As Moons et al. (2009) <sup>[10]</sup> appreciate, when workers believe and see themselves as members of a team, they will apply team attributes, and to define themselves they will even change their individual mindset to the stereotypical team mindset.

Therefore, we can appreciate that when team burnout occurs, team members tend to adjust their cognitions, affect, arousal levels, and behaviors to the perceived level and state of the team, especially when their team identity is evident (Begoña Uriena et al., 2021) <sup>[11]</sup>.

Adjustment is an adaptive form of behavior, as any attempt to resist or confront team norms will require a surplus of unavailable energy in an already depleted team (Baumeister et al., 2007) <sup>[12]</sup>.

Because we are working in teams more than ever, we should prevent the negative effects that the additional demands of teamwork, such as work intensity, demands, etc., have on teams and team members. An

example of this is highlighted by Leblanc et al. (2007) <sup>[13]</sup> who refer to team interventions by leaders and practitioners, stating that they can provide additional support through a top-down, top-down approach to reduce stress and burnout, and by developing supportive social norms, negative feelings of team members can be reduced.

Therefore, the better we know the individual psychological characteristics of the employees, as well as the demands of the workstations, we can design some appropriate programs of psychological assessment of staff, psychoeducation/psychoprophylaxis, development of psychological resilience (Salomo, Sutarto & Arianti, 2023) <sup>[14]</sup> etc., so as to prevent the onset of stress-related manifestations and traumatic events.

In this regard, Popa (2015, p.35) <sup>[15]</sup> stipulates that adaptation means the relationship between individual factors and organizational-situational factors, which materializes at the individual level through a series of adaptive responses, with reference to increased performance, commitment, persistence, etc. or maladaptive responses, consisting in low performance, non-compliance with rules, counterproductive behavior, resignation, etc.

We deduce that an employee's future professional performance in the workplace may be directly conditioned by the level of current professional adaptation, in addition to certain psychological characteristics measured during psychological assessments, taking into account some assumptions, such as (Popa, 2015, p.37):

- employee's current fit with the organization is a predictor for adaptation;
- the fit between the employee and the organization is the result of a system of interaction that covers extremely varied domains with respect to the job, the characteristics of the profession, the relationship with the bosses, the family relationship, the relationship with colleagues etc.;
- fit between employee and organization can be a good predictor of performance.

On the basis of the information presented above, we can conclude that the theoretical model promoted is centered on the concept of 'fit' and is based on a two-stage assessment process, namely the psychological selection assessment and the psychological on-the-job assessment. The difference between them is that while selection aims at job fit or prediction of employee performance on the basis of individual characteristics that are considered stable, matching aims at prediction of performance on the basis of the match between the level of fit in the workplace and a set of organizational expectations of future fit.

In this respect, psychological selection assessment is based on the assessment of individual psychological characteristics, referred to as predictors, and psychological post-employment assessment or regular psychological on-the-job assessment is based on a number of dimensions that target the level of adaptation to the work environment, assuming that better adaptation or fit will lead to better future job performance.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1. Objectives and assumptions

The general objective of the paper aims to highlight the role and importance of some psychological characteristics in relation to job satisfaction of emergency workers, taking into consideration three specific objectives.

**The first specific objective** aims to study the influence of variables such as locus of control, peer/boss support and some working conditions within the organization on job satisfaction.

**The second specific objective** aims to highlight the fact that some people's job satisfaction is influenced by age and/or gender, characteristics that can be facilitating factors for professional and personal development through the way they interpret themselves or the feelings generated by the conditions offered

at work.

*The third specific objective* aims at highlighting how job satisfaction is predicted through the prism of individual psychological characteristics.

In order to fulfill the research objectives we proposed to guide the research through the following research hypothesis:

- **Hypothesis no. 1** - We assume that between specific job satisfaction, generic job satisfaction and locus of control there are some interdependent relationships.
- **Hypothesis no. 2** - We assume that there are interdependent relationships between specific job satisfaction, generic job satisfaction and perceived organizational support from colleagues and/or bosses.
- **Hypothesis no. 3** - We assume that there are differences in specific job satisfaction and generic job satisfaction by gender and age.
- **Hypothesis no. 4** - We assume that locus of control and perceived organizational support play a significant role in predicting specific job satisfaction and generic job satisfaction.

## 2.2. Research group structure and description

The research lot was constituted according to the non-probabilistic (non-randomized) technique, i.e. the convenience technique, which does not take into account the requirement to indicate the probability of case selection, as a result, there is no guarantee that the lot is composed of cases that faithfully describe the reference population.

At the same time, the technique involves the inclusion of accessible and available cases, based on voluntarism, and is the least rigorous but also the most commonly encountered in the practice of limited-purpose research such as this study.

Thus, the research sample consisted of 120 people with the following characteristics:

- gender balanced, i.e. 64 females and 56 males;
- heterogeneous in terms of age, with ages ranging from 26 to 55 years and an average of 36 years;
- heterogeneous in terms of educational background, with 63 with secondary education, 10 with post-secondary education and 47 with bachelor's education;
- homogeneous from the perspective of the professional field in which they work, i.e. all individuals are part of an organization/institution of the emergency system, located in Bucharest.

The survey was conducted online on Google Forms and the questionnaires were open for 1 week at the end of March 2023.

Respondents were asked for their consent to collect and process data for the purpose of conducting scientific research, and all ethical rules were followed.

## 2.3. Tools used to measure variables

Four standardized psychological assessment instruments were used to collect the data needed to prove the hypotheses:

### 2.3.1. Scale of locus of control (S.L.C.R.-A.)

The scale was developed by Julian B. Rotter in 1966, based on the concept of "locus of control" in the description of personality, highlighting the psychological characteristics that imprint a certain direction on the behavior of the person, aiming to attribute the causes of behavior to factors that are in the subjective sphere, internal to the individual or outside him, in the objective world. The scale has been translated,

adapted and used by a group of specialists (Cracsner, Prisăcaru, Cană & Negură, 2007, p. 245-248) <sup>[16]</sup>, comprising 29 items with two response options each. The scoring guidelines aim at calculating the score for each of the two dimensions, i.e. for externality and internality, taking into account the score of each item in the subscale composition.

### 2.3.2. Specific Job Satisfaction Scale (SSPS)

The scale was taken from the website [www.researchcentral.ro](http://www.researchcentral.ro) and used to collect data on important aspects of work engagement such as task, goals, demands, involvement, expectations and rewards.

The scale consists of 15 items and the answers are recorded on a 7-step Likert-type scale, where 1 is extremely dissatisfied and 7 is extremely satisfied.

The scoring indications are twofold, as follows:

- scoring and calculating the score for each of the two subscales composing the instrument, namely Specific Intrinsic Job Satisfaction (SPSI) and Specific Specific Extrinsic Job Satisfaction (SPSE);
- scoring and calculating the overall/total score of specific job satisfaction (SSLMT), taking into account the score of each item of the scale.

### 2.3.3. Generic job satisfaction Scale (SSGLM)

The scale was taken from the website [www.researchcentral.ro](http://www.researchcentral.ro) and used to collect some data related to the beliefs and implicit feelings generated by the appreciation of people at work, the quality of interpersonal relationships, the quality of professional relationships with superiors, the degree of psychological comfort or well-being generated by the above characteristics, which ultimately lead to the overall satisfaction with the workplace and the organization as a whole.

The Generic Job Satisfaction Scale consists of 10 items, and responses are recorded on a 5-step Likert-type scale, where 1 represents strong disagreement with the statement and 5 represents strong agreement with the statement. The scoring instructions are intended to calculate the overall score (N.B.), taking into account the score of each item in the scale.

### 2.3.4. Scale of perceived organizational support (SSOP)

The scale was taken from the website [www.researchcentral.ro](http://www.researchcentral.ro) and used to assess the possible feelings that a person may experience at work, particularly those that are generated by the perceived and felt support provided by management and non-managerial staff and colleagues while involved in dealing with work tasks and temporary life situations that the person may experience.

The scale consists of 17 items, and responses are recorded on a 7-step Likert-type scale, where 1 means strongly disagree with the assertion and 7 means strongly agree with the assertion. The scoring indications aim at calculating the overall score (N.B.), taking into account the score of each item in the scale.

## 2.4. Procedure

The research was guided by quantitative research benchmarks, being established the independent variables and dependent variables translated into research hypotheses, as well as the statistical apparatus for data analysis, as follows:

- dependent variables are represented by specific job satisfaction and generic job satisfaction; independent variables are the locus of control and perceived organizational support.
- Correlation analysis, statistical mean difference and regression analysis were used for the statistical processing of the data, using the program S.P.S.S. version 18.00.

In the preliminary data analysis phase, aimed at ensuring the correctness of data recording, checking marginal values, identifying missing data/values and analyzing the normality of the distribution, no parti-

cular situations were identified.

### 3. Findings and Discussion

The statistical technique called Pearson correlations was used to prove Hypothesis no. 1 and the results are presented in Table no. 1.

**Table no. 1 - Descriptive statistics and correlation coefficient values between the variables specific job satisfaction, generic job satisfaction and locus of control (N=120)**

Variables	M	SD	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1) Generic job satisfaction	33.400	9.07337	-				
(2) Specific intrinsic satisfaction	35.2833	15.89154	-.587*	-			
(3) Specific extrinsic satisfaction	25.1250	13.67176	.612*	-.903*	-		
(4) Specific job satisfaction	60.6000	7.07986	-.167	.520*	-.111*	-	
(5) Internality	11.3750	6.10560	-.676*	.936*	-.962*	.264*	-
(6) Externality	11.6083	6.11555	.675*	-.936*	.962*	-.264*	-.912*

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-way).

For data interpretation, in agreement with Colton (1974, p.167) [17], the values of correlation coefficients have the following meanings: a correlation coefficient of -0.25 to 0.25 means weak or no correlation; a correlation coefficient of 0.25 to 0.50 (or -0.25 to -0.50) means an acceptable degree of association; a correlation coefficient of 0.50 to 0.75 (or -0.50 to -0.75) means moderate to good correlation; a correlation coefficient greater than 0.75 (or less than -0.75) means very good association or correlation.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the data presented in Table no.1:

**1. Highly statistically significant relationships between internality, externality, specific intrinsic satisfaction and specific extrinsic satisfaction**

- between externality as a dimension of locus of control and specific intrinsic satisfaction as a dimension of specific job satisfaction, as well as between internality as a dimension of locus of control and specific extrinsic satisfaction as a dimension of specific job satisfaction the Pearson linear correlation coefficient has a negative sign (one variable increases and another decreases) and  $r = -.936^{**}$ , respectively  $r = -.962^{**}$  ( $p < .01$ ), which emphasizes the presence of highly statistically significant

relationships between the mentioned variables or high association, and the statistical relationship is highly significant .01 (99% confidence);

- also, high values of Pearson correlation coefficient are evidenced in the relationship between internality as a dimension of locus of control and intrinsic specific satisfaction as a dimension of specific job satisfaction ( $r = .936^{**}$ ), as well as between externality as a dimension of locus of control and extrinsic specific satisfaction as a dimension of specific job satisfaction ( $r = .962^{**}$ ), which indicates highly significant statistical relationship .01 (99% confidence).

**2. Statistically significant relationships between internality, externality and overall job satisfaction**

- the Pearson linear correlation coefficient between internality as a dimension of the control place and general job satisfaction has a negative sign (one variable increases and the other decreases) and the value  $r = -.676^{**}$  ( $p < .01$ ), which shows the presence of a statistically significant relationship between the two variables, even if the association is lower than in the previous description but it is a correlation with good value, and the statistical relationship is significant .01 (99% confidence);
- also, good positive values of the Pearson correlation coefficient in the relationship between externality as a dimension of locus of control and generic job satisfaction ( $r = .675^{**}$ ) are also highlighted ( $r = .675^{**}$ ), indicating a statistically significant .01 (99% confidence).

It can be concluded that locus of control, as a dimension of psychological structure, can have a significant influence on specific job satisfaction, all the more so if there is a correspondence between the psychological characteristics described by locus of control and the two forms of satisfaction. In other words, people with a specific internalistic psychological profile, who attribute the causality of all events to subjective, internal determinations, which are related to their own person, ignoring the role of life situations, the conjunction of factors, chance, could obtain job satisfaction through the prism of internal conditions specific to work. At the same time, people with a specific externalistic psychological profile, who mainly attribute the causality of mental and physical phenomena to chance, fate, supernatural forces, could obtain job satisfaction through the external conditions specific to their work.

**Conclusion:**

After analyzing the data on the relationship between locus of control, specific job satisfaction and generic job satisfaction, it has been shown that it is statistically supported or that there are interdependent relationships between them. The data presented constitute evidence to prove Hypothesis no. 1.

The statistical technique called Pearson correlations was used to prove Hypothesis No. 2 and the results obtained are presented in Table no. 2.

**Table no. 2 - Descriptive statistics and values of correlation coefficients between the variables specific job satisfaction, generic job satisfaction and perceived organizational support (N=120)**

Variables	M	SD	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
(1) Generic job satisfaction	33.400	9.07337	-			
(2) Specific intrinsic satisfaction	35.2833	15.89154	-.587**	-		
(3) Specific extrinsic satisfaction	25.1250	13.67176	.612**	-.903**	-	
(4) Specific job satisfaction	60.6000	7.07986	-.167	.520**	-.111**	-



(5) Perceived organizational support	61.8167	29.32260	.681**	-.883**	.921**	-.236**
--------------------------------------	---------	----------	--------	---------	--------	---------

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-way).

The following conclusions can be drawn from the data presented in Table no. 2:

- between the perceived organizational support provided by bosses/colleagues and specific intrinsic satisfaction, as a dimension of specific job satisfaction, the Pearson linear correlation coefficient has a negative sign (one variable increases and another decreases) and r value =  $-.883^{**}$  ( $p < .01$ ), which highlights the presence of highly statistically significant relationships, and the statistical relationship is highly significant .01 (99% confidence);
- also, high positive values of Pearson correlation coefficient are evidenced in the relationship between perceived organizational support provided by bosses/colleagues and extrinsic specific satisfaction as a dimension of specific job satisfaction ( $r = .921^{**}$ ), which indicates highly significant statistical relationship. 01 (99% confidence); in other words, the affective support provided by bosses and colleagues has an increased relevance in the achievement of specific extrinsic satisfaction by people involved in professional activities, and this becomes a facilitating factor for involvement in daily professional activities;
- between perceived organizational support provided by bosses/colleagues and general job satisfaction, the Pearson linear correlation coefficient has a positive value  $r = .612^{**}$  ( $p < .01$ ), which shows the presence of a statistically significant relationship between the two variables, even if the association is lower than in the previous description but it is a correlation with good value, and the statistical relationship is significant .01 (99% confidence).

**Conclusion:**

The analysis of the data on the relationship between perceived organizational support from bosses/colleagues, specific job satisfaction and generic job satisfaction showed that it is statistically supported or that there is an interdependent relationship between them. The data presented constitute relevant evidence to prove Hypothesis no. 2.

The statistical technique called Independent Samples Test was used to prove Hypothesis no. 3 and the results obtained are presented in Table no. 3, Table no. 4, Table no. 5 and Table no. 6.

As regards the age of the individuals in the study group, they were distributed into two groups, i.e. 58 individuals aged up to 35 years in the first group and 62 individuals aged over 35 years in the second group.

**Table no. 3 - Descriptive statistics for the variables specific job satisfaction and generic job satisfaction by age of individuals (N=120)**

Variables	Age	N	M	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Generic job satisfaction	1	58	34.4828	9.46321	1.24258
	2	62	32.3871	8.64672	1.09813
Specific intrinsic satisfaction	1	58	34.0345	15.45561	2.02942
	2	62	36.4516	16.32727	2.07356
	1	58	25.7069	14.16694	1.86021

<i>Specific extrinsic satisfaction</i>	2	62	24.5806	13.28446	1.68713
<i>Specific job satisfaction</i>	1	58	59.9483	6.79118	.89173
	2	62	61.2097	7.34208	.93245

**Table no. 4 - Values of the differences of statistical means (Independent Samples Test) on specific job satisfaction and generic job satisfaction by age of individuals (pentru N=120)**

Variables	<i>t</i> calculat	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
<i>Generic job satisfaction</i>	1.268	118	.207	2.09566	1.65327	-1.17827	5.36960
<i>Specific intrinsic satisfaction</i>	-.832	118	.407	-2.41713	2.90677	-8.17332	3.33906
<i>Specific extrinsic satisfaction</i>	.449	118	.654	1.12625	2.50591	-3.83614	6.08864
<i>Specific job satisfaction</i>	-.975	118	.331	-1.26140	1.29358	-3.82305	1.30025

From the data presented in Table no. 3 we can observe that the statistical means obtained by younger people on some dimensions are slightly higher than those of older people, as follows:

- for younger persons:  $M_{\text{generic satisfaction}} = 34.4828$ ,  $M_{\text{specific extrinsic satisfaction}} = 25.7069$ ;
- for older people:  $M_{\text{generic satisfaction}} = 32.3871$ ,  $M_{\text{specific extrinsic satisfaction}} = 24.5806$ .

From the data presented in Table no. 4 we can draw the following conclusions regarding on specific job satisfaction and generic job satisfaction:

- on the variable generic job satisfaction, the difference between means is 2.09566, corresponding to a  $t_{\text{calculated}} = 1.268$  and a significance level Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.207;
- regarding the variable intrinsic specific satisfaction, the difference between means is -2.41713, corresponding to a  $t_{\text{calculated}} = -0.832$  and a significance threshold Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.407;
- regarding the variable extrinsic specific satisfaction, the difference between means is 1.12625, corresponding to a  $t_{\text{calculated}} = 0.449$  and a significance threshold Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.654;
- regarding the variable specific job satisfaction, the difference between means is -1.26140, corresponding to a  $t_{\text{calculated}} = -0.975$  and a significance threshold Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.331;
- although the values of the calculated difference between the statistical means are not large, it can be concluded that younger people may have higher specific extrinsic satisfaction compared to older people and vice versa, as well as that older people have higher specific intrinsic satisfaction compared to younger people.

**Table no. 5 - Descriptive statistics for the variables specific job satisfaction and generic job satisfaction by gender (N=120)**

Variables	Gender	N	M	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Generic job satisfaction	Females	64	35.1719	8.77506	1.09688
	Males	56	31.3750	9.06053	1.21076
Specific intrinsic satisfaction	Females	64	30.5000	15.93140	1.99143
	Males	56	40.7500	14.09352	1.88333
Specific extrinsic satisfaction	Females	64	29.0625	13.33914	1.66739
	Males	56	20.6250	12.72587	1.70057
Specific job satisfaction	Females	64	59.5625	7.44477	.93060
	Males	56	61.7857	6.50235	.86891

**Table no. 6 - Values of statistical mean differences (Independent Samples Test) on specific job satisfaction and generic job satisfaction by gender (pentru N=120)**

Variables	t calculate d	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Generic job satisfaction	2.329	118	.022	3.79688	1.63023	.56858	7.02517
Specific intrinsic satisfaction	-3.709	118	.000	-10.25000	2.76350	-15.72247	-4.77753
Specific extrinsic satisfaction	3.532	118	.001	8.43750	2.38916	3.70631	13.16869
Specific job satisfaction	-1.730	118	.086	-2.22321	1.28476	-4.76739	.32096

From the data presented in Table no. 5 we can observe that the statistical averages obtained by females on some dimensions are slightly higher than those of males, thus:

- for females:  $M_{\text{generic satisfaction}} = 35.1719$ ,  $M_{\text{specific extrinsic satisfaction}} = 29.0625$ ;
- for males:  $M_{\text{generic satisfaction}} = 31.3750$ ,  $M_{\text{specific extrinsic satisfaction}} = 20.6250$ .
- The following conclusions can be drawn from the data presented in Table 6:
- on the variable generic job satisfaction, the difference between means is 3.79688, corresponding to a  $t_{\text{calculated}} = 2.329$  and a significance threshold  $\text{Sig. (2-tailed)} = 0.022$ ;
- regarding the variable intrinsic specific satisfaction, the difference between means is -10.25000, corresponding to a  $t_{\text{calculated}} = -3.709$  and a significance threshold  $\text{Sig. (2-tailed)} = 0.000$ ;
- on the variable extrinsic specific satisfaction, the difference between means is 8.43750, corresponding to a  $t_{\text{calculated}} = 3.532$  and a significance threshold  $\text{Sig. (2-tailed)} = 0.001$ ;

- regarding the variable specific job satisfaction, the difference between means is -2.22321, corresponding to a  $t_{\text{calculated}} = -1.730$  and a significance threshold Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.086;
- although the values of the calculated difference between the statistical means are not large, it can be concluded that females may have higher extrinsic specific satisfaction compared to males and males may have higher intrinsic specific satisfaction compared to females.

**Conclusion:**

After analyzing the results on significance testing between the statistical means obtained by the two subgroups of individuals, it can be concluded that Hypothesis no. 3 is statistically supported.

The statistical technique called Simple Linear Regression was used to prove Hypothesis no. 4 and the results obtained are presented in Table no. 7.

**Table no. 7 - Regression coefficient values on the direct relationship between the locus of control, organizational perceived organizational control, specific job satisfaction and general job satisfaction (N=120)**

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
<b>a) Generic job satisfaction</b>					
Constant	113.184	109.270		1.036	.302
Place of control - Internality	-4.032	4.759	-2.713	-.847	.399
Place of control - Externality	-3.591	4.766	-2.420	-.753	.453
Perceived organizational support	.126	.062	.406	2.016	.046
<b>b) Specific intrinsic satisfaction</b>					
Constant	45.166	93.266		.484	.629
Place of control - Internality	.801	4.062	.308	.197	.844
Place of control - Externality	-1.613	4.068	-.621	-.396	.692
Perceived organizational support	-.004	.053	-.008	-.081	.935
<b>c) Specific extrinsic satisfaction</b>					
Constant	30.481	61.633		.495	.622
Place of control - Internality	-1.344	2.684	-.600	-.501	.617
Place of control - Externality	.537	2.688	.240	.200	.842
Perceived organizational support	.060	.035	.129	1.707	.090
<b>d) Specific job satisfaction</b>					
Constant	68.464	113.619		.603	.548
Place of control - Internality	-.200	4.948	-.172	-.040	.968
Place of control - Externality	-.634	4.956	-.548	-.128	.898
Perceived organizational support	.029	.065	.119	.443	.659

Dependent Variable: a) generic job satisfaction; b) specific intrinsic satisfaction; c) specific extrinsic satisfaction; d) specific job satisfaction.

Taking into account the values of the regression coefficients mentioned in Table no. 7, we can conclude that each personality characteristic explains and predicts in different proportions the level of generic job satisfaction and specific job satisfaction.

For example, 12.6% of the variation in generic job satisfaction can be explained by the perceived organizational support variable and 63.4% of the variation in specific job satisfaction can be explained by the externality variable as a locus of control dimension.

Partial conclusion: the data mentioned in Table no. 7 and the interpretation presented above allow us to state that Hypothesis no 4 is statistically supported.

## 5. Conclusions

In the present study the results showed that the research hypotheses are statistically supported, and some personality characteristics, namely locus of control and perceived support are in an intercorrelation relationship with satisfaction, which can be appreciated that the onset of satisfaction is influenced by them. The negative correlation between the externality variable as a dimension of locus of control and specific intrinsic satisfaction as a dimension of specific job satisfaction, as well as between internality as a dimension of locus of control and specific extrinsic satisfaction as a dimension of specific job satisfaction, shows that specific job satisfaction is in a close relationship with the dimensions of locus of control, but the negative sign of the correlation indicates that the dimensions are in inverse relationships, i.e. when one decreases, the other increases and vice versa.

At the same time, it can also be appreciated that people with a specific internality profile, as a dimension of the locus of control, will have a higher intrinsic specific satisfaction, as a dimension of specific job satisfaction, and people with a specific externality profile, as a dimension of the locus of control, will have a higher extrinsic specific satisfaction, as a dimension of specific job satisfaction.

Therefore, according to the profile characteristic of the two dimensions of locus of control, people who are more likely to feel more comfortable and experience high levels of specific job satisfaction are those who have the profile of the externality dimension of locus of control, relative to internalists. When the level of externality is lower, people feel they cannot cope with the demands of the job, work much harder to accomplish tasks, have a low perception of their own skills and competencies, and this can lead to lower specific job satisfaction and the risk of increased stress, burnout and burnout.

Also of note are the data on the significance of the relationship between internality as a dimension of locus of control and generic job satisfaction, in which the Pearson linear correlation coefficient has a negative sign with a high value, which indicates that one variable is increasing and another is decreasing, as well as high positive values of the Pearson correlation coefficient in the relationship between externality as a dimension of locus of control and generic job satisfaction.

Thus, it can be concluded that locus of control, as a dimension of psychological structure, can have a significant influence on specific job satisfaction as well as on generic job satisfaction, all the more so if there is a correspondence between the psychological characteristics described by locus of control and the two forms of satisfaction.

As for the relationships between perceived organizational support provided by bosses/colleagues and specific job satisfaction through its two dimensions, namely specific intrinsic satisfaction and specific extrinsic satisfaction, they are statistically supported by the Pearson linear correlation coefficient, but the data obtained show that the support provided by bosses and colleagues has an increased relevance in the extrinsic specific satisfaction of people working in emergency services, and this component (extrinsic

specific satisfaction) becomes a supporting factor for involvement in specific daily professional activities. At the same time, it is shown that between the perceived organizational support provided by bosses/colleagues and generic job satisfaction there are significant intercorrelations, supported by the Pearson linear correlation coefficient with high positive value ( $r = .612^{**}$ ), which allows us to conclude that perceived support influences and has a significant role in the relationship with generic job satisfaction. This explains why people who perceive that they have organizational support from colleagues and bosses feel better able to cope with the challenges of various situations in the workplace, have more self-confidence, can deal with situations more detached and have higher levels of specific job satisfaction as well as general job satisfaction.

In conclusion, the present research provides evidence for the scientific validation of the fact that employees in emergency services who have a high level of externality, a component of locus of control (they have an externalist orientation), as well as a high level of perceived organizational support from their bosses and/or colleagues, will more frequently show high levels of specific job satisfaction and generic job satisfaction, characteristics that allow us to assess that they will benefit from optimal adaptation at work.

In a different vein, we also note that research has shown that females have higher levels of generic job satisfaction and specific externalist job satisfaction than males, and that younger people are more likely to experience satisfaction than males.

## 6. References:

1. Laurenz L. Meier & Paul E. Spector - Job satisfaction, in Wiley Encyclopedia of Management, Human Resources, 2015.
2. Bîrca Alic - Impactul satisfacției profesionale asupra performanței organizaționale [The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Performance], in Selected Papers of the International Scientific Conference "Competitiveness and Innovation in the Knowledge Economy", Vol. 2, 2018, p. 1.
3. Armstrong M - Managementul resurselor umane. Manual practic [Human Resources Management. Practical manual], Editura Codecs, București, 2003, p. 872.
4. Zlate, M. - Tratat de psihologie organizațional-managerială [Treatise on organizational-managerial psychology], Editura Polirom, Iași, 2004.
5. Vlăsceanu, M. - Organizații și comportament organizațional [Organizations and organizational behavior], Editura Polirom, Iași, 2003.
6. McShane, S.L. & Von Glinow, M.A. - Organizational Behaviour. International Edition, McGraw-Hill Education, New York, 2003.
7. Dennis W. Organ & Tomas Bateman - Organizational Behavior: An Applied Psychological Approach, Business Publications, University of Michigan, 1986.
8. Jerald Greenberg & Robert A. Baron - Behavior in organizations: understanding and managing the human side of work, NY, United States, 1993, <https://www.ebay.com/09.08.2024>, 14.10.
9. Herbert A. Simon - Background of Decision Making, in Naval Varr Colege press, Volume 77, nr 1, Winter 2024.
10. Moons, W. G., Diana J. Leonard, Diane M. Mackie & Eliot R. Smith - I feel our pain: Antecedents and consequences of emotional self-stereotyping, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 45, 2009, p.760–769.
11. Begoña Uriena, Ramón Ricob, Evangelia Demeroutic & Arnold B. Bakkerd - An Emergence Model of Team Burnout, Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 37(3), 2021, p. 175-186.

12. Baumeister, R. F., Lauren E. Brewer, Dianne M. Tice & Jean M. Twenge - Thwarting the Need to Belong: Understanding the Interpersonal and Inner Effects of Social Exclusion, *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* Vol. 1/1 (2007), p.506–520.
13. Leblanc, S., Luc Ria, Gilles Dieumegard, Guillaume Serres & Marc Durand - Concevoir des dispositifs de formation professionnelle des enseignants à partir de l'analyse de l'activité dans une approche enactive, *Association Recherches et Pratiques sur les Activités*. Vol. 5-1, avril 2008.
14. Salomo Andro Teterissa, Sutarto Wijono & Arianti Ina Restiani Hunga - Psychological Resilience of Batik Artisans in Indonesia Based on "Putting-Out System" During the Pandemic from Seven Resilience Factors Reivich & Shatte, in *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, No. 3 (6), 2023, p.19-23.
15. Popa, M. - Evaluarea psihologică a personalului, între paradigmele selecției și adaptării [Psychological assessment of personnel, between selection and adaptation paradigms], in *Journal of Human Resources Psychology* nr.13, 2015, Association for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, p. 35-37.
16. Cracsner, E.C., Prisăcaru, A., Cană, A. & Negură, G. - Cunoașterea psihologică a personalului profesionalizat din mediul militar – Demers esențial pentru desfășurarea optimă a activităților specifice [Psychological Knowledge of Professional Personnel in the Military Environment - An Essential Approach for the Optimal Performance of Specific Activities], in *Proceedings of the Scientific Communications Session with International Participation of the National Defense University*, National Defense University Publishing House, Bucharest, 2007, p. 245-248.
17. Colton, T. - *Statistics in Medicine*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974, p. 167.

**Webliography:**

1. [www.researchcentral.ro/11.03.2023,10.07](http://www.researchcentral.ro/11.03.2023,10.07).