

Relationship Between the Intensity of the Internal and External Locus of Control and Relation to the Property of the Subjects

ABSTRACT

In this article the assumption that made to formulate the hypothesis that evaluation of attractiveness of financial instruments by the testees influence their perception of property was certainty that people who have got other attitude in terms of attractiveness towards particular products and financial instruments available on polish capital market, will experience notion of property differently.

KEYWORDS: internal and external locus of control; relation to property; business activity

INTRODUCTION

In my research thesis methodology of own research upon perception of property among members of housing cooperatives was talked over, in it theoretical assumptions of own research as well as object and subject of research. Research questions, detailed research hypotheses and methods were introduced. In the end there were characterized: methods of the questionnaire construction

* Correspondence regarding the paper should be sent to: Grzegorz Kida, Institute of Psychology, The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Al. Raławickie 14 (C-338), 20-950 Lublin, Poland, e-mail: gregor@kul.lublin.pl

and procedures of research and people examined. Their inspiration was universality and indispensability of everyday contact with property in the realities of market economy. As I described in earlier part of work, people had tried to deal with problem of property since ancient times. From birth we all have got inborn natural tendency for possession. It can also be shaped in a certain way. If we have not got properly shaped structures of "ownership", there is a risk that a development of a mature personality will not be optimal; the people without proper cognitive structures in this scope frequently have not got sense of perception on the surrounding world. This may be particularly important for people whose sense of ownership should be very strong because it links with work throughout the life during which they hoped to satisfy different kinds of their needs through the possession of own apartment in block of flats owned by housing co-operative. This is particularly important in socio-economic transformation in our country. All citizens had possibility to redefine their situation and certain schemas which would enable them to function in the new reality. Dwellers of housing block were given sham-property of flats which turned out to be not "the real property". That brings a question about the representation of notion "property" and conditioning of multidimensional perception of properties among these people. In this doctor's thesis the object of my analysis is psychological perception of property in the context of internal and external locus of control among members of housing co-operatives.

In this presented tests of this reserach's thesis in examined people, who lived in the buildings of housing co-operatives and were objects of the tests, created specific perception image of property and other occurrences linked with it: internal and external locus of control as well as actions that were taken by those people.

Based on previous theoretical contemplations and observations of everyday life basic research questions were asked- does occurrence of internal and external locus of control differ percep-

tion of property and tendency for making up risky decisions and object of research, that is people living in apartments of housing co-operatives and what kind of variables do influence distinction in perception of property dimensions

Dependent variables in my research were: perception of different kinds of property and tendency for making up risky decisions whereas independent variables were following characteristics: sex, age, previous education, professional experience, legal title of owned apartment, level of internal and external locus of control.

In thesis there were formulated two kinds of aims whose realization were dependent on conducted analyses. These were verification and application aims. In the context of above mentioned research aims a number of research hypotheses was formulated. These research aims and hypotheses required conducting of test among members of housing co-operatives. In the test 172 people took part.

The methods used in the my research re of author's construction Questionnaire of Property Perception other I.E. Rotter's questionnaire in R. Drwal's interpretation.

When formulating the research hypothesis, i.e. that the feature of internal and external locus of control affects the attitude to property assumed the assumption that the level of intensity of this feature affects the economic activity of the entity, ie making risky decisions in the form of starting a business, identifying with owned property as well as perception of its individual forms. With reference to this hypothesis, the following detailed hypotheses were formulated. The first one assumes that people with high level of external locus of control identify more with their sense of full private ownership, the second one is that people with low level of internal locus of control rarely make risky investment decisions; and finally, the last one, that people with high level of internal locus of control, take ownership as more solid and strong, and people with a lower level of locus of control take ownership as more responsible and ambitious.

The study subjects were divided according to the level of the sense of locus of control into 3 groups by rejecting extreme quartiles, as presented in table 1.

Table 1. The numbers of particular groups due to the level of internal and external locus of control

		Frequency	Percentage	Percentage important	Cumulative percentage
Important	1.00	43	25.0	33.3	33.3
	2.00	43	25.0	33.3	66.7
	3.00	43	25.0	33.3	100.0
	Total	129	75.0	100.0	
Data missing	System missing data	43	25.0		
Total		172	100.0		

Table 2 presents data on abundance, average and standard deviation in terms of division into particular types of property.

Table 2. Numbers, averages and standard deviations in terms of division into particular types of property

	IE (quarter)	Average	Standard deviation	Numbers
private property	1.00	4.0357	.70182	44
	2.00	4.3694	.52319	32
	3.00	4.3542	.52042	41
	Total	4.2386	.61171	117
state ownership	1.00	3.3864	.91137	44
	2.00	2.8110	1.04863	32
	3.00	2.6341	.92382	41
	Total	2.9654	1.00430	117

cooperative ownership	1.00	3.3052	.80932	44
	2.00	2.9196	.77120	32
	3.00	2.8780	.77416	41
	Total	3.0501	.80514	117
municipal property	1.00	2.9924	.62079	44
	2.00	2.9524	.77627	32
	3.00	3.0708	.74025	41
	Total	3.0090	.70370	117

To verify the hypothesis that people with a high level of outer-direction are more likely to identify with their sense of full private property, the Scheffe multiple comparison test has been used.

In table 3 fragments of post hoc test results will be presented for clarity, taking into account the relevant level of significance.

Table 3. Selected fragments of Scheffe's multiple comparison test results for particular types of properties, taking into account the level of the locus of control.

Dependent variable	(I) IE (quartiles)	(J) IE (quartiles)	Medium difference (IJ)	Standard error	Significance	95% confidence interval	
						Lower limit	Upper limit
state ownership			Lower limit	Upper limit	Lower limit	Upper limit	Lower limit
	1.00	2.00	.5754 (*)	.22184	.038	.0251	1.1256
		3.00	.7522 (*)	.20727	.002	.2381	1.2663
	2.00	1.00	-.5754 (*)	.22184	.038	-1.1256	-.0251
	3.00	1.00	-.7522 (*)	.20727	.002	-1.2663	-.2381
Cooperative ownership	1.00	3.00	.4271 (*)	.17079	.048	.0035	.8508
	2.00	1.00	-.4271 (*)	.17079	.048	-.8508	-.0035

Based on the average observed.

* The difference in averages is significant at 0.05.

Based on the results of the test, we cannot confirm this hypothesis. Statistically significant differences are visible only for state and cooperative ownership.

Another hypothesis was that people with low level of internal locus of control rarely take risky investment decisions.

To verify the above-mentioned hypothesis, the respondents were divided into the selection of specific financial instruments. The selection of stock exchange products was treated as making risky decision making decisions. This shows table 4.

Table 4. Numbers, averages and standard deviation for individual groups of respondents who differ in the level of the sense of control due to the tendency to make risky allocation decisions.

	IE (quartiles)	Average	Standard deviation	Numbers
security products	1.00	2.7180	.79823	30
	2.00	3.0809	.91853	14
	3.00	2.6018	.72945	30
	Total	2.7396	.80317	74
location products	1.00	2.8250	.73666	30
	2.00	2.6442	1.03693	14
	3.00	2.7000	.86888	30
	Total	2.7401	.84402	74
fixed products	1.00	3.6146	1.04819	30
	2.00	3.8767	.65006	14
	3.00	3.9111	.78751	30
	Total	3.7844	.88214	74

Stock exchange products	1.00	3.0908	.66163	30
	2.00	2.8816	.51116	14
	3.00	3.0003	.92897	30
	Total	3.0145	.75440	74
safe products	1.00	2.2333	.84826	30
	2.00	2.3214	.57536	14
	3.00	1.9798	.63635	30
	Total	2.1472	.72529	74

In order to verify the hypothesis that people with low intensity of locus of control, rarely take investment risk decisions, the test of multiple comparisons, the Scheffe test has been used .

Unfortunately, no results not even directly related to the hypothesis were found statistically significant. There is no relationship between the level of the locus of control and the risky decisions taken.

Another hypothesis, that it assumes that people with a high internal locus of control, take ownership as more solid and strong, further that people with a lower level of internal locus of control takes ownership as more responsible and ambitious. To verify these hypotheses, the Scheffe multiple comparison test has been used.

In table 5, fragments of post hoc test results will be presented for clarity, taking into account the relevant level of significance.

Unfortunately, as it can be observed from the results in table 5, these hypotheses have not been confirmed. There are significant differences in the perception of ownership as an entrepreneurial, independent, predictable and demanding due to the intensity of the locus of control.

Table 5. Selected fragments of the results of the multiple comparisons test of Scheffe's for particular pairs of adjectives describing the property, taking into account the level of the locus of control.

Dependent variable	(I) IE (quartiles)	(J) IE (quartiles)	Medium difference (IJ)	Standard error	Significance	95% confidence interval
			Lower limit	upper limit	Lower limit	upper limit
Entrepreneurship – non-entrepreneurship	1.00	3.00	-.65357(*)	.227640	.019	-1.21914
		1.00	.65357 (*)	.227640	.019	.08800
	3.00	3.00	-.57500 (*)	.226828	.044	-1.13856
Independence – dependence	1.00	1.00	.57500 (*)	.226828	.044	.01144
		2.00	-1.25431(*)	.240455	.000	-1.85172
	3.00	3.00	-.90357 (*)	.228194	.001	-1.47052
Predictability – no predictability	1.00	1.00	1.25431 (*)	.240455	.000	.65690
		1.00	.90357 (*)	.228194	.001	.33662
	2.00	2.00	-.66379 (*)	.237944	.024	-1.25496
	3.00	1.00	.66379 (*)	.237944	.024	.07262
Demanding – undemanding	1.00	2.00	-.65431 (*)	.234000	.023	-1.23568
	2.00	1.00	.65431 (*)	.234000	.023	.07294

* The difference in averages is significant at the level of 0.05.

Based on the average observed.

INTERPRETATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE INTENSITY OF INTERNAL AND EXTRENAL LOCUS OF CONTROL AND THE ATTITUDE TO THE PROPERTY OF THE SUBJECTS

When formulating the research hypothesis, i.e. that the feature of internal and external locus of control affects the attitude to property, it was assumed that the level of intensity of this feature affects the economic activity of the entity, ie making risky decisions in the form of undertaking business activity, identifying with

owned property as well as perception of its individual forms. With reference to this hypothesis, the following detailed hypotheses were formulated. The first one assumes that people with high level of external locus of control identify more with their sense of full private ownership, the second one is that people with low level of internal locus of control rarely make risky investment decisions; and finally, the last one, that people with high level of internal locus of control, take ownership as more solid and strong, and people with a lower level of locus of control take ownership as more responsible and ambitious. These hypotheses have not been confirmed.

However, attention should be drawn to statistically significant differences in the assessment of ownership in the description of business and non- entrepreneurial couples between persons choosing security products and fixed products, in terms of independence – dependency for persons choosing security and location products, and for the pair of adjectives – predictability – unpredictability between people choosing fixed and security products, in the end there are also significant differences in the assessment of the pair requiring – not requiring between people choosing security and location products.

A study conducted by Wesołowska (2003) on the psychological inclinations of undertaking business activity allowed us to state that internal locus of control alone is not enough to start a self-employed business. To be targeted at entrepreneurship, it must be accompanied by appropriate values. In Polish conditions – just like in western countries – it is important to achieve a high material and professional position. At the same time, it was observed that in in Poland, positive attitudes towards entrepreneurship co-exist with values of harmonious development. Thus, not only financial reasons motivate you to become an entrepreneur in Poland. The people who would like to be entrepreneurs are those who, apart from being inner-directed and willing to achieve high incomes, also value values such as

their own intellectual development, having interesting work and proven friends. This is probably a manifestation of the influence of a specific canon of the values of Polish culture. In Poland, private entrepreneurship may refer to the pre-war tradition, in which an independent craftsman was a valued member of the local community. Becoming such a craftsman meant not only providing income (livelihood), but also achieving a higher social status and respect. Perhaps the combination of the possibility of achieving material successes with the chance of social advancement and individual development will in Polish conditions affect the attractiveness of being an entrepreneur.

It seems that positive attitudes towards entrepreneurship in Poland on the one hand are based on our cultural values, but they are also transgression, going beyond the dominant canon. Summarizing these studies, however, it should be noted that inner-direction can be considered a necessary and basic condition for the individual remaining unemployed to consider the possibility of becoming an entrepreneur (to make this option attractive to this person). However, when it comes to setting up a company, internal locus of control seems to be a necessary but not a sufficient condition. There are other personality traits, values and beliefs here.

Internal locus of control may also be connected with achieving material successes in entrepreneurial activity, but it was not found that it was associated with a significant satisfaction with the role of entrepreneur. This is probably the case, because people with low locus of control can realize themselves in various fields of professional activity, even very different from entrepreneurship.

It is worth mentioning here also Begann's research (Zaleski, 2003). An experiment was carried out, in which some gained a locus of control, others stole them, the assumption was that the latter should seek to regain it, by assigning more control to their possessions. It has been proved, indeed, that for this group (with deprivation of control, items especially inanimate to a greater

extent than in the first group fulfill a role that gives a locus of control). It is the inanimate objects that matter here because they can be manipulated and owned as opposed to the animated ones. In the absence of a locus of control which is considered an important dimension of personality and the concept of self, people resort to possessing things. Through them need for control is precisely realized (Heider, 1958). In this context, mentioning a positive self-image, self-assessment and social evaluation also for less positive feelings like anxiety and fear for own property, which can often be associated with envy.

The considerations of Kofta and Szustrowa (2001) over the locus of control, illusions about oneself and psychological adaptation are also important in this context. In the study, he was looking for an answer to the question whether you can assign a need for control, which determines your perception of the course of events, and what influence on behavior has the fact that you feel yourself a master. He believed that the perception of control depends on perceiving the arbitrariness of oneself behavior. Man feels the freedom of choice when he notices that he has more than one possibility of action, and he thinks that he depends on himself and on which one he will decide (Harvey, Harris, 1979; Kofta, 1979). There is a sense of self-determination with the perception of freedom of choice, and hence the conviction that one's own self is the source of thoughts, evaluations and actions (Deci, Ryan, 1985).

The researchers dealing with the perception of the dependence between actions and their consequences (Averill, 1973; Kofta, 1979; Wortman, 1975) pointed to a slightly different aspect of the subjective control. The locus of control is according to them that people perceive the connection between their actions, and their consequences (eg successes or failures). In other words, they perceive their behavior as a cause, and the considered event as a effect of this behavior.

Finally, a locus of control is closely associated with the perception of oneself self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982), that is, with man's conviction that he is able to undertake and bring about an action that would enable him to achieve an important goal. The sense of self-efficacy is nothing other than faith in oneself, in one's abilities. The measure of the effectiveness of our actions is the achievement of the desired effect, and not the assessment of the degree of dependence between the activity and its results.

Although the important differences between the perception of freedom, the dependence of results on our actions and self-efficacy are often emphasized (Averill, 1973; Bandura, 1977; Deci, Ryan, 1985; Harvey, 1976), they are intertwined with each other and partially condition each other. For example, research has found that a sense of freedom of choice promotes the perception of influence on reality and reinforces faith in one's own abilities (Harley, Harris, 1975; Jellison, Harvey, 1973; Wortman, 1975).

The sense of control comes not only from the fact that we will lead you to real changes in the world (behavioral control), but also that we are able to predict with a certain probability what the course of events will be. In the latter case, we are talking about role and cognitive accounts, because the feeling of reigning in the world comes from knowledge about reality and about ourselves, from understanding the connections between events, understanding the world of things and people around us, and the possibility of predicting events. Research indicates that cognitive control is closely related to behavioral control: one determines the other, and the psychological effects of each are in many cases similar (Averill, 1973; Glass and Singer, 1972; Schulz, 1976).

Many authors suppose that the desire to be the cause of events is an elementary motivation, equated to basic biological needs (De Charms, 1968; Deci and Ryan, 1985; White, 1959). In other words, from two possible items to choose from: the position of the change factor in the environment and the position of the pawn – man naturally adopts the first of them. Of course, it can be

influenced by overwhelming circumstances as a pawn, but he does not like this position and wants to change it to the opposite one. Justifying this kind of thesis, psychologists point to the benefits that people derive from the fact that they enjoy freedom and the ability to exert influence: such a situation allows them to adapt the nature of the action taken and the type of gratification to the current dominant need (Brehm, 1966; Kofta, 1979). In other words, having the ability to influence simply facilitates meeting needs.

Empirical studies on the preference of control shed an interesting light on the problem under consideration. The most interesting are the works of Suzanne Miller (1980). She is an advocate of the view that having the ability to control in critical situations reduces stress mainly because it provides the person with a guarantee that the danger will not exceed certain limits. It follows that in certain circumstances a person may lose the desire to exercise control. It will be when he doubts if he is able to perform appropriate security measures in a critical situation, or there is no certainty whether such action, even if it is carried out – will lead to positive effects.

As shown by Doliński Dariusz (1998), the tendency to relegate control to others also grows when the expected consequences of exercising control are morally questionable, our actions may distress somebody or even pain to other people.

In addition to the self-assessment of competence and moral consequences of our actions on other people, an important factor affecting the preference of control may be the scope of responsibility related to the social roles we undertake. The possibility of exercising control, i.e. exerting influence on the actions of others and material reality, is often associated with increased responsibility for this area. For many people, responsibility can be a significant burden, because it makes us blamed for any negative events in the “control area”, i.e. in the realm of reality entrusted to us. It may arouse fear of responsibility, consequently leading

to the fact that we prefer a social position with a smaller scope of influence, but at the same time safer, with less responsibility.

The last considerations again lead to the question whether the pursuit of perpetration is an autonomous human motivation, as some authors have thought (De Charms, 1968; Deci, Ryan, 1985; White, 1959), or is it merely an instrument for satisfying other needs? This question cannot be answered unequivocally today. There is probably a natural preference for us to exercise control; however, this preference can be significantly modified by the circumstances of the action and its social context, as well as the mental state of the individual.

Research on the perception of subjective control has yielded many interesting results. Most psychological concepts focus on the factors that reduce feeling. One of them is the reactance theory that has already been mentioned (Brehm, 1966; Wicklund, 1974). Its subject matter is the consequences of direct restriction of freedom of choice: an individual is deprived of certain possibilities of action or at least these possibilities are at risk. In contrast, the autodetermination theory (Deci, Ryan, 1985) focuses on "subtle" variations of freedom, which are rooted in essentially positive events, such as the promise of reward for doing something. This is because it makes that person stops working because something interests him, but he takes action because he expects a certain gratification for it (fortunately, rewards do not always have such an impact on us). Another, similarly acting factor is passing on a message to someone that he should act in such and no other way. Another example of a subtle factor violating the feeling of inner freedom can be our own commitment to do something, originally accepted in a completely voluntary manner, without any external pressure. However, it can clearly limit our choices in future situations.

In turn, the results of research inspired by attribution theory indicate that the sense of freedom of choice may depend on certain features of the set of decision alternatives. People feel the maxi-

imum freedom of choice when they have a moderate number of alternatives, and when these alternatives differ slightly in their attractiveness (see Harvey, 1976, Kofta, 1979). This phenomenon may result from the fact that with a significant diversification of the attractiveness of alternatives, the most promising of them is the source of a certain pressure, because it is imposed as the only reasonable option. It was also found that the very degree of attractiveness of alternatives is important: people feel more freedom of choice when making it attractive alternatives than unattractive ones (Harvey, 1976).

As far as the perception of control and own efficiency is concerned, many studies point to the decisive role of previous experiences in their formation (Bandura, 1982; Rotter, 1966). Failure – especially long-term – in exercising control in a certain realm of reality is the source of the expectations of a lack of control and (although, as we will see, people defend themselves against such a statement), while positive experiences are a source of self-confidence and promote the expectation of control. The experience of other people can also influence our sense of perpetration (Bandura, 1982). If we see that someone similar to us cannot cope with a certain task, it can lead to the expectation of a lack of control if we encounter a similar problem.

Judgements about control and effectiveness also depend, of course, on the features of the situation in which we are currently. What affects them above all is what the objective degree of interdependence between the action and its consequences is, i.e. the level of contingency (Alloy, Abramson, 1979). A very important factor is, as it turns out, the probability of success: people feel that they have a greater impact on the occurrence of positive events in situations where such events are more frequent (Jenkins, Ward, 1965).

So what are the general conclusions of psychological research on human perpetration? First of all, they clearly show that people tend to be in situations where they can choose and bring about

changes in the environment. Second, the perception of self-control is biased: people are inclined to see their own influence on the course of events even when reality denies it. Finally, the sense of control is something that contributes to the psychological adaptation of a man both in the short term (for example, it supports the maintenance of action orientation, thereby determining the intentions) and long term (for example, allows to cope with the psychological effects of chronic illness or disability). The tendency to overestimate our own control over the course of events, which we have devoted much attention to – can therefore have beneficial effects: control expectations act as self-fulfilling prophecies, leading to a real increase in influence on our fate. It is not excluded that a clear tendency to exaggerating our impact on events (especially when these are positive events) has its deep justification: it allows us people to look optimistically in the future and find in us again and again the energy that we so desperately need to overcome adversity, take up new challenges and develop.

Does this mean that a high locus of control always favors adaptation? Such an argument would be too far-reaching. More recent studies indicate that the sense of control may sometimes be unfavorable, and we should set “psychological traps” on us. As Gollwitzer notes (1996), if the overstated sense of control and unrealistic optimism accompany the performance of the action, they undoubtedly foster – as we have said – effective implementation of the decisions, perfectly raising the chance of success. If, however, such an illusion of control occurs in the decision-making phase of choosing an action, this may mean that we will select a too difficult action that exceeds our capabilities. Hurray optimism can therefore lead to painful failures. Research in the field of health psychology reveals that in certain circumstances the feeling and expectation of control may intensify suffering and worsen the psychophysical condition of patients. For example, patients with rheumatism have found that if the sense of control was accompanied by situations where the actual control options

were small, it hindered psychological adaptation to the disease (Affleck et al., 1987). Other studies (Rodin, 1986) indicate that as health problems of older people increase with age, the perception of personal control over the condition of one's own health may exacerbate stress, fears, and increase the tendency to self-blame. Thus, generalized expectations of control may become dysfunctional when a person – for various reasons – does not have objective control possibilities.

REFERENCES

- Affleck, G., Tennen, H., Pfeiffer, C., Fifeield, J. (1987). Appraisals of control and predictability in adapting to a chronic disease, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 273-279.
- Alloy, L.B., Abramson, L.Y. (1979). Judgement of contingency in depressed and nondepressed students. Sadder but wiser? *Journal of Experimental Psychology. General*, 108, 441-485.
- Averill, J. (1973). Personal control over aversive stimuli and its relationship to stress, *Psychological Bulletin*, 80, 296-303.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self – efficacy in human agency. *American Psychologist*. 37, 122-147.
- Brehm, J.W. (1966). *A theory of psychological reactance*. New York: Academic Press.
- Deci, E.L, Ryan, R.M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self determinant sof behaviour. New York: Plenum Press.
- De Charms, R. (1968). *Personal causation. The internal affective determinants of behaviour*. New York: Academic Press.
- Doliński, D. (1998). to control or not to control. W: M. Kofta, G. Weary, G. Sędek (red) *Personal control in action. Cognitive and motivational mechanisms*. New York: Plenum.
- Glass, D.C, Singer, J.E.(1972). *Urban stress*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gollwitzer, P. (1996). The volitional benefits of planning. W: P.M. Gollwitzer, J.A. Bargh (red.) *The psychology of action. Linking cognition and motivation to behaviour*. New York: Guiliford.
- Harvey, J. J.H. (1976). Attribution of freedom. W: J.H.Harvey, W.I. Ickes, R.F. Kidd (red.). *New directions in attribution research*, t.1, Hillsdale, New York: Erbaum.

- Harvey, J.H., Harris, B. (1975). Determinants of perceived choice and the relationship between perceived choice and expectancy about feelings of internal control, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 101-106.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. Hillsdale New York: Erlbaum
- Jenkins, H.W., Ward, W.C. (1965). Judgement of contingency between responses and outcomes, *Psychological Monographs*, 79/1, nr 594.
- Kofta, M. (1979). *Samokontrola a emocje*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Kofta, M., Szustrowa, T. (red) (2001). *Złudzenia, które pozwalają żyć*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Miller, S. (1980). Older people and their families, pp. 337-369 in C. Eisdorfer (ed.) *Annual Review of Gerontology and Geriatrics*. New York: Springer.
- Rodin, J. (1986). Aging and health. Effects of the sense of control, *Science*, 233, 1271-1276.
- Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80.
- Schulz, R. (1976). Effects of control and predictability on the psychological well-being of the institutionalized aged. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 33, 563-673.
- Wesołowska, E. (2003). *Psychologiczny portret prywatnego przedsiębiorcy*. Olsztyn: Wydawnictwo UW-M.
- White, R.W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered. The concept of competence. *Psychological Review*, 66, 297-333.
- Wicklund, R.A. (1974). *Freedom and Reactance*. Maryland: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wortman, C.B. (1975). Some determinants of perceived control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 282-294.
- Zaleski, Z. (2003). *Psychologia własności i prywatności*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Żak.