



W. P.: 402

Working Paper

LOCUS OF CONTROL AS A MODERATOR
OF ROLE STRESS-SATISFACTION
RELATIONSHIP

By

D.M. Pestonjee

and

U.B. Singh

W P No. 402

December 1981

The main objective of the working paper series of the IIMA is to help faculty members to test out their research findings at the pre-publication stage

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT
AHMEDABAD-380015
INDIA

LOCUS OF CONTROL AS A MODERATOR OF
ROLE STRESS-SATISFACTION RELATIONSHIP

D.M. PESTONJEE *

&

U.B. SINGH **

*Professor and Chairman, Organizational Behaviour Area, Indian Institute of Management, Vastrapur, Ahmedabad - 380 015 (India).

**Research Fellow, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi - 221 005 (India).

The authors thankfully acknowledge the help received from Professor Udai Pareek in preparation of this article. He was kind enough to go through the manuscript and provide many useful suggestions.

A B S T R A C T

Present investigation is an attempt to study the effect of locus of control on the relationship between various role stressors and satisfaction with many off-the-job and on-the-job situations. 101 executives and engineers of an electricity generating and supplying company served as the sample of this study. Various role stressors were assessed with the help of Your Feelings About Your Role Scale. Satisfaction was assessed with the help of S-D Employee's Inventory. Locus of Control was measured by Rotter's (1966) I-E Scale. Statistical analysis performed in terms of correlation coefficients, sub-group analysis, and moderated regression analysis indicate that locus of control has moderated the relationships between self-role distance and satisfaction with the job, self-role distance and satisfaction with on-the-job situations, self-role distance and satisfaction as a whole, role ambiguity and satisfaction with the job, and role isolation and personal adjustment. The implications of the above findings in the industrial/organizational contexts are also discussed.

Satisfaction in the work environment is contingent upon several on-the-job and off-the-job factors. Recent researches have tended to highlight the factor of role-stress in relation to work life of all categories of organizational role occupants. The present study attempts to determine if the role stress-satisfaction relationship is moderated by one's orientation towards causality or locus of control. Some research has already been directed to distinguish internals from externals in relation to various role stressors. Researchers have generally glossed over the problem issue of treating the locus of control as a moderating variable.

As suggested by Love and Beehr (1981) job stress research can be described as consisting of atleast the following elements : (1) stressors- job characteristics that are thought to be causal; (2) strains - poor individual health characteristics that are thought to be consequences; and (3) coping - efforts to treat the stressor-strain problems. Besides, two other elements - both potential consequences - are included sometimes : outcomes to the organization either positive or negative (Beehr and Newman, 1978) and outcomes for the individual.

Since the seminal work of Kahn et. al. (1964) the behavioural sciences approach to the job stress recorded a biased shift toward the psychological and social elements mainly in the framework of 'role theory' which assumes that the demands on an employee (the role occupant) stems from his being in a system of interlocking roles.

Pareek (1976) defines role as the position occupied by a person as defined by the expectations of significant individuals, including the role occupant. Thus, the concept of role involves several variables like the self, the other roles, as well as the expectations held by the self. It is extremely difficult to imagine situations in which there is no conflict among these variables. As a matter of fact, the very nature of the role has built-in potential for conflict or stress.

Kahn and Quinn (1970) have classified role stress in three main categories : (1) expectation generated stresses which include role conflict and role ambiguity; (2) expectation resource discrepancies which include role overload, responsibility-authority dilemma, and inadequate technical information; and (3) role and personality.

Marshall and Cooper (1979) have listed seven major sources of managerial stress : (1) Job-working conditions, overload; (2) organizational role-role ambiguity, role conflict, responsibility, others; (3) relationships at work (relationships with superiors, relationships with colleagues); (4) career development - lack of job security, status incongruity; (5) organizational structure and climate; (6) extra-organizational matters-marriage patterns, mobility etc., and (7) the individual himself - physical characteristics, behaviour patterns, etc. Pareek (1976, Note 1) has discussed role stress or

conflicts under two main categories : (i) role space stress and conflicts which include self-role distance, intra-role conflict, role stagnation, inter-role distance, and role boundness; and (ii) role set conflicts which include role ambiguity, role overload, role isolation, role erosion, and role inadequacy.

In general, although role theory framework provides a broader perspective in understanding the causes and consequences of job stress, most of the literature available on this topic has been limited to the study of role ambiguity, role conflict, role stagnation and underload-overload dimensions. There is scarcely any study available which directly deals with such stressors as self-role distance, role-role (inter-role) distance, role isolation, role inadequacy, etc. Very recently Sen (1981) has tried to deal with these aspects in relation to various strains as also with the coping styles of bank employees.

Modern theorists suggest that stress is essentially individually defined and must be understood with reference to characteristics of both the focal person and his environment, as it is the outcome of a particular combination of the two (Cooper and Marshall, 1978). This

person oriented emphasis suggests the possibility of individual differences playing an important role in reaction to stress. House (1974) observes that the "evidence that a result does not generalize across major demographic groups suggests that there are important individual (physiological and/or psychological) or social environmental variables mediating the relationships in question" (p. 24). Kahn et. al. (1964) and Lyons (1971) observed that need for clarity moderated the relationship between perceived ambiguity and job related tension. Beehr (1976) and Beehr, et. al. (1976) have also found that group cohesiveness, higher order need strengths and autonomy moderates the relationship between stressor and strain. Caplan and Jones (1975) noted the moderating effect of Type A personality on perceived work load and anxiety relationship. However, Caplan, Cobb, and French (1975) found no moderating effect of Type A personality on quantitative overload and guilt smoking.

Evidence suggests that the perception of the situation is influenced by the elements of the personal characteristics. Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975) suggested that employee's needs and values can influence their perceptions of the task and its environments. Lazarus (1966) believes that the reaction (to the stress) depends on how the person interprets or appraises (consciously or unconsciously) the significance of a harmful, threatening or challenging event and this appraisal of threat is not a simple perception of the elements

of the situation, but a judgement, an influence in which the data are assembled to a constellation of ideas and expectations. Thus, the expectancies regarding the controllability of an outcome may make a considerable difference in the way an individual will construe changes in their experience. For example, as noted by Masserman (1943), even partial control over the environment seems to encourage more adoptive behaviours in experimental animals. Staub et. al. (1971) have also reported that aversive quality of a stimulus decreased when subjects experienced control over that stimulus. Pervin (1963) observed that subjects preferred predictable, self-controlled shock administration to unpredictable experimenter controlled situations. Some investigators report that stress, as measured by physiological changes, was reduced when subjects were able to control the onset and termination of aversive stimulation (Corah & Boffa, 1970; Heggard, 1943). The above findings suggest that those who believe being the actors and in control of their own fate within limits will differ in their perception of the threatening situation than those who believe being controlled by external forces. Organ and Green (1974) using the Rotter's (1966) measure of locus of control have found that the relationship between role ambiguity and job satisfaction differs from those having beliefs in their own control of the situations (internals) to those who believe that they are controlled by some outside forces (externals). That is, locus of control seems to

moderate the relationship between role ambiguity and work satisfaction. The above discussed studies suggest that locus of control will have a moderating effect on various stress-strain relationships.

HYPOTHESES

On the basis of the above discussed literature the following two specific hypotheses were formulated.

- (i) Various role stressors will be negatively and significantly related to different aspects of satisfaction.
- (ii) The relationship between different role stressors and satisfaction dimensions will be mediated through locus of control.

METHOD

Sample :

This study was conducted in a private electricity generating and supplying company of Western India. There were 200 potential respondents in the executive cadre of the company. However, few of them could not be contacted and few of them refused to serve as the respondent of the study. A total of 150 persons were given a set of questionnaires through personal contacts. They were assured of anonymity of their responses. The filled questionnaires were also collected personally. Only 101 set of questionnaires were received which were

complete in all respects. The average age of the respondents was 39.63 (SD = 10.08) years. The average experience of this sample was 15.19 (SD = 9.94) years. The respondents of this study ranged from junior officers to the top level management. Their nature of work varied from mainly technical to purely administrative responsibilities.

Measures :

Satisfaction Measure : Satisfaction was measured with the help of Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction Employee's Inventory (S-D Employee Inventory) developed and standardized by Pestonjee (1973, Note, 2). This Inventory provides an estimate of satisfaction in four areas, namely, job, management, personal adjustment, and social relations.

Each of these areas include the following factors:

Job : Nature of work; hours of work; fellow workers; opportunities for promotion and advancement (prospects); machines and tools, etc.

Management : Supervisory treatment; participation; rewards and punishment; praise and blame; leave policy; favourism etc.

Personal Adjustment : Emotionality; health; home and living conditions; finances; relations with family members; etc.

Social Relations : Neighbours; friends and associates; attitude toward people in community; participation in social activities; sociability; caste barriers, etc.

There are 20 items in each area and thus 80 in total. Each item would be responded in terms of 'Yes' or 'No'. Job and Management areas taken together constitute on-the-job factors which measures satisfaction within the work environment. Personal Adjustment and Social Relations together constitute off-the-job factors and assess satisfaction with off-the-job situations.

The area wise split-half reliability was found to be .99 for Job, .99 for Management; .98 for personal Adjustment; and .98 for Social Relations. The construct validity was determined by using the "Known Groups" and "item-test correlation" techniques (Pestonjee, 1973). The inventory has recently been factor analysed and the factor validity found very high (Pestonjee, Note 2). The results of the factor analysis yielded a set of ten factors for on-the-job dimension of satisfaction; namely, supervisory treatment/consideration, equity (work load and pay), supportive function, interest in work, rules and regulations, intrinsic satisfaction, regard for the organization, working condition, cooperation of the co-workers, supervisory/nurturance of subordinates; and 11 factors for off-the-job dimension of satisfaction, namely, relation with family members, emotionality - neuroticism, perception of people in the society, anxiety about health, extraversion-intraversion, neighbourhood, intrapsychic factors, trust, isolation, and living condition.

Role Stress Measures :

The stress was assessed with the help of "Your Feelings About Your Role" scale constructed and standardized by Pareek (Note 1). It measures role stress of eight different types, namely, self-role distance, inter-role distance, role stagnation, role ambiguity, role overload, role isolation, role erosion, and role inadequacy. The scale has 40 items in total, each to be scored on a five point scale ranging from 0 to 4. The respondents are required to mark 0 to the items they never or scarcely agree, and 4 to those they very frequent or always agree. Each type of stress is measured by five items and the total score for a sub-scale is obtained simply by adding the scores of the concerned items. An overall stress index can be obtained by adding the scores of all the sub-scales.

A brief definition of the stressors included in this scale is summarized below on the basis of Pareek's (Note 1) descriptions :

Self-role distance: It is an outcome of the conflict between self-concept and the expectations from the role as perceived by the role occupant. For example, an introvert person, who is fond of studying and writing, may have self-role distance when he has occupied the role of a salesman in an organization and later realizes that the expectations from his role include meeting people and being social.

Inter-role distance : In actual life situation an individual occupies more than one role and there may be conflict between two roles he occupies. For example, an executive may find difficult to have enough time to meet his organizational role demands as well the demands of his wife and children to share his time. In such cases two roles are said to be in conflict producing some stress to the individual concerned.

Role ambiguity : When the individual is not clear about the various expectations people has from his role, he faces the conflict which is called 'role ambiguity'. Role ambiguity may be due to the lack of information available to the role occupant, or due to the lack of understanding of the cases available to him.

Role stagnation : As the individual grows physically, he also grows in the role he occupies in an organization. With the advancement of the individual, his role changes and with this change in role, the need for his taking new roles becomes crucial. This is the problem of role growth. This becomes acute especially when an individual has occupied a role for a long time, and he enters another role in which he may feel less secure. However, the demand for new role is for the individual to out-grow his previous role and occupy the new role effectively. This produces some stress in the individual.

Role overload : When the role occupant feels that there are too many expectations from the significant others in his role set, he experiences role overload. This also produces stress in many cases.

Role Isolation : In a role set, the role occupant may feel that certain roles are nearer to him, while some other roles are at a distance. The main criterion of role isolation is the frequency and ease of interaction with other roles. When linkages are strong, the role isolation (also called role-role distance) will be low and vice versa. The gap between the desired and existing linkages will indicate the amount of distance between the two roles, i.e., the degree of role isolation.

Role Erosion : A role occupant may feel that some functions which he may like to perform are being performed by some other roles. The stress felt may be called 'role erosion'. Role erosion is the subjective feeling of an individual that some important role expectations he has from his role do not match with the expectations other roles have for him. The role erosion is likely to be felt in an organization which is redefining its role and creating new roles.

Role Inadequacy : Role inadequacy refers to two types of feelings: (a) that the role occupant does not have adequate resources to perform the role effectively; and (b) that he is not fully equipped (lack of internal resources) for effective performance of the role.

The test-retest reliability for each type of stress was found to be .45 for self-role distance, .58 for inter-role distance, .63 for role stagnation, .65 for role ambiguity, .53 for role overload, .37 for role erosion, and .58 for role inadequacy. The overall reliability of the scale was found to be .73. Internal consistency and factor validity of the scale has also been tested and found fairly high (Pareek, Note 1).

Locus of Control Measures :

Locus of control was measured using Rotter's (1966) Internal-External Scale (I-E Scale). The scale consists of 23 forced-choice items alongwith six filler items designed to make the test purpose less obvious. The reliability and validity of the scale is well established in a number of previous researches.

Analysis

The data was analysed using Person Product Moment Correlation Coefficients, subgroup analysis method, and moderated regression analysis. For the purposes of subgroup analysis data were trichotomized on the basis of locus of control scores. Three groups, namely, internal or low scores group (LLC), the medium score group (MLC) and external or higher score group (HLC) were created on the basis of 33rd and 66th percentiles as cutpoints. In spite of usual

practice of creating only two groups (those having higher scores and those having lower scores on the classification measure) the middle group was also created in view of the criticisms voiced by White (1978) for failing to report results for the middle group of trichotomized groupings.

RESULTS

Results in the Table 1 (box formation) show that various types of role stressors are negatively and significantly related to different satisfaction measures. However, some of the correlation coefficients are not in the expected direction, i.e., they are positively related with the satisfaction measures. For example, the relationship between role isolation and social relations, role erosion and social relations, and role erosion and off-the-job satisfaction are positive. None of these correlations, however, are statistically significant and they are almost negligible. Thus they appear to be the artifact of sampling fluctuations. Further, except for self-role distance - social relations dimension ($r = -.239, p < .05$) none of the correlations between role stressors and social relations dimension were found significant. Role-isolation-off-the-job satisfaction and role erosion-overall satisfaction relationships were also found to be statistically insignificant. No significant correlations were found between locus of control and role stressors as well as satisfaction measures except

for inter-role distance dimension of the stress and personal adjustments dimension of satisfaction (Table 1).

TABLE 1 HERE

In order to test the moderating effect of locus of control on various stress-strain relationships the sample was trichotomized on locus of control scale and thus the three groups, namely, LLC, MLC, and HLC were created. LLC group represented those having internal locus of control, HLC represented those having external locus of control, and MLC represented those in between externality - inter-ality dimension of locus of control on Rotter's (1966) I-E Scale. Product moment coefficients of correlation were computed for all these three groups separately to find out the relationship between various role stressors and satisfaction dimensions. The results are given in Table 2.

TABLE 2 HERE

It is evident from Table 2 that satisfaction with the job was significantly related only with self-role distance, interrole distance, role ambiguity and role overload in the case of LLC group. In the case of externally controlled group (HLC) the relationship between various stressors and satisfaction with job was found to be significant only in the case of self-role distance, inter-role distance, role ambiguity, role isolation, and overall role stress. In the case of MLC group the

relationships turned to be significant only in the case of inter-role distance, and role overload. Apparently, it seems that MLC group is different from both LLC and HLC groups in its perception of various role stressors as a potential cause of their dissatisfaction. In order to test this hypothesis, t - ratios were computed for comparisons between LLC vs MLC, LLC vs HLC, and MLC vs HLC groups- using Fisher's ~~z~~ Transformation. Results recorded in Table 3 indicate that there ~~is~~ a significant difference between the correlation obtained between self-role distance and satisfaction with job for LLC vs MLC

TABLE 3 HERE

groups ($t = 2.70, p < .02$) and MLC vs HLC groups ($t = 2.129, p < .05$). However, no significant differences were obtained between LLC vs HLC groups. The above results indicate that locus of control is a potential moderator of the relationship between self-role distance-satisfaction with the job. Both the externals and internals being the worst affected from self-role distance. In the case of MLC's the correlation between self-role distance and satisfaction with the job tends almost to be zero (Table 2).

Locus of control also emerged as a moderator of role ambiguity-satisfaction with the job relationship. The difference between the obtained r 's for MLC and HLC groups was found to be statistically significant ($t = 2.16, p < .05$ (Table 3). The important finding

in this case is the fact that role ambiguity was significantly related to satisfaction with the job only for LLC and MLC groups (Table 2). This confirms the previous findings that the perception of any stimulus situation as stressful is dependent upon the perceiver's individual psychological build up - it is individualistic (Lazarus, 1966, 1971). None of the other relationships between satisfaction with one's job and other role stressors like inter-role distance, role stagnation, role overload, role isolation, role erosion etc., turned to be statistically significant when LLC, MLC and HLC groups were compared with each other.

From the results recorded in the Table 2 it can be seen that a significant but negative relationship existed between satisfaction with management and various role stressors like inter-role distance, role stagnation, role ambiguity, role isolation, role erosion, role inadequacy, and overall role stress for the LLC group. In the case of MLC group, self-role distance, role isolation, and overall role stress were significantly but negatively related to the satisfaction with the management. Role stagnation was found to be the only significant predictor of satisfaction with the management for the HLC group. Results recorded in Table 3 show that locus of control is not a potential moderator to the relationships between various role stressors and satisfaction with the management.

Various role stressors like role stagnation, role ambiguity, role overload, role inadequacy, and overall stress were found to be significantly related with personal adjustment dimension of satisfaction for the LLC group and the relationship was negative. A significant but negative relationship existed between role overload, role inadequacy, and overall role stress and personal adjustment for HLC group. In the case of MLC group all the role stressors were negatively and significantly related to personal adjustment except for the role erosion dimension of role stress (Table 2). When the locus of control was examined as the moderator of these relationships it merged as a potential moderator in the case of role-isolation-personal adjustment relationship. It was found that LLC group differed significantly ($t = 2.21, p < .05$). The role isolation-personal adjustment relationship was more pronounced in the case of MLC group ($p < .01$) in comparison to LLC group.

It can further be seen from Table 2 that a negative and significant relationship existed between self-role distance-social relations, role stagnation-social relations, and overall stress-social relations for LLC groups. None of the relations for MLC and HLC groups between role stressors-social relations dimension reached the level of significance except for role overload in the HLC group ($r = -.456, p < .01$). Locus of control was not found as a potential moderation of the relationship between various role stressors and social relations dimension of satisfaction.

When satisfaction with job and management was taken together to obtain a combined picture of on-the-job satisfaction, as shown in Table 2, negative and statistically significant correlations were observed with all the role stressors being considered in this investigation for the LLC group; only interrole distance, role overload, and overall stress emerged as potential predictors for MLC group; while self-role distance, role stagnation, role ambiguity, and overall stress emerged as potential predictors of on-the-job satisfaction for HLC group. Locus of control emerged as a potential moderator of self-role distance - on-the-job relationship. Significant differences were observed between the obtained correlations for LLC and MLC groups ($t = 2.571, p < .02$) and MLC vs HLC groups ($t = 2.08, p < .05$) (Table 3).

The relationship between various role stressors and off-the-job relationship (personal adjustment and social relations taken together) also differs from group to group. For example, self-role distance, role stagnation, role ambiguity, role inadequacy, and overall role stress were found to be potential stressors for LLC group; interrole distance, role inadequacy, and overall role stress were the significant predictors for MLC group. In the case of HLC only role overload emerged as a potential predictor of off-the-job relationship. None of these relationships were moderated by locus of control (Table 3).

Moderated regression analysis (Zedeck, 1971) was also performed to cross-validate the results of sub-group analysis. Significant differences between R^2 's obtained before and after adding locus of control to the regression equation were found (cf. Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1973) in the cases of role-stagnation-personal adjustment ($F = 4.056$; $df = 1, 98$; $p < .05$), role ambiguity-personal adjustment ($F = 4.976$; $df = 1, 98$; $p < .05$), role overload-personal adjustment ($F = 5.90$; $df = 1, 98$; $p < .05$), role isolation-personal adjustment ($F = 5.783$; $df = 1, 98$; $p < .05$), role erosion-personal adjustment ($F = 5.915$; $df = 1, 98$; $p < .05$) and role inadequacy-personal adjustment ($F = 7.82$; $df = 1, 98$; $p < .01$) relationships. However, no significant differences were observed in any other role stress-strain relationship when locus of control was added to the regression equation.

D I S C U S S I O N

The results of the present investigation are consistent with our assumptions regarding the relationships between various role stressors and different satisfaction dimensions. In most of the cases a negative and statistically significant relationship has been observed except for social relations dimension where only self-role distance was found to be significantly related with the social relations aspect of satisfaction.

However, the previous finding regarding the relationship between locus of control, role ambiguity (Organ and Green, 1974) and locus of control and job satisfaction (Mitchell, Smyser, and Weed, 1975; Organ and Green, 1974) were not held except for personal adjustment dimension of satisfaction. The only role-stressor which related with locus of control was inter-role distance. A significant and positive but low correlation was observed between these two variables.

Further, the results of sub-group analyses indicate that locus of control has moderated the relationships between self-role distance and satisfaction with job, self-role distance and satisfaction on-the-job (job and management as a whole), self-role distance and satisfaction as a whole, role ambiguity and satisfaction with job, and role isolation and personal adjustment. However, the results of moderated regression analysis are not consistent with the results obtained from sub-group analysis except in the case of role isolation-personal adjustment relationship. This, however, does not negate the findings of sub-group analysis. As suggested by Zedeck (1971), sub-group analysis appeared more appropriate when the proposed moderator variable discriminated among relatively discrete groups, that were not linearly related, whereas moderated regression techniques appeared more applicable when the moderator was viewed as relatively continuous.

Our findings that locus of control moderated the relationship between role ambiguity and satisfaction with the job is partially consistent with findings of Organ and Green (1974) that locus of control produces differential effect on the role ambiguity-work satisfaction relationship. In their study role ambiguity and work satisfaction were related significantly for the internal locus of control group ($r = -.29, p < .01$) but not for the external locus of control group ($r = -.19, p < .10$). This according to them, suggests that role ambiguity is aversive primarily to those who are frustrated in the active attempts to secure job-related information. However, in the present investigation a significant and negative correlation is found between role ambiguity and satisfaction with the job for both the internal (ILC) and external (ELC) groups. The reason behind Organ and Green's failure to obtain significant relationship between these variables for the external control group may lie in their neglect to consider middle group as well. As one can see in the present investigation, it is the middle group (MLC) for which no significant relationship is found between role ambiguity and satisfaction with the job ($r = -.133, p = NS$) (Table 2).

The results recorded in Table 2 indicate that the relationship between various role stress-strain combinations is somewhat different than the linear. Rotter (1966) have hypothesized that the locus of control measures should have a curvilinear relationship with assessments of maladjustment. That is, individuals who feel themselves to

be entirely at the mercy of external circumstances should be no more aberrant in their daily functioning than persons who believe that they are responsible for each and every important event that occurs throughout their lifetime. These observations become extremely meaningful in the light of the Person-Environment or P-E fit theory (Campbell, 1974; Caplan, 1972; French and Kahn, 1962; French et.al. 1974; Harrison, 1976; House, 1972; Pinneau, 1976).

According to this theory, a job is stressful to the extent that it does not provide supplies to meet the individual's motives and to the extent that the abilities of the individual fall below the demands of the job which are prerequisite to receive supplies (Harrison, 1978). Thus, an individual's experience of job stress will be reflected in the discrepancies between the individual's motives and the supplies in the job environment. Mismatch between the person and the environment can also be explained in terms of dimensions which describe job demands and the individual's abilities (French, 1971; House, 1972; Lofquist and Dawis, 1969). Fit on a demand-ability dimension may reflect the level of supplies for motives in two ways (1) when access to supplies is contingent on meeting the demand, and (2) when the demand has been internalized as a value. As listed in Harrison (1978) factors determining which type of strain(s) will result in response to P-E fit include : (1) motive(s) which are not being met; (2) genetic and social backgrounds of the individual; (3) defence and coping

predispositions of the individual; and (4) situational constraints on particular responses. These four factors presented above transform the sustained motive arousal (or tension) into specific strain responses, but do not alter the direct relationship : strain should increase as P-E fit dimensions reflect increased insufficiency of goal supplies for the motives (cf, Harrison, 1978).

Since the locus of control is assumed to be a personality variable internals and externals will vary in their dispositions with regards to defence and coping (Lefcourt & Ladwig, 1965), performance (Crandall, Katkovsky, Preston, & 1962; Dissinger, 1968; Lessing, 1969), and motivational component of performance and effort (Leid & Pritchard, 1976). Thus the same U-shaped relationship between P-E fit dimensions and strain as proposed by French et. al. (1974) and Zaplan et. al. (1975) can safely be assumed here. The complexity of the observed dimensions from the relationship between fit and strain can be explained by taking into account effects of excess supply in excess of motives strength as well. Excess of the supplies may result in no change in the level of strain, decreased strain, or increased strain, depending on the implications which excess supplies for the motives have for supplies for the other motives. The various possibilities are explained at length by Harrison (1978). However, it can be emphasized here that the P-E fit theory can account well for the explanations of the present findings.

In conclusion, the findings of this study indicate that locus of control may be an important variable in explaining a number of organizational processes. At least in the case of stressor-strain relationship, as revealed by this study, one way to reduce the strain may be to provide a better fit between the job demands and the person's physiological, psychological and social needs. For example, internals can be placed on those jobs where greater integrity and sense of responsibility is needed. At the same time, externals can be placed safely to those jobs which make lesser demands on their ability/motivation criterion.

However, the conclusions drawn from the present investigation can be viewed as only suggestive since we have not been able to control many factors which may confound the results. For example, the status and the place in the organizational hierarchy, and occupational differences may also moderate the relationship in either direction. Thus, further studies are needed in order to reach firmer conclusions.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Parcek, U. Role Stress Scales (Research Report). Ahmedabad : Indian Institute of Management, 1981.
2. Pestonjee, D.M. Development of a Psychometric Measure of Job Satisfaction (Research Report). Ahmedabad : Indian Institute of Management, 1981.

REFERENCES

- Beehr, T.A. Perceived situational moderators of the relationship between subjective role ambiguity and role strain. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61, 35-40.
- Beehr, T.A. and Newman, J.E. Role stress, employee health, and organizational effectiveness : A facet analysis, model, and literature review. Personnel Psychology, 1978, 31, 665-699.
- Beehr, T.A., Walsh, J.T., and Taber, T.D. Relationship of stress to individually and organizationally valued states : Higher order needs as a moderator. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61, 41-47.
- Campbell, D.B. A program to reduce coronary heart disease risk by altering job stresses. Dissertation Abstract International, 1974, 35, 564-B.
- Caplan, R.D. Organizational stress and individual strain : A social-psychological study of risk factors in coronary heart disease among administrators, engineers, and scientists. Dissertation Abstract International, 1972, 32, 6706B-6707B.

- Caplan, R.D., Cobb, S. and French, J.R. Relationship of cessation of smoking with job stress, personality and social support. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 211-219.
- Caplan, R.D., Cobbs, S., French, J.R.P., Jr., Harrison, R.V. and Pinneau, S.R., Jr., Job demands and worker health : Main effects and occupational differences. Washington, D.C. : U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.
- Cooper, C.L. and Marshall, J. Understanding executive stress. London : Mac Millan Press, 1978.
- Corah, J.L. and Boffa, J. Perceived control, self-observation and response to aversive stimulation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16, 1-14.
- Crandall, V.J., Katkovsky, W. and Preston, A. Motivational and ability determinants of young children's intellectual academic achievement situations. Child Development, 1962, 33, 643-661.
- Dissinger, J.K. Locus of Control in achievement : Measurement and Empirical Assessment. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Purdue University, 1968.
- French, J.R.P., Jr., Assessment of research on integration-disintegration. In B.H. Kaplan (Ed.) Psychiatric disorder and the urban environment: Report of the Cornell Social Seminar. New York : Behavioural Publications, 1971.
- French, J.R.P. and Kahn, R.L. A programatic approach to studying the industrial environment and mental health. Journal of Social Issues, 1962, 18, 1-47.

- French, J.R.P., Jr., Rogers, W., and Cobb, S. A model of person-environment fit. In G.V. Coelho, D.A. Hambury, and J.E. Adams (Ed.), Coping and adaptation. New York : Basic Books, 1974.
- Harrison, R.V. Job demands and worker health: Person-environment misfit. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 10358
- Harrison, R.V. Person-environment fit and job stress. In C.L. Cooper and R. Payne (Eds.) Stress at work. New York : John Wiley and Sons, 1978.
- Heggard, E.A. Experimental studies in affective processes. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1943, 33, 257-284.
- House, J.S. The relationship of intrinsic and extrinsic work motivations to occupational stress and coronary heart disease risk. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 2514-A.
- House, J.S. Occupational stress and coronary heart disease : A review and the theoretical integration. Journal of Health and Social Behaviour, 1974, 15, 12-27.
- Kahn, R.L. and Quinn, R.P. Role stress : A framework for analysis. In A. McLean (Ed.) : Occupational mental health. New York : Rand McNally, 1970.
- Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R.P., Snoek, D., Jr., and Rosenthal, R.A. Organizational Stress : Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. New York : Wiley, 1964.

- Kerlinger, F.N. and Pedhazur, E.J. Multiple regression in behavioral research. New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.
- Lazarus, R.S. Psychological stress and the coping process. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Lazarus, R.S. The concept of stress and disease. In L. Levic (Ed.) Society, stress and disease (Vol. 1). London : Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Lefcourt, H.M. and Ladwig, G.W. The American Negro : A problem in expectancies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 377-380.
- Lied, T.R. and Pritchard, R.D. Relationships between personality variables and components of the expectancy-valence model. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61, 463-467.
- Lessing, E.S. Racial differences in indices of ego functioning relevant to academic achievement. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1969, 115, 153-167.
- Love, K.G. and Beehr, T.A. Social stressors on the job : Recommendations for a broadened perspective. Group and Organization Studies, 1981, 6, 190-200.
- Lofquist, L.H. and Dawis, R.V. Adjustment to work. New York : Appeltion-Century-Crofts, 1969.

- Lyons, T.F. Role clarity, need for clarity, satisfaction, tension, and withdrawal. Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance, 1971, 16, 99-110.
- Marshall, J. and Cooper, C.L. Executives under pressure. London : Mac Millan Press, 1979.
- Masserman, J.H. Behaviour and neurosis. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1943.
- Mitchell, T.R., Smyser, C.M. and Weed, S.E. Locus of Control : Supervision and work satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 1975, 18, 623-631.
- Organ, D.W. & Green, C.N. Role ambiguity, locus of control, and work satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 101-102.
- Pareek, U. Inter-role explorations. In J.W. Pfeiffer and J.E. Jones (Ed.) The 1976 annual handbook for group facilitators. LaJolla, California : University Associates, 1976.
- Pestonjee, D.M. Organizational Structures and Job Attitudes, Calcutta : Minerva, 1973.
- Pinneau, S.R., Jr., Effects of social support on psychological and physiological strains. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36, 5359B.
- Porter, L.W., Lawler, E.E., III, and Hackman, J.R. Behaviour in organizations. New York : McGraw-Hill, 1975.

- Rotter, J.B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 20 (Whole No. 609).
- Sen, P.C. Personal and organizational correlations of role stress and coping strategies in some public sector banks. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Gujarat University, Ahmedabad, 1981.
- Staub, E., Tursky, B., and Schwartz, G.E. Self-control and predictability: Their effects on reaction to aversive stimulation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 18, 157-162.
- White, J.K. Individual differences and the job quality-worker response relationship : Review, integration, and comments. Academy of Management Review, 1978, 3, 267-280.
- Zedeck, S. Problems with the use of "moderator" variables. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 76, 295-310.

TABLE - 1
CORRELATIONS AMONG ROLE STRESSORS, SATISFACTIONS, AND LOCUS OF CONTROL
(N = 101)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
ROLE STRESSORS																	
1. Self Role Distance	X	.101	.484**	.420**	.642**	.351**	.274**	.444**	.625**	-.437**	-.272**	-.346**	-.235	-.406**	-.349**	-.436**	.294**
2. Interrole Distance		X	.215	.342**	.329**	.240	.065	.283**	.507**	-.479**	-.317**	-.367**	-.147	-.456**	-.308**	-.450**	.185
3. Role Stagnation			X	.393**	.303**	.432**	.495**	.466**	.696**	-.265**	-.365**	-.323**	-.111	-.360**	-.260**	-.363**	.168
4. Role Ambiguity				X	.602**	.625**	.365**	.618**	.794**	-.369**	-.299**	-.384**	-.052	-.382**	-.262**	-.380**	.100
5. Role Overload					X	.418**	.163	.471**	.684**	-.346**	-.257**	-.434**	-.195	-.345**	-.376**	-.408**	.060
6. Role Isolation						X	.531**	.511**	.748**	-.280**	-.347**	-.272**	+0.011	-.358**	-.157	-.314**	.050
7. Role Erosion							X	.405**	.601**	-.129	-.274**	-.096	+0.166	-.229	+0.040	-.135	.030
8. Role Inadequacy								X	.760**	-.241	-.240	-.454**	-.136	-.275**	-.355**	-.351**	-.004
9. Role Stress (Overall)									X	-.469**	-.439**	-.498**	-.140	-.519**	-.382**	-.528**	.156
SATISFACTION																	
10. Job Area										X	.530**	.368**	.324**	.877**	.412**	.781**	-.047
11. Management											X	.451**	.391**	.873**	.501**	.821**	-.177
12. Personal Adjustment												X	.411**	.467**	.844**	.711**	-.240
13. Social Relations													X	.408**	.835**	.667**	.007
14. On-The-Job Satisfaction														X	.522**	.916**	-.128
15. Off-The-Job Satisfaction															X	.820**	-.141
16. Overall Satisfaction																X	-.152
17. Locus of Control																	

* P < .05

** P < .01

TABLE - 2

LOCUS OF CONTROL AS A MODERATOR OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ROLE STRESS AND SATISFACTION (SUB-GROUP ANALYSIS)

	CORRELATIONS WITH JOB SATISFACTION																				
	JOB AREA			MANAGEMENT AREA			PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT AREA			SOCIAL RELATIONS AREA			ON THE JOB SATISFACTION			OFF THE JOB SATISFACTION			OVERALL SATISFACTION		
	LLC	MLC	HLC	LLC	MLC	HLC	LLC	MLC	HLC	LLC	MLC	HLC	LLC	MLC	HLC	LLC	MLC	HLC	LLC	MLC	HLC
SELF ROLE DISTANCE	-.639**	-.099	-.548*	-.283	-.003	-.318	-.253	-.401*	-.115	-.463**	-.183	-.201	-.587*	-.053	-.506**	-.466**	-.338	-.183	-.632**	-.180	-.450**
INTER ROLE DISTANCE	-.479**	-.550**	-.390*	-.362*	-.450**	-.203	-.238	-.401*	-.343	-.146	-.213	-.045	-.529**	-.534**	-.227	-.208	-.377*	-.246	-.461**	-.510**	-.285
ROLE STAGNATION	-.325	-.139	-.286	-.356*	-.267	-.395*	-.388*	-.371*	-.124	-.374*	-.043	-.115	-.424*	-.220	-.386*	-.427*	-.255	-.019	-.509**	-.253	-.282
ROLE AMBIGUITY	-.362*	-.133	-.575**	-.444**	-.202	-.180	-.36**	-.390*	-.319	-.197	-.127	-.064	-.501**	-.181	-.449**	-.328*	-.163	-.241	-.509**	-.188	-.349*
ROLE OVERLOAD	-.356*	-.365*	-.333	-.254	-.310	-.202	-.377*	-.529**	-.442**	-.220	-.023	-.466**	-.384*	-.361*	-.312	-.328	-.312	-.536**	-.425*	-.370*	-.492**
ROLE ISOLATION	-.270	-.139	-.377*	-.436**	-.361*	-.212	-.065	-.525**	-.143	-.109	-.231	-.091	-.435**	-.273	-.344*	-.101	-.193	-.141	-.343*	-.261	-.315
ROLE EROSION	-.189	-.013	-.132	-.377*	-.208	-.216	-.142	-.181	-.091	-.122	-.306	+.307	-.347*	-.123	-.191	-.146	-.075	-.222	-.308	-.047	-.022
ROLE INADEQUACY	-.302	-.188	-.196	-.452**	-.145	-.097	-.302**	-.535*	-.418*	-.241	-.088	-.058	-.466**	-.178	-.173	-.398*	-.384*	-.302	-.517**	-.282	-.275
OVERALL ROLE STRESS	-.497**	-.333	-.531**	-.524**	-.387*	-.308	-.343**	-.615**	-.355*	-.338*	-.019	-.097	-.638**	-.387*	-.491**	-.431*	-.368*	-.283	-.647**	-.411*	-.490**

LLC = Low Score Group on Locus of Control Dimension (Internals).

MLC = Medium Score Group on Locus of Control Dimension.

HLC = High Score Group on Locus of Control Dimension (External).

Note: For LLC, n = 35; for MLC, n = 33; for HLC, n = 33

* P < .05

**p < .01

TABLE - 3

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CORRELATIONS
 BETWEEN ROLE STRESSORS AND SATISFACTION FOR
 LLC Vs MLC, LLC Vs HLC, and MLC Vs HLC

ROLE STRESSORS	SATISFACTION																				
	JOB AREA			MANAGEMENT AREA			PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT			SOCIAL RELATIONS			ON THE JOB SATISFACTION			OFF THE JOB SATISFACTION			OVERALL SATISFACTION		
	LLC	LLC	MLC	LLC	LLC	MLC	LLC	LLC	MLC	LLC	LLC	MLC	LLC	LLC	MLC	LLC	LLC	MLC	LLC	LLC	MLC
	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs	Vs
MLC	HLC	HLC	MLC	HLC	HLC	MLC	HLC	HLC	MLC	HLC	HLC	MLC	HLC	HLC	MLC	HLC	HLC	MLC	HLC	HLC	
SELF ROLE DISTANCE	2.70***	.327	2.122**	1.171	.163	1.335	.653	.245	1.224	1.306	1.224	.082	2.571***	.490	2.08**	.653	1.347	.694	2.286**	1.061	1.224
INTER ROLE DISTANCE	0.408	.449	.857	.408	.735	1.14	.735	.449	.286	.245	.408	.653	0.000	1.469	1.469	.694	.122	.571	.245	.316	1.061
ROLE STAGNATION	0.813	.163	.653	.408	.163	.57	.082	1.183	1.102	1.429	1.102	.327	.92	.163	.776	.571	1.592	1.020	1.184	1.061	.122
ROLE AMBIGUITY	1.020	1.143	2.16**	1.102	1.510	.4	.245	.571	.326	.286	.571	.286	1.510	.286	1.224	1.306	.980	.327	1.510	.776	.735
ROLE OVERLOAD	.041	.163	.204	.245	.245	.49	.776	.286	.490	.857	1.143	2.00*	.082	.327	.245	0.000	1.143	1.143	.286	.327	.612
ROLE ISOLATION	0.571	.490	1.061	.367	1.061	.69	2.21**	.286	1.837*	.484	.082	.571	.776	.489	.286	.653	.851	.204	.327	.082	.245
ROLE EROSION	0.722	.245	.490	.776	.775	.04	.163	.204	.367	.816	.816	0.000	.939	.653	.286	.490	.122	.612	1.102	1.224	.122
ROLE INADEQUACY	0.490	.449	.041	1.347	1.551	.20	.204	.32	.612	.612	.735	.122	1.592	1.388	.041	.939	.571	.367	1.184	1.184	0.000
ROLE STRESS (OVERALL)	0.857	.163	1.020	.694	1.061	.367	.480	.367	1.347	1.347	1.020	.327	1.429	.898	.531	.61	1.020	.408	1.388	.980	.408

* P < .10
 ** P < .05
 *** P < .02