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The relationship among locus of control, role con-
flict, role ambiguity and job satisfaction were examined
for chief housing officers of member institutions of the
Association of College and University Housing Officers-
International with a resident population of under 1,000.

The literature review revealed that high levels
of role conflict and ambiguity are related to low levels
of job satisfaction and that locus of control affects
perceived role conflict, role ambiguity and job satis-
faction. Internals (those who believe their fate is
controlled by themselves) experience less role conflict
and ambiguity and more job satisfaction then do externals
(those who believe their fate is controlled by factors
external to themselves). However, empirical evidence
of the relationships among locus of control, role variables
and job satisfaction has been inconsistent.

The relationship among these variables was further
examined using Rotter's Locus of Control Scale, the Role
Conflict and Ambiguity Scale and the Job Description Index.
The investigator's Personal Data Questionnaire was used

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
to gather personal and job-related information from the 104 of the 184 eligible participants who responded.

Seven hypotheses were formulated to examine the relationships among the variable. They examined 1) the influence of locus of control belief on perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction 2) differences between the effects of locus of control belief and role variables on perceived job satisfaction and 3) the effects of locus of control belief and role variables on perceived job satisfaction.

No statistically significant differences were found between locus of control and perceived role conflict or role ambiguity. A significant difference was found between locus of control and perceived job satisfaction. Significant differences were found between job satisfaction and both role conflict and role ambiguity. Role ambiguity accounted for more of the explained variance in job satisfaction than did role conflict or locus of control.
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CHAPTER 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

In recent years it has become apparent that organizations play a major role in shaping the lives of individuals as well as societies (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal, 1964). In effect, the behavior of the individual can thus be viewed within the context of both organizational memberships and role expectations. Each can have a direct impact upon the individual's emotional and physical state. While the resulting interdependence has been mutually rewarding, the exchange has been costly. In submitting to the demands of organizational expectations, the individual ensures personal, economic and physical survival but, simultaneously, may experience negative role-related effects in the form of role conflict and role ambiguity (Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman, 1970).

Institutions of higher education, universities and colleges, are not fundamentally different from other social organizations. Being purposeful in nature, a high degree of conformity is expected of institutional members. Once assigned an institutional role, the member is expected to perform that role consistently and dependably. According to
Kahn et al. (1964), one of the inherent needs of any organization is dependability of role performance with each member doing assigned tasks. This pervasive influence over member behavior is well documented (Penny, 1972). Also like other organizations, universities and colleges maintain hierarchies of authority and control over member's behavior, ensuring that organizational expectations are maintained through a system of rules, regulations, and procedures. Stroup (1966) informs us that organizational hierarchies are designed to ensure that organizational purposes and goals are fulfilled.

College student personnel services are an integral part of all institutions of higher education (Packwood, 1977). However, it has been suggested that the student personnel worker has not been able to establish a position among the dominant power centers of faculty, administration, and students (Penny, 1972). Services offered are generally guided by the student personnel point of view as expressed by E.G. Williamson's committee in 1949 (American Council of Educational Studies). Therefore, traditional student personnel services such as counseling, student activities, and housing are based on the assumptions that students have individual differences, that each is a functioning whole, and that students should be met at their particular point of development (Wrenn, 1951).

Student personnel services are influenced by the unique characteristics of each institution. As might be expected, services vary from institution to institution.
Salmén (1971) in his detailed description of administrative duties in higher education mentions fifty various duties. Although it is unlikely that any educational institution has all the officers whose duties are described, most colleges and universities carry out the functions described by Salmén. Housing or residential services is one of those functions. Several writers have stressed that residential programs be considered as one sub-system of the larger educational organization and, therefore, should be planned and organized to support the institutional and educational programs of the college (Riker, 1956; Williamson, 1958; Fairfield, 1961, 1963; Clark, 1970).

It is the primary task of the chief housing officer, a student personnel professional, to bring about this outcome. As a member of the institutional organization, the chief housing officer assumes direct responsibility for college and university housing (Association of College and University Housing Officers - International (ACUHO-I), 1982). This person is expected to provide dynamic leadership and not merely react to the organizational environment. In light of the complexity of the chief housing officer's position, Brown (1974) suggests that the person be a social engineer or behavioral scientist. Among the various duties of the chief housing officer is a responsibility for housing operations such as administration, educational programming, and food service. Concurrently, there exists a responsibility both to the students using housing facilities.
and the institution that provides those facilities. Other roles of the chief housing officer include an understanding of the educational goals of the institution and operationalizing these goals in daily functions.

House (1970) states that individuals in organizations are continually exposed to a variety of expectations from their work environment that may affect the perceptions of their organizational roles. In fulfilling an organizational function, the chief housing officer assumes several roles while relating to the various constituencies that include students, faculty, other administrators, and often the general public. As a professional, the chief housing officer is expected to act with integrity and dignity, while striving for competence and avoiding conflict between personal interests and the interests of the organization (ACUHO-I, 1982).

In assessing the chief housing officer's position within the educational environment, clearly a relationship of mutual dependence exists between the position and the institution. Because of the nature of interdependent relationships between individuals and organizations increased attention has been given to the study of organizational role dynamics (Kahn et al., 1964) and the effects of personal beliefs in internal versus external locus of control (Rotter, 1966). Research efforts on these two topics generally have emphasized 1) the relative importance of perceived role ambiguity versus perceived role conflict in explaining job...
satisfaction and 2) the interrelationships among locus of control as a personality variable, perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction (Szilagyi, Sims, and Keller, 1976). These efforts have produced evidence that there are significant relationships among an individual's belief in either an internal or external locus of control, role perceptions, and job satisfaction. However, varying results and inconclusive evidence suggest that these relationships need further study (Korman, 1971; Organ and Green, 1974).

Therefore, the argument can be advanced that the chief housing officer's perceptions of role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction are influenced by a belief in either an internal or external locus of control. In a review of related literature no study was found by this researcher that attempted to investigate these relationships relative to the chief housing officer.

Statement of the problem

The basic problem of this research is to ascertain the nature and extent of the relationships among chief housing officers' personal beliefs in internal or external locus of control, perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction.

In seeking to understand the relationships among these variables, this researcher investigated the influence of a locus of control belief on perceived role conflict,
role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. Subjects with high role conflict and ambiguity scores were compared to subjects with low role conflict and ambiguity scores, respectively, on perceived job satisfaction. The job satisfaction variance accounted for by locus of control belief, role conflict, and role ambiguity was determined. Finally, the relative influence of locus of control, role conflict, and role ambiguity on job satisfaction was predicted.

The central problems for this research then were: What is the influence of a belief in either an internal or external locus of control on perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction? Which variable, locus of control, role conflict or role ambiguity makes the greatest contribution to the variance in job satisfaction? Which variable, locus of control, role conflict, or role ambiguity serves as the better predictor of job satisfaction?

Significance of the Study

Although there is a great deal of empirical research that has investigated personality variables such as a personal belief in internal versus external locus of control, role perceptions, and job satisfaction in industrial or business settings, there is a paucity of such research being conducted in settings of higher education. A review of related literature failed to disclose any previous studies involving these variables as related to the chief housing officer. This study is an attempt to investigate the
relationships among previously mentioned variables with this segment of the higher education work force.

Previous research efforts involving the relationships among the locus of control variable, role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction have produced conflicting results. While the research has indicated that personal beliefs in internal versus external control, role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction are related, the nature and extent of these relationships are still the subject of discussion. For example, several researchers have found that role ambiguity is more related to job satisfaction than is role conflict (Rizzo et al., 1970; House and Rizzo, 1972). At least one researcher has postulated just the opposite: role ambiguity is not significantly related to job satisfaction (Tosi, 1971). Still, others have found that locus of control makes a greater contribution to job satisfaction than does role ambiguity (Organ and Green, 1974). And finally, Szilagyi et al. (1976) have proposed that role ambiguity explains more variance in job satisfaction than does locus of control and that the differential effects of role conflict and role ambiguity depends, to some extent, on occupational level.

It is anticipated that this study will help to further explicate the relationships among the locus of control variable, role variables, and job satisfaction. If this desired outcome should be obtained, then, additional information will be provided for the understanding of the
impact of organizations upon individuals.

Limitations of the Study

This study has several limitations including: difficulties in sampling, instrumentation, data collection, accuracy in perceptions of respondents, and the existence of causality.

The sample for this research consisted of chief housing officers of the Association of College and University Housing Officers - International (ACUHO-I) member institutions with a residence hall capacity of 1,000 or fewer residents. Using this category of ACUHO-I member institutions was an attempt by the researcher to ensure similarity among sample institutions and to ensure similarity of perceived experiences of sample respondents. However, this sample is relatively small. Therefore, the generalization of the results of the study may be limited.

Self-report instruments were used in the study. Therefore, the accuracy of the perceptions and responses of the subjects may be another limitation. The research instruments were mailed to subjects. As suggested by Kerlinger (1964), the utilization of mailed instruments is a limitation because it does not provide the researcher with the opportunity to check the veracity of the responses. Also, with the use of mailed instruments, there was no way to determine if subjects who returned the instruments were different from those who did not return.
the instruments. Finally, the existence of statistically significant relationships and differences did not in any way imply causality.

Summary

This chapter established the premise that much can be learned about the individual as well as society through an examination of the effects of personal membership within an organization. Systematic study of these effects has generated empirical evidence that significant relationships exist among the individual's perception of role conflict and ambiguity within the organization, a personal belief in either internal or external locus of control, and perceived job satisfaction. The research at hand will further examine these relationships for chief housing officers.

The significance of this study along with its limitations were presented. The next chapter will examine the literature relevant to the problem.
CHAPTER 11

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This study investigated the nature and extent of the relationships among chief housing officers' personal belief in internal or external locus of control, perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. Role theory has expounded the relevance of role stress in the form of conflict and ambiguity as key factors in member satisfaction and the successful or unsuccessful operation of the organization. Several studies, relying upon role theory and social learning theory, have demonstrated significant relationships among the constructs locus of control, role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. In viewing institutions of higher education as social organizations and applying role theory and social learning theory concepts, important contributions can be made to the study of organizational dynamics and management practices within such institutions.

This review presents research on role conflict and role ambiguity within organizations, investigations of a personal belief in internal versus external locus of control as a mediating variable of interpersonal and organizational
dynamics, and studies that combine role theory and the locus of control construct. Also, the Student Personnel profession in general and the role of the chief housing officer in particular will be discussed.

**Role Theory**

All social systems, including work organizations, consist, in part, of the activities of a number of individuals that are complementary and interdependent. Kahn et al. (1964), following this line of reasoning, developed a theory of role dynamics which focused on the impact of an organization upon the individual through the existence of organizational stress resulting from conflicting, incompatible and/or vague expectations. The authors theorized that conflicting, incompatible and/or vague expectations resulting from the work environment produced organizational stress which translated into role stress for the individual. Two main types of stress were defined: role conflict and role ambiguity. The authors stated that when the behaviors expected of an individual are inconsistent, a state of role conflict will exist and stress and dissatisfaction will be experienced. Subsequent performance will be less effective than if the expectations imposed did not conflict.

It was also stated that a lack of necessary information available to a particular organizational position will create role ambiguity for the person holding that position. In effect, this will cause unclear expectations and the use
of inappropriate coping mechanisms. Role ambiguity also increases the likelihood that the individual will be dissatisfied with the role, will experience anxiety, and subsequently, will perform less effectively (House and Rizzo, 1972).

Role conflict and role ambiguity as theoretical constructs are also supported by a growing body of empirical research. Kahn et al. (1964) conducted two separate studies; one, an extensive series of case studies involving 53 selected individuals in business and industry, the second, consisted of a national sample of 725 persons representing the labor force of 1961. The results indicated that high levels of role conflict and role ambiguity were both related to low levels of job satisfaction, low confidence in the organization, and high degrees of job-related tension. Rizzo et al. (1970), in a study of managerial and technical employees in industry, found strong negative relationships among role ambiguity, role conflict, and measures of job satisfaction. However, role ambiguity was found to be more strongly related to job satisfaction than was role conflict. Recognizing that role conflict and role ambiguity are important intervening variables which influence organizational and individual practices and outcomes, they developed and validated the measurement of these constructs against measures of organizational and management practices, leadership behavior, satisfaction, anxiety, propensity to leave the job and demographic variables. Factor
analysis revealed two factors corresponding to role conflict and role ambiguity, thus supporting the separation of the two constructs. Item analysis of the original questionnaire led to the development of a fourteen item instrument containing questions which, independently, measure role conflict and role ambiguity (Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale, 1970). A later study by House and Rizzo (1972) confirmed their earlier conclusion that role ambiguity was more strongly related to job satisfaction than was role conflict.

Tosi (1971) examined several aspects of role theory and the role-taking model proposed by Kahn and his associates. He collected data from 488 managers of consumer loan offices of a large, geographically dispersed finance organization. His results, in general, supported Kahn's et al. (1964) research. Using correlational analysis, Tosi found that higher levels of role conflict resulted in lower job satisfaction. However, contrary to the Kahn et al. and the Rizzo et al. (1970, 1972) findings, role ambiguity was not found to be significantly related to job satisfaction.

Similarly, Keller (1975), using 88 professional employees of an applied science department in a large government research organization, examined the relationships among role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. Performing correlational analysis with five dimensions of job satisfaction as measured by the Job Description Index (JDI) developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), he concluded that role conflict and ambiguity were both associ-
iated with low levels of job satisfaction. Unlike the
House and Rizzo (1972) findings however, role ambiguity was
not found to be a more powerful variable on job satisfaction
than was role conflict. Instead, role conflict and role
ambiguity were both associated with different dimensions of
job satisfaction as measured by the JDI scale. Keller
found that role ambiguity had a highly significant, negative,
relationship with low levels of satisfaction on the intrinsic
dimension of the work itself as measured by the Work sub-
scale of the JDI. Conversely, role conflict was not found
to be significantly related to the Work sub-scale, but was
found to be significantly, negatively, related to lower
levels of satisfaction on extrinsic dimensions as measured
by the Supervision, Pay, and Opportunities For Promotion
sub-scales of the JDI. Keller's results indicated that
conflicting role expectations were related to extrinsic job
satisfaction factors, while ambiguous role expectations
were related to intrinsic job satisfaction factors. He
concluded that the relationships between job satisfaction
and role conflict and ambiguity are better understood when
satisfaction is viewed and measured as a multidimensional
variable.

Liphan (1962) has suggested that all roles in complex
organizations are subject to many sources and types of con-
flicts and, therefore, other factors may be of importance.
In addition to the belief in individual internal versus ex-
ternal locus of control, occupational level has been postu-
lated as a moderating variable of role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction by several writers (House, 1971; Hammer and Tosi, 1974; House and Rizzo, 1972; Szilagyi et al., 1976). The results of these studies tended to indicate that at higher occupational levels, where it was common to experience lack of job clarity and ill-defined expectations and responsibilities, role ambiguity explained more job satisfaction variance than did role conflict; while at lower occupational levels, where expectations and responsibilities are usually well-defined, role conflict explained more job satisfaction variance than did role ambiguity.

In still another avenue of investigation, Schuler (1977) examined the relationships between role variables and employee satisfaction and performance moderated by employee ability. Employee ability was hypothesized to reduce the negative relationships between role perceptions and satisfaction and performance. The results generally failed to support the hypothesized relationships. However, it was found that employees with high ability were less affected by role ambiguity than employees with low ability.

While it is true that the research under review tended to associate both role conflict and role ambiguity with low job satisfaction and dysfunctional behavior, the relative importance of each construct in explaining job satisfaction variance is still unclear (Keller, 1975).

**Locus of Control**

Szilagyi et al. (1976) stated that the study of
organizational role dynamics has been furthered through the investigation of role-related and other types of instrumental information relating to the belief system of the individual. While postulating the theoretical basis for role theory, Kahn et al. (1964) also emphasized the importance of individual response to perceived conflict and ambiguity. Subsequent research efforts have, in fact, demonstrated significant relationships between an individual's role perceptions and his general belief system (Korman, 1971; Organ and Green, 1974; Szilagyi et al., 1976). An individual's belief that he has control over the outcome of his behavior can, therefore, add to the understanding of role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction.

Rotter (1966) has described this concept of control over behavior as internal versus external locus of control. He states that:

Where a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own, but not being entirely contingent upon his action, then, in our culture, it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance, fate, as under the control of powerful others, or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him. When the event is interpreted in this way by an individual, we labeled this a belief in external control. If the person perceives the event as contingent upon his own behavior or his own relatively permanent characteristics, we have termed this a belief in internal control (1966).

Rotter hypothesized that internal versus external locus of control is of major importance in understanding the nature of learning processes in different kinds of learning situations and that consistent individual differences exist among
Individuals in the degree to which they are likely to attribute personal control to reward in the same situations.

Social learning theory (Rotter, 1954, 1955, 1960) provides the theoretical basis for the nature and effects of reinforcements. This theory postulates that a reinforcement serves to strengthen the expectation that a particular event will be followed by that reinforcement in the future. Once the expectation is developed, the failure of the reinforcement to occur will result in the reduction or elimination of the behavior. As a person develops, he or she will differentiate events which are causally related to preceding ones and those which are not. Therefore, when the reinforcement is viewed as contingent upon the individual's behavior, its occurrence will increase the expectation more than when it is non-contingent.

According to Rotter, expectancies generalize from a specific situation to a series of situations which are perceived as related or similar. Consequently, a generalized expectancy for a class of related events has functional properties that make up an important aspect of personality description. A generalized expectancy or belief regarding the causal relationship between behavior and its consequences may affect a variety of behavioral choices in a broad context of life situations.

Rotter (1966) cites references to a number of variables which have relationships to internal-external control. Merton (1946) described the belief in fate as more or less
a defensive behavior which maintained self-esteem in the face of failure. The concept of alienation (Seeman, 1959), especially as it has come to mean powerlessness, bears some relationship to the internal-external control construct. The concept that has received the most attention is that of need for achievement. McClellan, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell (1953) suggested that people with high achievement needs are likely to have strong beliefs in their ability to determine the outcome of their efforts. Seeman and Evans (1962) conducted a study to measure the attempts of people to control their environment in important life situations. In an investigation of the behavior of patients in a tuberculosis ward, they found that internals knew more about their conditions and expressed less satisfaction with answers given them concerning their conditions than did externals.

More recently, studies investigating the internal-external control construct in relationship to work related variables have increased. Summarizing the results of these studies, it can be said that internals, to a greater extent than externals, tend to be better informed about the knowledge required as well as the nature and demands of their work. Internals believe that they have more control over benefits, achievements, and accomplishments than do externals. Internals report greater satisfaction with work, perceive higher performance-to-reward expectancies, and report higher motivation than do externals. Internals also perceive and respond to environmental contingencies more consistently.
and perform at higher levels in incongruent, stressful situations than do externals (McDonald, 1974; Valencha, 1972; Organ and Green, 1974; Szilagyi and Sim, 1975; Lawler, 1971; Evans, 1974; Houston, 1972, respectively).

In summary, these studies support Rotter's (1966) hypothesis that the individual who has a strong belief of personal control over destiny is likely to be more alert to certain aspects of the work environment and to take advantage of those aspects which provide useful information for successful functioning.

Role Theory, Locus of Control, and Job Satisfaction

Kahn et al. (1964) anticipated possible relationships between the belief system of the individual and role theory when they observed that objective ambiguity is derived from the environment, whereas subjective ambiguity is derived from the individual. It has subsequently been found that role ambiguity is negatively related to the variable job satisfaction (Rizzo et al., 1970; House and Rizzo, 1972).

Organ and Green (1974) provided the evidence for an empirical link among the variables locus of control, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. These researchers investigated the hypothesis that the possession of job-related information and the perception of role ambiguity were related more strongly to the belief system of the individual, rather than to the specific environmental contingencies. A sample of 94 scientists and engineers responded to questionnaires...
consisting of Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale, a measure of role ambiguity, and two measures of job satisfaction. Of the two job satisfaction measures, one was concerned with actual job content, and was labeled "work satisfaction"; the other measure was concerned with satisfaction with the organization and its management. This measure was labeled "general job satisfaction".

Results indicated that locus of control was related to both role ambiguity and job satisfaction. Locus of control, however, provided a greater independent contribution to satisfaction than did role ambiguity. The writers suggested that it was possible that role ambiguity may have elicited negative attitudes specific to the task and work behavior, but did not generalize to the subjects' general attitude concerning the organization. Also, it appeared that the correlation between role ambiguity and work satisfaction was significant only for those subjects scoring in the direction of internal locus of control. Organ and Green concluded that role ambiguity may have been aversive, primarily to those who were frustrated in active attempts to gain information that would assist them in their jobs.

Szilagyi et al. (1976) extended this line of research a step further by examining the relationships among locus of control, role conflict and ambiguity, and subordinate satisfaction and performance for various occupational levels. In examining relationships among these constructs, the researchers collected data on personnel from
two organizations. One set of data was collected from paramedical and support personnel of a mid-western medical center. The personnel were classified as administrative, professional, technical, and clerical. The second set of data came from a sample of male managerial, engineering, and supervisory personnel of a southwestern manufacturing firm. The results of these two studies led the researchers to conclude that 1) a general belief in internal control increases as one progresses from lower occupational levels to higher ones; 2) only the clerical group's scores showed a significant relationship between role ambiguity and locus of control, while the professional, technical, and clerical groups' scores showed significant relationships between locus of control and role conflict. Overall, internals perceived less role conflict than externals, but when role conflict was held constant, no difference in role ambiguity perceptions was found between internals and externals; 3) for the total sample, there were significant, negative relationships among locus of control, performance, and satisfaction. Internals in the professional, clerical, and technical groups reported higher satisfaction with work (Organ and Green, 1974). However, internals did not perform better nor were they more satisfied than externals when the effects of role dynamics were partialled out. In contrast, when locus of control was partialled out, many of the relationships among role conflict, role ambiguity, and satisfaction and performance remained significant. The
authors concluded that role variables made a greater contribution to the explained variance in satisfaction and performance than did locus of control. However, for the administrative group, role ambiguity appeared to contribute more to the explained variance in satisfaction and performance, while role conflict explained more variance at the lower occupational levels (professional, technical, and clerical groups).

In conclusion, the Szilagyi et al. (1976) research provided support for Organ and Green's (1974) conclusion that role perceptions are related to the belief system of the individual. However, they did not replicate Organ and Green's finding that locus of control and role ambiguity were significantly related. Role conflict, on the other hand, was found to have a stronger relationship to locus of control than it did to role ambiguity.

**Student Personnel Work**

Without question, Student Personnel has had difficulty in establishing itself as an acceptable enterprise within academic circles. This difficulty has centered, primarily, on the goals of Student Personnel, its functions and roles, and the legitimacy of student personnel workers performing those functions and roles.

Rather than originating from within educational institutions, Mueller (1961) states that student personnel work was imposed upon the educational world by public pressures resulting from the economic and social trends of
the nineteenth century. Concurrently, the shift in emphasis from religious to secular concerns, the expansion in size and complexity of academic institutions, and the shift in faculty focus from student development to academic interests provided additional impetus to the development of the Student Personnel profession (Delworth, Hanson, and Associates, 1980). Prior to this time personnel work emphasized saving the students' souls rather than saving the minds. Cowley (1949) comments that "Personnel work" of this era consisted of "a pertinent emphasis on extracurricular religion, and also a considerable snooping into the personal lives of the students". However, with the secularization of education, the attitude developed that once a college had admitted a student, it should assume a moral obligation to do all within reason to help that person succeed. It was partly in response to this obligation and charge that the student personnel movement began.

Not until 1938 and again in 1949 did formal statements appear that described student personnel work at the college level. These statements were developed by the Committee on College Personnel and culminated in the publishing of The Student Personnel Point of View (American Council on Education, 1937; 1949). This point of view is characterized by three postulates: 1) every student should be recognized as unique; 2) every individual should be regarded as a total person; 3) the current needs and interests
of individual students are the most significant factors to be considered in developing a program of campus life (Penny, 1972; Wrenn, 1951).

While the principles incorporated in The Student Personnel Point of View have been the basis for student personnel work, it is interesting to note that it was a "point of view" rather than the content or services provided that helped to define this profession. A consequence of this development is that many services representing student personnel functions are not distinctive to personnel work, but fall within the provinces of other professions and occupations (Shoben, 1967). This peculiarity has had serious ramifications for the profession and its standing within the realm of higher education.

In general, college student personnel workers are delegated responsibility for nonacademic areas of collegiate life, such as housing, counseling, financial aid, placement, health services, and student activities (Penny, 1972). Services offered may vary from institution to institution, depending upon its size, needs, and resources. Packwood (1977) lists fifteen student personnel services or functions. His list appears to be sufficiently comprehensive to be applicable to most institutions of higher education. In fulfilling these various functions, the student personnel worker has had difficulty in achieving professional recognition in a community of professionals. One result of this lack of professional recognition is that
the student personnel worker is often placed in a position of needing to justify existence among the dominant power centers of faculty and administration. Brown (1972) contends that the student personnel worker must become involved in the academic arena in order to continue to function in higher education. In Brown's opinion, the student personnel worker has, for too long, felt on the periphery of academia, holding second-class citizenship to the teaching faculty.

Penny (1972) made an attempt to identify the causative factors for this predicament. He began by pointing to the paucity of basic literature in the Student Personnel profession. While there exists a wealth of journal articles, abstracts, and monographs, there is little in the way of writings that conceptualize the development of the profession (Committee on the Student in Higher Education, 1968). Penny also questions the dubious value of the student personnel worker's academic preparation, labeling his training ambiguous. He suggests that there is little evidence that professionally trained workers perform more effectively than non-professionally trained workers. Hill also surveyed the available studies on the selection and training of student personnel workers. He noted the high degree of self-selection of people into the field without well-defined training patterns.

Although the preparation of these workers has steadily moved in the direction of professionalism, training
in student personnel work is still not universally recognized as a mandatory prerequisite for appointment to a student personnel position (Knock, 1977).

Related to the issue of training are problems created as a result of the philosophical premise on which student personnel work rests. Saddlemire (1980) expressed this premise as being centered on holism, humanism, and pragmatism. However, in the realm of higher education, it is far more common for professions to have a solid, theoretical foundation as opposed to a philosophical one. To the contrary, the Student Personnel profession has included a variety of functions, many of which have not clearly formulated criteria of accomplishment (Penny, 1972). Several authors have characterized the profession as still searching for ways to become more fully integrated with the academic enterprise (Mueller, 1961; Brown, 1972; Miller and Prince, 1976). Hodgkinson (1970) presented data from a national study of employees of academic institutions, confirming what many of the critics of student personnel workers have been saying. He concluded that the student personnel worker has not made it in the central arena of the academic institution. Dewey (1972) arrived at a similar conclusion. He projected that the profession may become extinct unless steps are taken to better define its functions to alleviate its characteristic defensiveness, anxiety, and frustration. He also suggested that the scope of the profession be
enlarged to encompass the institution as a whole, of which Student Personnel is a part.

In more recent years, the profession has made attempts to integrate itself more fully into the academic environment. These efforts have been directed, primarily, into the areas of professional standards (Miller, 1980), professional preparation (Knock, 1977; Tollefson, 1975), and redefining functions and practices (Brown, 1972; Miller and Prince, 1976). Whether or not student personnel work as a profession will ever achieve professional recognition within the academic community remains to be seen. Currently, it is the view of some that the field has been and continues to be in an identity crisis, with the student personnel worker viewing his segregation from primary academic functions as a troubling issue that evades solution (Delworth, Hanson, and Associates, 1980).

The chief housing officer is a student personnel worker who performs a basic student personnel function. The primary responsibility of the chief housing officer is to administer the college or university housing program. By virtue of the historical development of this position and its inherent duties and responsibilities (Cowley, 1949), much of what has been written about the student personnel field is applicable to this position.

In most instances, the student housing program has a combination of broad objectives covering both management and educational functions. According to Decoster and Mable
(1974), the chief housing officer and the administration must understand and appreciate each other's areas of specialization and expertise to avoid working at cross-purposes. Riker and Decoster (1971) developed a model that described the interrelationship between managerial and educational functions. The model illustrated that without the mutual support among administrative and educational personnel, the college housing program would not be able to meet the needs of the students it serve.

In addition, there are a number of constituencies that attempt to exert control over the operation of the housing program. These groups include students, faculty, other administrators, and parents. Each group, invariably, has its own ideas about priorities within the residential community. Decoster and Mable (1972) reported that quite often the various expectations are incompatible, as evidenced by frequent problems resulting from institutional policies designed to control or regulate the personal behavior of resident students.

In effect, clarity of priorities, institutional support, and institutional policies determine, to a great extent, how well the chief housing officer performs assigned responsibilities. Lack of any of these necessary ingredients will, most likely, produce role conflict, role ambiguity, and low job satisfaction. Bender (1980) surveyed select members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) to identify feelings on
She found that sixty-six percent of the sample reported satisfaction with their jobs, but only thirty-six percent of the sample indicated that they intended to do student personnel work for their entire career. Moreover, respondents expressed a high degree of pessimism on the status, both present and future, of student personnel work.

Within the context of Role Theory (Kahn et al., 1964), the pessimism expressed by student personnel workers can be attributed to forces operating within the academic institution. Such forces may be the result of the lack of institutional acceptance of student personnel role functions, the conflicting institutional demands and expectations for student personnel workers, and the vague or unclear institutional priorities perceived by student personnel workers. Should this be the characteristic work environment of student personnel workers, it is expected that they will perceive negative role-related effects in the form of role conflict and role ambiguity (Rizzo et al., 1970, 1972). The purpose of this writer's research is to attempt to provide additional answers to questions relating to perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction levels for one group of student personnel workers, chief housing officers.
Summary

Role theory research has produced varying and inconsistent results. However, the literature provides ample evidence that high levels of role conflict and role ambiguity are related to low job satisfaction and dysfunctional behavior (Kahn et al., 1964; Rizzo et al., 1970; House and Rizzo, 1972). At present, it is not apparent which variable provides the greater amount of variance in job satisfaction (Rizzo et al., 1970; Tosi, 1971; House and Rizzo, 1972).

Also, it was reported that there are significant relationships between the locus of control variable and role variables. Organ and Green (1974) found that internals perceived less role ambiguity than did externals, while Szilagyi et al. (1976) reported that internals perceived less role conflict than did externals.

The question of significant relationships among the locus of control variable, role variables, and job satisfaction also has produced conflicting results. At least one study has found that the locus of control variable provided a greater contribution to job satisfaction variance than did the role ambiguity variable (Organ and Green, 1974). Still another study has found that role variables, conflict and ambiguity, explained more variance in job satisfaction then did locus of control (Szilagyi et al., 1976).

The review of Student Personnel literature revealed
some of the major problems experienced in the field since its inception. These problems are a lack of a solid theoretical base from which to operate, a lack of clearly defined functions and criteria for accomplishment, a lack of professional acceptance by other professionals within the academic community, and the perception of questionable preparation of trained student personnel workers. Moreover, as a student personnel professional, the chief housing officer must cope with the conflicting demands of his/her own expectations and those of established institutional policies and priorities, faculty, students, and parents.

With the application of role theory concepts to the work circumstances of the chief housing officer, it appears reasonable to expect that some degree of role conflict, role ambiguity, and low job satisfaction will be experienced. Further, social learning theory concepts suggest that these perceptions may be influenced by the chief housing officer's personal belief in internal versus external locus of control. The problem is to determine the nature and extent of the relationships among chief housing officers' personal beliefs in internal versus external locus of control, role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction.
CHAPTER 11

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the research design and procedures that were used in this study. These procedures include: 1) selection of participating institutions and chief housing officers; 2) instrumentation; 3) process of data collection; and 4) the process of data analysis.

Population and Sample

The population for this study was comprised of chief housing officers employed by member institutions of the Association of College and University Housing Officers (ACUHO-I). Membership to the association is institutional rather than individual, with each institution being categorized according to its residence hall capacity. The categories are as follows: 1) up to 1,000 residents; 2) 1,001 to 2,000 residents; 3) 2,001 to 4,000 residents; and 4) more than 4,000 residents. In addition, each member institution is assigned to one of nine regional associations based upon its geographic location. The nine regional associations, encompassing institutions within the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and several foreign
countries, include the following designations:

NORTHEAST  Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Rhode Island, and Vermont

MID-ATLANTIC  Delaware, District of Columbia, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia

SOUTHEAST  Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia

GREAT LAKES  Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Ontario

UPPER MID-WEST  Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Saskatchewan, and Wisconsin

SOUTHWEST  Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas

INTERMOUNTAIN  Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Manitoba, and New Mexico

NORTHWEST  Alaska, Alberta, British Columbia, Oregon, and Washington

CALIFORNIA  California, Hawaii, and Nevada

The sample for this study was drawn from chief housing officers employed by four-year institutions with a residence hall capacity of up to 1,000 residents. In its 1982 directory, ACUHO-I listed 184 such institutions. Of this number of chief housing officers, 104 participated in this study. Each region of ACUHO-I was represented in the sample, with the NORTHEAST region having the largest number of participants (27). Of the 104 participants, 58 were employed at institutions with fewer than 2,000 students, 28 at institutions with 2,000 to 4,999 students, 10 at institutions...
with 5,000 to 9,999 students, five at institutions with 10,000 to 10,999 students, and three were employed at institutions with 20,000 or more students. Of the total number of participants, 43 were employed by public institutions and 61 were employed by private institutions.

**Instruments**

**Personal Data Questionnaire (PDQ).** Personal and job-related information was collected from each respondent through the use of the Personal Data Questionnaire (PDQ). Developed by this researcher, the PDQ is a 21 item, self-report instrument. Each item in the PDQ required the respondent to either fill in the blank or to choose from one of the alternatives listed. Four of the items requested personal information (i.e., age, sex, race or ethnic origin, and education). The remaining items requested job-related information.

**Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (LC).** The dimension of internal-external locus of control is concerned with the respondent's belief in whether fate is determined by factors for which the individual is responsible or by external forces. In order to measure this dimension, Rotter (1966) designed the Locus of Control Scale. Complete information about its development is contained in Rotter's 1966 monograph.

The scale consists of a twenty-three item forced-choice questionnaire in which each item offers a choice between internal and external belief statements. For a
group of 200 male and 200 female Ohio State University students, an internal consistency analysis yielded $r = .80$ for both male and female samples. For two sub-groups of this population, test-retest reliability coefficients were computed after one month: males, $r = .60 (N=30)$; females, $r = .83 (N=30)$; combined $r = .72 (N=60)$. After two months: males, $r = .49 (N=63)$; females, $r = .61 (N=54)$; combined, $r = .55 (N=117)$. Rotter suggests that part of the lower correlation, after the two month period, is due to a difference in administration procedures (group versus individual).

Rotter also reported that correlations with the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale (1964) ranged from -.07 to -.35. Several factor analyses supported the assumption of unidimensionality of the internal-external concept. Rotter reported on two factor analyses. The first, based on the original Ohio State sample, indicated that much of the variance was included in a general factor, locus of control. Franklin (1963) factor analyzed 1,000 high school students and obtained similar results. All the items loaded significantly on the general factor which accounted for 53 percent of the total variance.

Job Description Index (JDI). This scale is a cumulative point adjective check-list measure of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is defined as the degree to which the respondent's desires, expectations, and needs are fulfilled by employment in an organization. To measure
this concept, Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) designed the JDI. A multi-dimensional scale, the JDI measures five areas of job satisfaction: satisfaction with work, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with opportunities for promotions, satisfaction with supervision, and satisfaction with co-workers. For each area there is a list of adjectives or short phrases, each with a blank space behind it. In describing how well the adjective or phrase fits the aspect of the job in question, the respondent writes "Y" for "Yes", "N" for "No", or "?" for "cannot decide" beside each blank space.

In total, the JDI consists of 72 adjectives or phrases. It yields five scores, one for each area. Scores are obtained by adding the number of satisfied responses within each area according to the keys provided by the authors. All satisfied responses are given three points, dissatisfied responses are given zero point, and all omissions or "?" are scored one point. Respondents are classified as either "satisfied" or "dissatisfied" on the basis of their total scores in each of the five areas. The five areas measured by the JDI were chosen to be consistent with findings of factor analytic studies which have been done on the dimensions of job satisfaction (Ash, 1954; Astin, 1958).

The internal consistency reliabilities of the five JDI scales range from .80 to .88, as determined by corrected split-half correlations based on the responses of 80
employees from two different electronic plants. The JDI yielded measures of satisfaction with five different aspects of jobs which were discriminably different from each other. The average correlation among the scales is approximately .37, sufficiently low to indicate discrimination among the five areas. While there is no single general criterion measure which can be used to validate a measure of job satisfaction, the five scales of the JDI correlate highly with other measures of satisfaction (average $r = .70$) and are affected in the expected directions by worker, job, and situational differences. The authors suggested that if a general measure of job satisfaction is required, the JDI is as effective as other measures.

**Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale (RCA).** Role conflict is defined in terms of congruency-incongruency or compatibility-incompatibility in the requirements of a role, relative to a set of standards or conditions which affect role performance. Role ambiguity refers to the lack of clarity in role definition or lack of communicative feedback in order to determine an appropriate course of action. To measure the individual’s perception of these constructs, Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) developed the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale (RCA).

The RCA consists of 14 items, eight of which measure role conflict and six which measure role ambiguity. Responses are scored on a seven-point, likert-type scale ranging from very false to very true. Responses indicate
the degree to which the condition exists for the respondent. Role conflict and role ambiguity are treated as separate variables in scoring and analysis. Lower scores indicate higher amounts of role conflict or ambiguity as perceived by respondents. The median score of the range of role conflict and role ambiguity scale scores was used as the cut off point to define high and low conflict and ambiguity perceptions.

The original thirty-item form of the RCA was used by the authors as part of their extensive investigation of management development needs in a large manufacturing company. A 35 percent random sample of the central offices and main plant employees and a 100 percent random sample of the research and engineering division were administered the questionnaire. Sample A consisted of 199 subjects and Sample B consisted of 91 subjects. Factor analysis of the responses to the RCA revealed two factors (Factor 1, role conflict and Factor 2, role ambiguity). The strong parallel between these two factors and the theoretical concepts of role conflict and role ambiguity supported the separation of the two role dimensions. Items for the final form of the RCA were selected on the basis of the factor analysis.

The criteria used by the authors in this selection were three-fold. First, only items loading greater than or equal to .30 were considered. Second, those items with relatively high loading on both factors were eliminated.
in order to obtain greater independence of scores. Finally, reliability was determined by applying Kuder-Richardson internal consistency reliabilities with Spearman-Brown correction. Reported reliability figures for each sample were .816 and .820 on role conflict and .780 and .808 on role ambiguity, Samples A and B, respectively.

Data Collection

Due to the small number of eligible participants, the collection of data utilized the total number (184) of chief housing officers of the 1982 ACUHO-I member institutions with a resident population of 1,000 or fewer students. A total of 104 chief housing officers participated in the study. Permission to survey the sample was obtained from the Executive Board of ACUHO-I. Instruments previously described served as the prime source of data collection. They were mailed by the researcher to the entire sample along with a set of instructions and an appropriate explanation of the study. The instruments required approximately 25 to 40 minutes for completion.

Definition of Terms

Organization - an open, dynamic system characterized by a continuing process of input, transformation, and output. Role - a set of activities or potential behaviors to be performed by any person who occupies a position within an organization.
Role Expectations - other organizational members' beliefs and attitudes about what a person should and should not do as part of his or her role.

Role Stress - pressures created on the individual as a result of requirements of a particular role performed in an organization.

Role Conflict - the perceived degree of incongruity or incompatibility of expectations within a referent group, among several referent groups, or between two or more roles. This is operationalized and measured by one dimension of the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale (RCA) (Rizzo et al., 1970).

Role Ambiguity - the perceived lack of clarity in role definition or lack of communicative feedback in order to determine an appropriate course of action. This is operationalized and measured by one dimension of the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale (Rizzo et al., 1970).

Job Satisfaction - the degree to which an individual's desires, expectations, and needs are fulfilled by employment in an organization. This is operationalized and measured by the Job Description Index (JDI) (Smith et al., 1959).

Locus of Control - an individual's perception of whether one's fate or reinforcements are controlled by internal forces or external forces. This is operationalized as a score on the Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (LC) (Rotter, 1966).

Internal Locus of Control - an individual's belief that fate or reinforcement is contingent upon personal behavior.
External Locus of Control - an individual's perception that fate or reinforcement is controlled by factors external to the person.

Student Personnel Services - services provided to college students, primarily nonacademic, that are designed to assist in their personal development and to enhance their academic experiences.

Student Personnel Worker - an institutional employee assigned the functions of providing student personnel services.

Chief Housing Officer - the student personnel worker who assumes direct responsibility for the institutional function of providing housing for students.

Hypotheses

The influence of the chief housing officer's personal belief in internal versus external locus of control on perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction was examined. Also, a determination was made of which variable, locus of control, role conflict, or role ambiguity makes the greater contribution to job satisfaction variance and which variable serves as the better predictor of job satisfaction. Using the chief housing officer as the unit of analysis, the following null hypotheses were tested for this investigation.

H₀₁ There is no difference between belief in internal versus external locus of control and perceived role conflict.
There is no difference between belief in internal versus external locus of control and perceived role ambiguity.

There is no difference between belief in internal versus external locus of control and perceived job satisfaction.

There is no difference between perceived role conflict and perceived job satisfaction.

There is no difference between perceived role ambiguity and perceived job satisfaction.

There is no difference in the variance of role conflict, role ambiguity and locus of control with respect to perceived job satisfaction.

There is no difference in the influence of locus of control, role conflict or role ambiguity on perceived job satisfaction.

Data Analysis

Scoring the Rotter Locus of Control scale is accomplished by summing the total number of external choices endorsed by each respondent. The median score of the range of total locus of control scale scores is used as a cut off point to define internality versus externality.

The scoring of the Role Conflict and Ambiguity scale
is accomplished by summing the numerical response obtained for each item. A separate score is obtained for each construct measured. The median score of the range of total role conflict and role ambiguity scale scores is used as a cut off point to define low and high conflict and ambiguity perceptions.

The Job Description Index is scored by summing the total of responses on each of the five sub-scales according to the scoring key provided with the scale. Subjects are classified as "satisfied" or "dissatisfied" on the basis of their total score in each of the five areas measured.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 1975, 1979) was used to analyze the compiled data. Collected data from each respondent was coded and key-punched on 80-column IBM cards. Responses were numbered sequentially using three-digit numbers. Each number was preceded by an institutional code.

A special set of computer instructions was developed to meet the analytic needs of this study. The SPSS program instructions provided absolute and adjusted frequencies for each variable on the PDQ, the Locus of Control Scale, the RCA, and the JDI. The SPSS performed all statistical tests used by the investigator in the analysis of the collected data. The data were computed using the Rhode Island College Computer Center.

Hypotheses one, two, and three were tested using
single-classification analysis of variance. The first three hypotheses were designed to assess the significance of difference between chief housing officers who had an internal versus an external locus of control score on the variables role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction, respectively. The SPSS sub-program ONEWAY was used to satisfy the statistical requirements.

Similarly, the sub-program ONEWAY was used to test hypotheses four and five. Hypothesis four concerns the relationship between role conflict and job satisfaction. Hypothesis five concerns the relationship between role ambiguity and job satisfaction.

The independent and combined effects of role conflict, role ambiguity, and locus of control scale scores on job satisfaction variance were assessed in hypothesis six. The SPSS sub-program PARTIAL CORRELATION was used to test hypothesis six.

Hypothesis seven assessed the significance of difference in the influence of an internal versus an external locus of control score, a low versus a high role conflict score, and a low versus a high role ambiguity score on perceived job satisfaction. In other words, which variable or combination of variable serves as the better predictor of job satisfaction. The SPSS sub-
program REGRESSION was used to test hypothesis seven.

In addition to testing the seven major hypotheses, questions contained on the PDQ were assessed for significance with the four major research variables, locus of control, role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. The SPSS sub-program BREAKDOWN was utilized to make the assessments. This sub-program provided means, standard deviations, variances, and performed analysis of variances between PDQ items and the research variables.

Summary

This chapter presented the procedures which were carried out in this study. The process used for the selection of institutions and chief housing officers was described. Instruments used in the collection of data were described and, to the extent possible, a case was made for the validity and reliability of each instrument. The procedures used for the collection of data were also described. The research hypotheses were presented and, finally, the procedures for the analysis of all data were presented.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

The basic research problem was to ascertain and describe the nature and extent of the relationships among chief housing officers' personal belief in internal versus external locus of control, perceived role conflict and ambiguity, and perceived job satisfaction. In line with this general problem, seven major hypotheses were developed to guide the investigation. These hypotheses investigated (1) the influence of a belief in either an internal or external locus of control on perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction, (2) the variation in the influence of locus of control belief and role variables on perceived job satisfaction, and (3) the predictability of locus of control belief and role variables on perceived job satisfaction. In addition, questions contained on the Personal Data Questionnaire (PDQ) were tested for significance with the four major research variables.

In the remaining sections of this chapter, personal and demographic information derived from the PDQ and data relevant to the hypotheses offered in the previous
chapter will be presented.

Sample for the Study

The sample for this study was comprised of chief housing officers employed by 1982 ACUHO-I member institutions having a resident population of 1,000 or fewer residents. Research instruments were mailed to 184 eligible participants during the Spring of 1983. A total of 104 useable instruments was returned. This total represents a 57% return rate for the entire sample.

Prior to the analysis of the data, the researcher used the SPSS sub-program BREAKDOWN on the PDQ items to provide descriptive statistics for the sample. Table 1 summarizes some of the general characteristics of the sample as generated by the BREAKDOWN sub-program. As revealed in Table 1, the average age of respondents was 32.3 years with an age range of 24 years to 51 years. The sample consisted of 55% males and 45% females with 97% of the respondents being white. The vast majority of the sample had obtained a master's degree (75), while 17% held a bachelor's degree and only 8% held a doctorate degree. Fifty-one percent of the sample was employed by private institutions, while 41% was employed by public institutions. The average years of employment in higher education was 8.24 years and 3.59 years was the average for employment in the current position. Ninety-four
## TABLE 1

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Average of respondents is 32.3 years with an age range of 24 to 51 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>55% of the sample is male and 45% of the sample is female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>97% of the sample is White and 3% of the sample is Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17% of the sample held B.A.'s, 75% held M.A.'s, and 8% held doctorates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Institution where</td>
<td>59% of the sample was employed by private institutions and 41% was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employed</td>
<td>employed by public institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Employed in Higher Education</td>
<td>Average number of years respondents were employed in higher education is 8.24 years with a range of one to 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Employed in Current Position</td>
<td>Average number of years respondents were employed in their current position was 3.59 years with a range of one to 18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Salary</td>
<td>Average annual salary of respondents is $21,059.92 with a salary range of $6500 to $42,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
percent of the sample was employed on a 12 month basis with an average annual salary of $21,060.

**Hypotheses One, Two, and Three**

A major concern of this study was to determine the influence of a belief in either an internal or an external locus of control on perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. In other words, is there a perceptible difference between internals and externals when measuring perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction?

The variable locus of control was measured by the administration of the Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (LC). The LC is a 23 item, forced-choice, questionnaire with each item consisting of two opposing statements. The respondent is asked to indicate agreement with one of the statements. The scale is scored in terms of increasing externality. Role conflict was measured by means of the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale (RCA). The RCA consists of 14 items. Eight of the items measure role conflict and the remaining six items measure role ambiguity. Responses are scored on a seven-point, likert type, scale ranging from very false to very true. This score indicates the degree to which the condition exists for the respondent. Job satisfaction was measured through the administration of the Job Description Index (JDI). The JDI consists of five sub-scales, each measures a different aspect of job satisfaction. In total, the
JDI contains 72 adjectives or phrases that describe different aspects of job situations. Each sub-scale is scored by summing the number of "satisfied" responses according to the scoring keys provided with the scale.

Table 2 presents the means, medians, and standard deviations for locus of control, role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction scale scores for all respondents.

**TABLE 2**

MEANS, MEDIANs, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR LC, RCA, AND JDI SCALE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
<th>MEDIANS</th>
<th>STD. DEV.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control (LC)</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict (RCA)</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity (RCA)</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction (JDI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>34.97</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>24.98</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>13.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>13.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>40.95</td>
<td>44.90</td>
<td>12.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>42.34</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI - Total</td>
<td>159.90</td>
<td>164.00</td>
<td>39.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The median score of the range of LC scale scores was used as the cut off point to define internality and externality. Respondents who scored at or below the median were classified as internals, while respondents who scored above the median were classified as externals. Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations of role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction scores for respondents classified as Internals versus respondents classified as Externals.

**TABLE 3**

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF ROLE CONFLICT, ROLE AMBIVGUITY, AND JOB SATISFACTION SCORES FOR INTERNALS AND EXTERNALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>(INTERNALS)</th>
<th>(EXTERNALS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI - Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>166.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To ascertain the difference between internals and externals on these variables, hypotheses one, two, and three are offered.

**Hypothesis One**

\[ H_{01} \] There is no difference between belief in internal versus external locus of control and perceived role conflict.

To assess the significance of difference between respondents who scored internal versus those who scored external on the role conflict variable, an analysis of variance was utilized. The results of this analysis are given in Table 4. This data indicates that there is no significant difference between chief housing officers classified as internal versus external in perceived role conflict. Hypothesis one, therefore, can be accepted.

### TABLE 4

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEIVED ROLE CONFLICT BY INTERNALS AND EXTERNALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139.70</td>
<td>139.70</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7346.12</td>
<td>72.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>7485.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis Two

\[ H_{02} \] There is no difference between belief in internal versus external locus of control and perceived role ambiguity.

Role ambiguity mean and standard deviation scores for internals and externals are found in Table 3. As in hypothesis one, an analysis of variance was performed to assess the significance of difference between internals and externals on perceived role ambiguity. Table 5 indicates that there is no significant difference between chief housing officers classified as internal versus those classified as external in perceived role ambiguity. Therefore, hypothesis two can be accepted.

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>106.88</td>
<td>106.88</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3951.93</td>
<td>38.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4058.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis three investigated the influence of a belief in internal versus external locus of control on per-
ceived job satisfaction. It is stated as follows:

**Hypothesis Three**

\[ H_0^3 \text{ There is no difference between belief in internal versus external locus of control and perceived job satisfaction.} \]

Mean and standard deviation scores for the locus of control and job satisfaction variables are found in Table 2. To assess the significance of difference between respondents who scored internal versus those who scored external on perceived job satisfaction, an analysis of variance was conducted. The results of this analysis are found in Table 6. The data presented in this table indicates that there are, indeed, significant differences between internals and externals on one of the five job satisfaction sub-scales. The relationship between the means of internals and externals on the WORK sub-scale is significant at the \( p < .05 \) level. An examination of the means of the two groups on the WORK sub-scale indicates that internals obtained higher job satisfaction scores than did externals. Although there are no significant differences indicated for the remaining four sub-scales, mean scores reveal that internals consistently reported higher job satisfaction than did externals. Hypothesis three is, therefore, rejected because of the significance of difference found with the WORK sub-scale.
### TABLE 6

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF JOB SATISFACTION**
**SUB-Scale SCORES**
**FOR INTERNALS AND EXTERNALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-Scale</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>325.12</td>
<td>325.12</td>
<td>4.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>8197.74</td>
<td>80.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.16</td>
<td>42.16</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>19229.70</td>
<td>188.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>343.87</td>
<td>343.87</td>
<td>1.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>19163.53</td>
<td>187.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPERVISION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83.22</td>
<td>83.22</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>16363.39</td>
<td>160.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEOPLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109.84</td>
<td>109.84</td>
<td>0.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14665.64</td>
<td>143.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JDI - TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3927.56</td>
<td>3927.56</td>
<td>2.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>159852.68</td>
<td>1567.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Hypotheses four and five investigated the effects of role conflict and role ambiguity on job satisfaction. Specifically, respondents who scored low versus respondents who scored high on role conflict and ambiguity were compared on the job satisfaction variable. The median score of the range of role conflict and role ambiguity scale scores was used as the point to define low and high role conflict and role ambiguity. Table 7 presents the means and standard deviations of job satisfaction sub-scale scores for respondents defined as low and high on role conflict. Table 8 presents similar data for respondents defined as low and high on role ambiguity.

TABLE 7

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF JOB SATISFACTION SUB-SCALES FOR LOW AND HIGH ROLE CONFLICT (RC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>(LOW RC)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>(HIGH RC)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.59</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32.34</td>
<td>8.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.57</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>12.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>13.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45.88</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36.01</td>
<td>13.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46.19</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38.50</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI -Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>174.71</td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>145.09</td>
<td>37.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF
JOB SATISFACTION SUB-SCALES
FOR LOW AND HIGH ROLE AMBIGUITY (RA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>(LOW RA)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>(HIGH RA)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32.05</td>
<td>10.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27.05</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>13.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45.62</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td>13.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46.29</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38.54</td>
<td>12.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI - Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>177.21</td>
<td>33.61</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>143.24</td>
<td>38.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To examine the relationships between respondents who scored low versus respondents who scored high on role conflict and perceived job satisfaction, hypothesis four is stated as follows:

Hypothesis Four

$H_{04}$ There is no difference between perceived role conflict and perceived job satisfaction.
An analysis of variance was utilized to assess the significance of difference between these two groups. Table 9 presents the results of this analysis. As indicated in this table, there are significant differences between the groups. In particular, significant differences were found on the WORK (p .01), SUPERVISION (p .001), and PEOPLE (p .001) sub-scales. Although there were no significant differences found between the groups on the PAY and PROMOTION sub-scales, the JDI as a total measure of job satisfaction was significant (p .001). Hypothesis four also can be rejected.

In examining the relationship between role ambiguity and perceived job satisfaction, hypothesis five stated that:

Hypothesis Five

**H₀₅** There is no difference between perceived role ambiguity and perceived job satisfaction.

Again, analysis of variance was utilized to assess the significance of difference between the two groups. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 10. The data in Table 10 indicate that there are, indeed, significant differences between the groups. Significant differences were found in four of the five job satisfaction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-SCALE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>716.62</td>
<td>716.62</td>
<td>9.364**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7806.27</td>
<td>76.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>264.98</td>
<td>264.98</td>
<td>1.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>19006.85</td>
<td>186.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMOTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>339.85</td>
<td>339.85</td>
<td>1.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>19167.56</td>
<td>187.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPERVISION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2530.47</td>
<td>2530.47</td>
<td>18.547***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>13916.19</td>
<td>136.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEOPLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1538.49</td>
<td>1538.49</td>
<td>11.855***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>13237.02</td>
<td>129.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JDI - TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22803.84</td>
<td>22803.84</td>
<td>16.499***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>140976.62</td>
<td>1382.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
***p < .001
TABLE 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF JOB SATISFACTION SUB-SCALE SCORES FOR LOW AND HIGH ROLE AMBIGUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-SCALE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>918.09</td>
<td>918.09</td>
<td>12.314***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7604.78</td>
<td>74.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>517.57</td>
<td>517.57</td>
<td>2.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>18754.28</td>
<td>183.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1146.94</td>
<td>1146.94</td>
<td>6.372**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>18360.48</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2187.67</td>
<td>2187.67</td>
<td>15.649***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14258.98</td>
<td>139.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1559.83</td>
<td>1559.83</td>
<td>12.039***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>13215.63</td>
<td>129.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI - TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29992.58</td>
<td>29992.58</td>
<td>22.866***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>133787.97</td>
<td>1311.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p .01  
***p .001
sub-scales. Specifically, the WORK (p  .001), PROMOTION (p  .01), SUPERVISION (p  .001), and PEOPLE (p  .001) sub-
scales were found to be significant. In addition, the JDI
as a total measure of job satisfaction was significant at
the p  .001 level. Respondents who scored low on role
ambiguity consistently reported higher job satisfaction
than respondents who scored high on role ambiguity.
Hypothesis five is rejected because of the significant dif-
ferences found between the groups.

The previous five hypotheses attempted to delin-
eate the relationship between 1) the locus of control
variable and role variables, 2) the locus of control vari-
able and perceived job satisfaction, and 3) role variables
and perceived job satisfaction. Hypothesis six is an at-
ttempt to provide an answer to the question of which variable,
locus of control, role conflict, or role ambiguity makes
the greatest independent contribution to the variance in
perceived job satisfaction. Hypothesis six is stated as
follows:

Hypothesis Six

\[ \text{H}0_6 \] There is no difference in the
variance of role conflict, role ambiguity,
and locus of control with respect to per-
ceived job satisfaction.

In order to assess the significance of difference
in the contribution that locus of control, role conflict,
and role ambiguity make to job satisfaction variance,
partial correlation procedures were used. Table 11 presents the zero-order correlations between locus of control, role conflict, and role ambiguity, and subsequent job satisfaction. Second-order correlations (i.e., holding two of the primary variables constant) are presented in Table 12.

Zero-order correlations demonstrate that there were significant, negative relationships between role conflict, role ambiguity and all five of the job satisfaction sub-scales. There was also a significant, negative relationship between locus of control and two of the five job satisfaction measures, the WORK and PROMOTION sub-scales. In addition, all three variables were found to be significant with the JDI scale as a total measure of job satisfaction.

The second-order correlational data presented in Table 12 reveals that, when holding two of the variables constant, significant, negative relationships continue to exist between each of the three variables and job satisfaction. However, the data clearly indicates that role ambiguity makes the greatest independent contribution to job satisfaction variance. In examining the data related to the role conflict variable and job satisfaction, only two of the job satisfaction sub-scales, SUPERVISION and PEOPLE, remain significant. With the locus of control variable and job satisfaction, only the WORK sub-scale remains significant. However, with the role ambiguity variable, a signi-
TABLE 11

ZERO-ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ROLE VARIABLES, LOCUS OF CONTROL, AND JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>ROLE CONFLICT (N=104)</th>
<th>ROLE AMBIGUITY (N=104)</th>
<th>LOCUS OF CONTROL (N=104)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOB SATISFACTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>-0.2842**</td>
<td>-0.4542***</td>
<td>-0.2665**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>-0.2090*</td>
<td>-0.2193*</td>
<td>-0.0594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>-0.2007*</td>
<td>-0.3347***</td>
<td>-0.1720*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-0.4208***</td>
<td>-0.4391***</td>
<td>-0.1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>-0.4870***</td>
<td>-0.3082***</td>
<td>-0.0906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI-TOTAL</td>
<td>-0.04854***</td>
<td>-0.5261***</td>
<td>-0.1639*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001
### Table 12

**Second-Order Correlations Between Role Variables, Locus of Control, and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Role Conflict (N=104)</th>
<th>Role Ambiguity (N=104)</th>
<th>Locus of Control (N=104)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.3541***</td>
<td>-0.1762*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>-0.1383</td>
<td>-0.1687*</td>
<td>-0.1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>-0.0602</td>
<td>-0.2601**</td>
<td>-0.0962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-0.2849**</td>
<td>-0.3099***</td>
<td>-0.0056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>-0.4121***</td>
<td>-0.1232</td>
<td>-0.0084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI-TOTAL</td>
<td>-0.3346***</td>
<td>-0.3908***</td>
<td>-0.0258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  
**p < .01  
***p < .001
significant relationship is retained with four of the five job satisfaction sub-scales. These retained significant relationships are with the WORK, PAY, PROMOTION, and SUPERVISION sub-scales. Role conflict and role ambiguity also retained a significant relationship with the JDI as a total measure of job satisfaction, while the locus of control variable did not remain significant.

In summary, the results of the partial correlational analysis revealed that role variables, role conflict and ambiguity, made a greater contribution to the explained variance in job satisfaction than did the locus of control variable. Of the two role variables, role ambiguity made a greater contribution to the explained variance than did role conflict (.39 vs .33). Hypothesis six is also rejected.

Hypothesis seven investigated the influence of locus of control, role conflict, and role ambiguity on perceived job satisfaction. In particular, the investigator wanted to determine the strength of each variable as a predictor of job satisfaction. Hypothesis seven is stated as follows:

**Hypothesis Seven**

\[ H_{07} \quad \text{There is no difference in the influence of locus of control, role conflict or role ambiguity on perceived job satisfaction.} \]
To assess the significance of differences in the influence of these three variables on perceived job satisfaction, multiple regression procedures were used. Locus of control, role conflict, and role ambiguity served as predictor variables. The five sub-scales of the JDI scale served as criterion variables for job satisfaction. Table 13 presents the results of the regression analysis.

The investigator was interested primarily in determining which variable or combination of variables is the better predictor of job satisfaction. Therefore, BETA weights, which gives a measurement of the contribution that each variable makes toward the prediction of job satisfaction, are given for each predictor variable. The proportion of the variance among the criterion scores that can be explained by differences in the predictor variables is given as the coefficient of determination ($R^2$). In addition, for each correlation coefficient ($r$), a test of significance was utilized ($F$ ratio).

The data in Table 13 indicates that for the JDI sub-scale WORK, role ambiguity had the largest BETA weight (-.37) of the three predictor variables, making it the better predictor of job satisfaction. Locus of control had the second largest BETA weight (-0.16) and role conflict had the smallest BETA weight (-0.09). The three predictor variables explained 24% of the variance in job satisfaction. Of this amount, role...
### Summary of Multiple Regressions

**For Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity and Locus of Control Scale Scores on Job Satisfaction Sub-Scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>PREDICTOR VARIABLES</th>
<th>ADJUSTED EXPLAINED VARIANCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>BETA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work</strong></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.20630</td>
<td>3/100</td>
<td>14.340***</td>
<td>-0.37323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>0.21577</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>-0.09734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>0.24013</td>
<td>3.205*</td>
<td>-0.16112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0.24013</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.533***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pay</strong></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.04808</td>
<td>2.931*</td>
<td>-0.18571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>0.06413</td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td>-0.14888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>0.07943</td>
<td>1.663</td>
<td>-0.12772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0.07943</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.876*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion</strong></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.11202</td>
<td>7.257***</td>
<td>-0.28505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>0.11587</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>-0.06270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>0.12405</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>-0.09336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0.12405</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.720**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.19282</td>
<td>10.624***</td>
<td>-0.31734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>0.25843</td>
<td>8.834***</td>
<td>-0.28439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>0.25845</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.00501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0.25845</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.617***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.09499</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>-0.12167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>0.24889</td>
<td>20.461***</td>
<td>-0.43558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>0.24895</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.00752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0.24895</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.048***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p .05
**p .01
***p .001
ambiguity accounted for the largest proportion (20%) of the explained variance. The role ambiguity correlation coefficient was significant (F=14.340) at the .001 level, while the locus of control correlation coefficient was significant (F=3.205) at the .05 level.

On the PAY sub-scale of the JDI, predictor variable BETA weights were relatively small: role ambiguity (-0.18), role conflict (-0.14), and locus of control (-0.12). These three variables accounted for only 7% of explained variance in job satisfaction. Only role ambiguity had a significant correlation coefficient (F=2.931, p .05).

Role ambiguity was also the dominant predictor variable on the JDI sub-scale PROMOTION. Role ambiguity had the largest BETA weight (-0.28), accounted for 11% of the total (12%) explained variance in job satisfaction, and had the only significant correlation coefficient with the PROMOTION sub-scale (F=7.257, p .001).

Similarly, role ambiguity proved to be the dominant variable on the SUPERVISION sub-scale. Role ambiguity had the largest BETA weight (-0.31) and accounted for the majority (19%) of the total explained variance (25%) in job satisfaction. Role ambiguity was one of two predictor variables that had a significant relationship with the SUPERVISION sub-scale (F=10.624, p .001). The second significant relationship was obtained by role conflict (F=8.834, p .001). Role conflict also accounted for practically all of the remaining explained variance in job satisfaction.
satisfaction and had the second largest BETA weight (-0.28). Locus of control made minimal contribution to the explained variance in job satisfaction and demonstrated little value as a predictor of job satisfaction (BETA = -0.007).

Finally, on the PEOPLE sub-scale of the JDI, role ambiguity, again, proved to be the dominant variable. It had the largest BETA weight (-0.38), it accounted for 27% of the explained variance in job satisfaction (35%), and it had a significant relationship with the PEOPLE sub-scale (F=18.027, p .001). Role conflict was the second most important predictor variable with a BETA weight of -0.31. Role conflict also accounted for approximately 8% of the explained variance in job satisfaction and had a significant relationship with the PEOPLE sub-scale (F=12.607, p .001).

In summary, the data indicates that the role variables, role conflict and role ambiguity, were better predictors of job satisfaction than was locus of control. Of these two variables, role ambiguity was a more powerful predictor of job satisfaction than was role conflict. Role ambiguity had the largest BETA weight on four of the five job satisfaction sub-scales. Role conflict had the largest BETA weight on the remaining sub-scale. Locus of control had minimal influence as a predictor of job satisfaction. The tests of significance performed with the predictor and criterion variables demonstrated that there are, indeed, significant differences between predictor variables. On
all five of the JDI sub-scales at least one significant difference was obtained. Hypothesis seven can, therefore, be rejected.

Although no formal hypotheses were stated, each of the 21 Personal Data Questionnaire (PDQ) items were tested for significance of differences on the four research variables. Unlike previous situations whereby individual sub-scale scores of the JDI were used as measures of job satisfaction, a total score, comprised of sub-scale scores, was used as the measure of job satisfaction. Other scale scores were used as in previous instances. Tests of significance were made through the use of analysis of variance procedures.

The results of these analyses demonstrated that the mean difference between scoring groups on two PDQ items were significant with one or more of the research variables. Item number four of the PDQ, which requested the sex of the respondent, was found to be significant on the Locus of Control scale (F=3.125, df 2/101, p .05). Males tended to score more internal than did females. Item number five of the PDQ, which requested the race or ethnic origin of the respondent, was also found to be significant on the ambiguity questions of the Role Conflict and Ambiguity scale (F=3.162, df 2/101, p .05). Black respondents had lower ambiguity scores than did white respondents.
Summary

In this chapter data were presented relevant to the seven hypotheses and the interactions between the Personal Data Questionnaire and the four research variables. First, the data pertaining to the scores of chief housing officers classified as internal versus chief housing officers classified as external on role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction were presented. These data allowed for an acceptance of the first two null hypotheses. However, the third null hypothesis was rejected. Significant differences were found between the two chief housing officers' groups on the job satisfaction variable. Next, data were presented that assessed the differences between chief housing officers who scored low versus chief housing officers who scored high on role conflict and role ambiguity and the job satisfaction variable, hypotheses four and five respectively. Significant differences were found between the chief housing officer groups on role conflict and role ambiguity. These findings allowed for a rejection of both hypothesis four and five. Hypothesis six assessed the difference in contribution to job satisfaction variance made by role conflict, role ambiguity, and locus of control. There were significant differences in the contribution that each variable made to the variance in job satisfaction. This allowed for a rejection of the sixth null hypothesis. Hypothesis seven measured the difference in the influence
of role conflict, role ambiguity, and locus of control on perceived job satisfaction. Again, significant differences were found in the influences of these variables on perceived job satisfaction. As a result, hypothesis seven was also rejected. Finally, significant differences were found between chief housing officer groups on two of the Personal Data Questionnaire items (sex and race) and the four research variables.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

It has been established that there are, indeed, significant relationships among chief housing officers' personal beliefs in internal or external locus of control, perceived role conflicts, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. As stated in the second chapter, the results of previous research involving these variables have been inconsistent. Similarly, the findings of this study lend support to some previous research, but fail to support other research. The purpose of this chapter is to offer some conclusions about the value of these findings in research and practice.

Summary of Findings

Before giving an analysis of the findings, a brief summarization of the procedures used and the results obtained may be useful. First, a one-way analysis of variance established that there were no significant differences between subjects classified as internal versus external locus of control and the role conflict and role ambiguity variables. A significant difference in perceived job
satisfaction was found between subjects classified as internal and subjects classified as external. In particular, a significant difference was found on the WORK sub-scale of the JDI scale. Oneway Analysis of variance procedures also produced significant differences on the job satisfaction variable between subjects who scored low on role conflict and subjects who scored high on role conflict. These significant differences were found on the WORK, SUPERVISION, and PEOPLE sub-scales of the JDI scale. Similarly, when comparing subjects who scored low versus subjects who scored high on role ambiguity, significant differences were found between the groups in perceived job satisfaction. These significant differences were located on the WORK, PROMOTION, SUPERVISION, and PEOPLE sub-scales of the JDI scale. Using the JDI scale as a singular criterion measure of job satisfaction, significant differences were found between the groups in the case of both role conflict and role ambiguity.

To account for the explained variance in job satisfaction, partial correlation procedures were used. Zero and second-order correlations demonstrated significant, negative relationships between role conflict, role ambiguity, and locus of control respectively, and the job satisfaction variable. However, the role variables were found to have made a greater contribution to the explained variance in job satisfaction than did the locus of control variable. Of the two role variables, role ambiguity made
the greatest contribution to the explained variance in job satisfaction.

The results of multiple regression procedures indicated that role variables were better predictors of job satisfaction than was the locus of control variable. Role ambiguity was the most effective predictor of job satisfaction.

Finally, analyses of variance procedures were used to assess the significance of differences between 21 PDQ items and the four research variables. The results of these analyses revealed that the sex of the respondent was significant for the locus of control variable and that race was significant for the role ambiguity variable.

Analysis of Findings on Locus of Control

Contrary to the findings of previous research (Organ and Green, 1974; Szilagyi et al., 1976), the locus of control variable did not have a significant relationship with perceived role conflict or perceived role ambiguity. Subjects who scored internal on the locus of control variable did not differ dramatically on the two role variables from subjects who scored external. Previous researchers' (Szilagyi et al., 1976) contention that role conflict had a stronger relationship with locus of control than did role ambiguity was not replicated (see Tables 4 and 5). Consistent with the locus of control literature, however, the internal locus of control group did score lower on perceived
role conflict and ambiguity than did the external locus of control group.

Locus of control is the concept that an individual has control over the outcome of personal behavior. In this study, the personal behaviors are reactions to environmental contingencies in the chief housing officer's work setting. The question of an individual's sense of control over environmental contingencies has been extensively studied in terms of social learning theory (Rotter, 1966). Rotter states that:

the individual who has a strong belief that he can control his own destiny is likely to (a) be more alert to those aspects of the environment which provide useful information for future behaviors; (b) take steps to improve his environmental positions; (c) place greater value on skill or achievement reinforcement; and (d) be resistant to subtle attempts to influence him.

The person who has a belief of personal control over circumstances is more likely to make efforts to experience that control. Indeed, research on the locus of control concept indicates that internals perceive and respond to environmental contingencies more consistently and perform at higher levels in incongruent, stressful situations than do externals (Valencha, 1972; McDonald, 1974).

According to role theory, incongruent and stressful situations are the very types of situations whereby role conflict and/or role ambiguity are perceived and experienced. Although the data from this study did not indicate significant relationships between the locus of control variable and
the role variables, they did indicate that internals and externals respond to stress and incongruency in slightly different ways. Some current views of the student personnel profession characterize it as a profession that is non-professional and not an integral part of the academic community. Under these circumstances, it seems reasonable that conflict and ambiguity would be an inherent part of each student personnel professional's work environment. The option of exercising personal control would appear to be limited. Therefore, individual chief housing officers would not be expected to respond to conflicting and ambiguous situations in significantly different ways.

A significant relationship was indicated between the locus of control variable and perceived job satisfaction. Chief housing officers who scored internal on the locus of control variable had significantly higher job satisfaction scores on the WORK sub-scale of the JDI scale than did chief housing officers who scored external. Although there were no significant differences indicated on the remaining four sub-scales of the JDI scale, internals consistently obtained higher job satisfaction sub-scale scores. Previous research has indicated that internals report greater satisfaction with work (Organ and Green, 1974). Keller (1975) has reported that the job satisfaction variable is a multidimensional variable with intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions that influence individual perceptions of job satisfaction. The significant finding on the WORK sub-scale reported in
this study adds credibility and support to these previous findings. According to Keller, the WORK sub-scale of the JDI scale measures an intrinsic dimension of a job. That is, it measures qualities of a job that have to do with the nature of the work itself. The data from this study indicated that internals reported more satisfaction than externals with the intrinsic nature of the work itself. Significant differences were not obtained on the remaining four sub-scales which measured, primarily, extrinsic dimensions of the job. These findings suggest that, in areas of the job that allow for more personal control, the intrinsic dimensions, internals are more satisfied than externals. In areas of the job that allow for little personal control, the extrinsic dimensions, there is little difference in the way that internals and externals perceived job satisfaction.

These findings also parallel student personnel research on job satisfaction. For example, when Bender (1980) attempted to identify student personnel workers' feelings regarding job satisfaction, she found that 66% of those surveyed reported satisfaction with their jobs (intrinsic dimension). However, respondents also expressed a high degree of pessimism about the status and future of student personnel work (extrinsic dimensions). Only 36% of those surveyed intended to do student personnel work for their entire career. Apparently, for this group of student personnel workers, satisfaction with the work itself was not enough to instill a sense of pride and long-term security.
about their jobs.

Brown (1972) characterized the student personnel profession as one that is searching for an identity and seeking total acceptance from the academic community. In such an environment, it seems reasonable to find that those chief housing officers who seek to exercise personal control over circumstances would report a greater degree of job satisfaction than those chief housing officers who exercise little personal control.

Analysis of findings on Role Variables and Job Satisfaction

The state of role conflict exists when the behaviors expected of an individual are inconsistent. Role ambiguity is created when necessary information for the successful performance of a task is not made available to the individual. The existence of either condition will, generally, cause the individual to feel stress and/or anxiety and to perform less effectively (Kahn et al., 1964; House and Rizzo, 1972).

The results of this study indicated that there were significant differences between the role variables and perceived job satisfaction. Chief housing officers who had low role conflict and low role ambiguity scores reported greater satisfaction with their jobs than did the chief housing officers who had high role conflict and high role ambiguity scores. A comparison of chief housing officers' role conflict scores on the job satisfaction variable indi-
cated that significant differences were found on the WORK, SUPERVISION, and PEOPLE sub-scales of the JDI scale. In other words, chief housing officers who experienced less conflict with the nature of the work itself, the supervision received, and the relationships maintained with fellow workers were more satisfied with their jobs than chief housing officers who experienced more conflict in those areas. Although significant differences were not found on the PAY and PROMOTION sub-scales, the scores on these two sub-scales indicated that chief housing officers were less satisfied with the pay and promotional aspect of job satisfaction than they were with other aspects of the job.

Similarly, a comparison of chief housing officers' role ambiguity scores on the job satisfaction variable also indicated that there are significant differences on the WORK, SUPERVISION, and PEOPLE sub-scales. In addition, a significant difference was found between role ambiguity scores on the PROMOTION sub-scale. The significance of this difference will be discussed in another part of this analysis. No significant difference was found between role ambiguity scores on the PAY sub-scale. As in the case of role conflict, those chief housing officers who experienced less role ambiguity with the work itself and were able to receive appropriate job-related information from supervisors and fellow workers reported greater job satisfaction.

Several factors may be offered as possible explanations for the non-significant relationships between role
conflict and the PAY and PROMOTION sub-scales and role ambiguity and the PAY sub-scale. One factor is that many of the traditional reasons for which individuals choose student personnel work as a career may be disappearing. Byran (1977) indicated that student personnel workers come into the field because they enjoy working in a collegiate environment, desire the security offered by employment in higher education, and enjoy the flexibility and mobility which higher education has traditionally afforded. However, institutions of higher education of today are, increasingly, coming under the control of internal and external economic and political constraints. These constraints are having a tremendous impact upon the educational environment and are especially apparent in institutional pay and promotional policies. Because the majority of monies made available to public educational institutions come from state government coffers, more than ever before, these funds are being determined by the economic and political realities experienced by the state. Finn (1978) states that higher education has emerged from a prolonged period of expansion into a period of retrenchment. As a result of this retrenchment period, less monies are available to support institutional programs including monies for salaries and promotional advancements.

In addition to the financial constraints placed upon institutions by dwindling resources, collective bargaining has arrived on many college and university
The editor's page of the *Journal of College Student Personnel* (March, 1972, p. 98) states that in the case of higher education, change is taking place overnight. As higher education's economic crisis deepens, ever increasing numbers of college and university staff members, who once saw little need to organize and to negotiate for salaries and working conditions, now are accepting the philosophy of collective bargaining. No longer is length of service and supervisor's appraisal the only determining factors in pay and promotional opportunities. It is now common within collective bargaining institutions that pay and promotions be based upon criteria established by the institution in agreement with the bargaining units that represent the employees (Martin, 1973).

Therefore, whether it be economic belt-tightening by the institution or restriction placed upon the institution by collective bargaining agreements, the individual student personnel worker finds that there are fewer opportunities to personally influence the amount of pay received or the promotional opportunities made available. It is suggested that these factors mitigate against finding significant relationships between role conflict and the PAY and PROMOTIONAL sub-scales and role ambiguity and the PAY sub-scale.

The significant relationship found between role ambiguity and the PROMOTIONAL sub-scale may be understood in reference to role theory research. House and Rizzo (1972)
reported that both role conflict and role ambiguity are related to job satisfaction, but that role ambiguity is more related than is role conflict. Other research derived from role theory has reported that in job settings where there is a lack of job clarity with poorly defined expectations and responsibilities, role ambiguity tends to explain more of the variance in job satisfaction than does role conflict (Hammer and Tosi, 1974; Szilagyi et al., 1976). Clarity of priorities and expectations have also been proposed as major factors in the successful performance of chief housing officers (Decoster and Mable, 1974). Indeed, the results of this study indicated that chief housing officers who experienced less role ambiguity reported greater satisfaction with promotional opportunities than did chief housing officers who experienced more role ambiguity. The significant relationship between role ambiguity and the PROMOTION sub-scale establishes significant relationships between role ambiguity and four of five JDI sub-scales. On the other hand, role conflict has a significant relationship with only three of the five JDI sub-scales. This particular finding, however, underscores the importance of role clarity as opposed to lack of role conflict in explaining variance in job satisfaction.

**Analysis of Findings on Job Satisfaction Variance**

The results of the analysis of variance procedures demonstrated that locus of control, role conflict, and role
ambiguity are all related to perceived job satisfaction. Partial correlation procedures were used to assess the contribution that each of these variables made to the explained variance in job satisfaction.

Zero-order correlational data, presented in Table 11, indicate that each of the three variables have significant, negative relationships with job satisfaction. Second-order correlational data, presented in Table 12, indicate that when holding two of the variables constant, significant, negative relationships continued to exist between the three variables and job satisfaction. There was, however, a reduction in the number of JDI sub-scales that maintained a significant relationship with each of the variables. The number of significant relationships between the JDI sub-scales and role ambiguity were reduced from five to four. Significant relationships with role conflict were reduced from five to two. The significant relationships with locus of control were reduced from two to one. Clearly, it can be seen that role ambiguity made the greatest contribution to the explained variance in job satisfaction. Although small, role conflict's contribution to the explained variance in job satisfaction was greater than that of locus of control.

As stated earlier, previous research indicated that all three variables are related to job satisfaction but, the results have been somewhat inconsistent as to whether the role variables or the locus of control vari-
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able made the greatest contribution to the explained variance in job satisfaction (Organ and Green, 1974; Szilagyi et al., 1976). The results of this study indicate that the role variables, in particular role ambiguity, made the greatest contribution. The contribution made by locus of control was minimal. When the effects of the role variables were partialled out, locus of control maintained a significant relationship with only one of the JDI sub-scales. When the effects of locus of control was partialled out, many of the relationships among role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction remained significant. Applying these results to the chief housing officer position, it seems plausible to suggest that the general concept of job satisfaction is not strongly dependent upon a personal belief in either internal or external locus of control. The chief housing officer's ability to obtain role clarity and to minimize or accommodate conflicting demands appear to be more potent factors in perceived job satisfaction. The fact that role ambiguity contributed more to the explained variance in job satisfaction than did role conflict lends support to the notion, expressed by Decoster and Mable (1974), that the chief housing officer position characteristically operates under vague or unclear institutional directives. Under these conditions, role ambiguity tends to influence perceived job satisfaction to a greater degree than does role conflict.
Analysis of Findings on Job Satisfaction Predictability

Multiple regression procedures were used to determine the best predictor variable of job satisfaction. The data presented in Table 13 indicate that role ambiguity was a better predictor of job satisfaction than were role conflict and locus of control.

Variable Beta weights were used to measure the contribution made by each variable (predictors) towards the prediction of job satisfaction (criterion variable). Coefficients of determination were computed to explain the proportion of job satisfaction variance that was explained by differences in the three predictor variables. A review of how each predictor variable related to the individual sub-scales of the JDI scale shows that role ambiguity had the largest Beta weight of the three variables on four of the five JDI sub-scales: WORK (B = -0.37), PAY (B = -0.18), PROMOTION (B = -0.28), and SUPERVISION (B = -0.31). Using the JDI scale as a singular criterion measure of job satisfaction, role ambiguity also had the largest Beta weight (B = -0.38) and explained 27% of the total variance in job satisfaction. The size of each of the sub-scale's Beta weight and the size of the JDI scale Beta weight demonstrated that role ambiguity was an effective predictor of job satisfaction as measured by the JDI scale.

Role conflict had the largest Beta weight on the PEOPLE sub-scale (B = -0.43) and the second largest Beta weight on the SUPERVISION sub-scale (B = -0.28). Again,
using the JDI scale as a singular criterion measure of job satisfaction, role conflict had the second largest Beta weight ($B = -0.31$) of the three predictor variables. Role conflict, however, explained only eight percent of the variance in job satisfaction. This relatively modest amount of job satisfaction variance explained by role conflict raises questions as to the effectiveness of role conflict in a job satisfaction prediction equation using the JDI scale as the criterion measurement of job satisfaction. Although previous research has demonstrated significant relationships between role conflict and job satisfaction, Keller (1975) proposed that role conflict is significant with the extrinsic dimensions of job satisfaction as measured by the SUPERVISION, PAY, PROMOTION, and PEOPLE sub-scales. Indeed, this researcher found that role conflict was significant with the SUPERVISION and PEOPLE sub-scales, but not the PAY and PROMOTION sub-scales. Explanations for the non-significant relationships between the PAY and PROMOTION sub-scales and job satisfaction were given in an earlier section of this chapter and are also appropriate as explanations for these findings. The Beta weights for the SUPERVISION and PEOPLE sub-scales were large enough to indicate that role conflict was an effective predictor in both cases.

The locus of control variable had an impact as a predictor variable only on the WORK sub-scale ($B = -0.16$) and explained only .004% of the total variance in job
satisfaction. These results indicate that locus of control was not an effective predictor variable of job satisfaction. It should, therefore, not be used as a predictor variable in an equation that uses the JDI scale as the criterion measurement of job satisfaction.

The data demonstrated that role ambiguity was the best predictor of chief housing officers' job satisfaction. In previous sections of this chapter, the researcher put forth explanations as to why role ambiguity was the dominant variable in accounting for the explained variance in job satisfaction. Those explanations are also applicable in accounting for role ambiguity's dominance in predicting job satisfaction. In summary, it should be restated that there is evidence that job satisfaction is a multidimensional variable. Therefore, certain variables may be more related to one dimension of job satisfaction versus another. Accurate prediction of job satisfaction requires consideration of this characteristic.

Analysis of Findings on the Personal Data Questionnaire

It was the sense of this research that other variables may also affect the relationships among the research variables. Therefore, analysis of variance procedures were used to assess the significance of differences between each of the 21 items contained on the PDQ and the four research variables. In the case of job satisfaction, the analyses were run between the PDQ items and the JDI scale being used as a singular criterion measurement of job
satisfaction. The analyses produced only two significant findings. Sex was significant with the locus of control variable and race or ethnic origin was significant with the role ambiguity variable.

Male chief housing officers (N = 57) tended to score more internal than female chief housing officers (N = 46). The mean locus of control score for males was 7.38, while females mean score was 8.60. Similar findings have been reported by Rotter (1966) and Feather (1968). Rotter reported that, while sex differences on the locus of control variable among college students appear to be minimal, he did find one case in which sex differences was significant. Feather, on the other hand, showed that females earned significantly higher external scores than did males at the University of England. It is not within the scope of this research to account for the apparent sex difference in response to the locus of control variable. However, Feather has suggested that sex-role identification is a major factor. In other words, through the process of acculturation, males and females have been conditioned to think of themselves as having more or less personal control over circumstances. Generally speaking, males tend to think they have more personal control than do females. Although this interpretation is not substantiated by the data from this study, it may account for the significant sex difference found on the locus of control variable.
Race or ethnic origin was also found to be significant on the role ambiguity variable. There were seven categories of ethnic groups listed on the questionnaire. However, only two categories were identified in the sample, White (N = 100) and Black (N = 3). Black respondents had significantly lower role ambiguity scores (x = 12.3) than did white respondents (x = 17.9). Obviously, any interpretation from such an imbalanced response pool would be misleading. However, there is evidence from other sources that point to response differences based upon ethnic origin. For example, whites have been found to score more internal on the locus of control variable than blacks (Battle and Rotter, 1963; Lefcourt and Ludwig, 1966). Therefore, it is not inconceivable that blacks would perceive less ambiguity than whites or, perhaps, would respond to role ambiguity in a more constructive manner than would whites. Empirical evidence for these hypotheses await future research efforts.

Limitations of Findings

There are several factors related to the methodology of this study that may limit the generalizability of the findings. This study was limited to chief housing officers of ACUHO-I member institutions with a residence hall population of 1,000 or fewer residents. The extent to which this group is self-selected and have different characteristics from chief housing officers at institutions that do not belong to ACUHO-I is uncertain. There may also be factors within the participating institutions that
limit these findings. These factors may include: 1) The institutional organizational pattern; 2) the presence of collective bargaining units within the institution; 3) the financial and political status of the institution; and 4) the status of student personnel workers within the institution.

The research instruments utilized in this study were mailed to the study participants. Kerlinger (1964) has suggested that the utilization of mailed instruments is a limitation because it does not provide the researcher with the opportunity to check the truthfulness of the responses. However, the return rate of instruments and the results obtained suggest that the findings are reliable.

Job satisfaction, one of the main independent variables, was assessed through the use of the Job Description Index scale. Evidence has been presented that suggest that this instrument is a multidimensional measure of job satisfaction. This characteristic of the JDI scale may place limits on the ability to compare the results of this study with results obtained through the use of other measures of job satisfaction.

Some of this study data is correlational in nature. Although statistically significant correlations were found, the magnitude of some of the correlations (and hence, the amount of explained variance) were only of a low-to-moderate level. It is, therefore, possible that other influential or antecedent variables may have had an impact upon the
relationships found among the research variables.

Finally, no evidence has been presented which indicate a causal relationship between any of the research variables. The data indicates only whether or not there is a relationship. Where relationships are found, the direction of those relationships is also given.

**Implications of Findings**

It has been established that chief housing officers' belief concerning the degree of personal control possessed and their perceptions of role conflict and ambiguity impact upon perceived job satisfaction. It is, therefore, recognized that these job-related variables can have a tremendous effect upon the efficient functioning of the educational organization. To maximize the efficiency of the organization and to increase the effectiveness of chief housing officers, efforts by the institution should be directed towards eliminating or minimizing the negative impact of significant relationships found in this study. Of equal importance is the need to maintain or improve upon the positive impact of relationships found in this study.

The finding that chief housing officers with a belief in internal locus of control report significantly higher levels of job satisfaction should be of interest to institutional policymakers. A belief in internal locus of control has also been shown to have positive relationships with employees' persistence, aspirations, achievement motivation, and performance. While little is known about the
antecedents of developing attitudes of internality, efforts to instill beliefs of internality in employees appear to have definite advantages for the institution. As an example, Bender (1980) pointed out that fewer than 50% of her sample of student personnel workers perceived that student personnel work was considered to be an important entity on their campus. Only 36% intended to do student personnel work for their entire career. Efforts to instill a sense of personal control may change these feelings. Such efforts could result in an increase in student personnel workers' morale, productivity, and create a sense of belonging that may cause more student personnel workers to consider the profession as a career endeavor.

Perceptions of role conflict and role ambiguity also made a significant impact upon the perceived job satisfaction of chief housing officers. It was pointed out that the chief housing officer position is one that has inherent conflict and ambiguity. Shaffer's (1984) assessment of student personnel work is quite appropriate for the chief housing officer position. He states that "faculty, administrators, students, parents, townspeople, newspapers, and alumni have applied to student personnel work some of the toughest, most rigorous criteria for accountability ever faced by any enterprise." The institution can, however, play a major role in alleviating or minimizing some of the conflict and ambiguity resulting from these forces. In this regard, efforts should be made
to insure that the responsibilities performed by chief housing officers and those that report to the chief housing officer are recognized as important contributions to the successful functioning of the institution. A prevalent feeling among student personnel workers is the sense that they are not an important part of the campus community (Brown, 1974). It is this ambiguous notion as to who and what they are within the academic community that can be addressed through institutional actions directed towards establishing the legitimacy and worthwhileness of chief housing officers.

In addition to recognizing the responsibilities of chief housing officers as making important contributions to the institution, the parameters of these responsibilities need to be clearly enunciated to all segments of the campus community. The chief housing officer is responsible for providing services, primarily, to students of the campus community. The nature of these services encompasses many aspects of student lives and campus life. Frequently, criticisms concerning students' lifestyles, moral development, behavior patterns, and morale are directed to the chief housing officer. It is conceivable that such criticisms exacerbate the chief housing officer's ability to exert control over institutional functions for which he or she is responsible and can be a potential source of conflict and ambiguity. These types of situations require a clear understanding of the role and responsibilities of the
chief housing officer position. Institutional efforts to provide this understanding may have the effect of enhancing chief housing officers' job satisfaction.

The case has been made that job satisfaction, as measured by the JDI scale, is a multi-dimensional variable with intrinsic and extrinsic properties. If this is true, it may be beyond the capabilities of the institution to affect all aspects of chief housing officers' job satisfaction. For example, role conflict and role ambiguity were shown to have significant relationships with the PAY and PROMOTION sub-scales, measures of extrinsic dimensions of job satisfaction. However, because of the economic and political constraints placed upon institutions, there may be little that the institution can do alone to improve pay and promotional polices. The institution is best served, in these instances, by directing improvement efforts towards areas of job satisfaction that it may be able to affect.

The data indicated that these areas lie within the realm of 1) the nature of the work performed by the chief housing officer, 2) the relationship that exists between chief housing officers and supervisors, and 3) the relationships that exist between chief housing officers and fellow workers. In addition to these efforts, institutional policy-makers need to become familiar with the content of role expectations for chief housing officers to better understand the relationships between role conflict, role ambiguity, and the different dimensions of job satisfaction.
Suggestions for Future Research

The results of this research suggest several directions for future research involving employee job satisfaction, the locus of control variable, and role variables. There is a need to conduct investigations of each variable independently and to conduct investigations that further explore the relationships among these variables. It is anticipated that future investigations will lead to a better understanding of the underlying theory of each variable and its effect upon the work environment. Some suggestions for future research are listed:

1. The variables under study should be subjected to longitudinal measures and analyses.
2. There should be further exploration of the multi-dimensionality of job satisfaction.
3. Investigations should be undertaken to delineate the antecedent conditions for developing a belief in internal control.
4. There should be further exploration of the relationship between race or ethnic origin and role variables.
5. Additional research is needed on student personnel workers perceptions of their work environment.

These suggestions are all interesting extensions of this research. They will all contribute to a better understanding of personal belief in locus of control, role vari-
ables, job satisfaction, and the relationships among these variables.

Summary

This study began with an awareness that institutions of higher education, like other organizations, have a tremendous impact upon the lives of employees. It was believed that membership in an institution established certain role expectations for the employee. It was also believed that accomplishment of role expectations result in satisfaction with the assigned task. Difficulty in the accomplishment of role expectation leads to the experience of negative role-related effects, frequently, in the form of role conflict and role ambiguity. The belief in either internal or external locus of control was thought to influence how the employee reacted to role expectations and subsequent job satisfaction. It was, therefore, decided to attempt to investigate the relationships among role variables, the locus of control variable, and job satisfaction for one category of institutional employees. Specifically, the problem for this research was to ascertain the nature and extent of the relationships among chief housing officers' personal belief in internal or external locus of control, perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. Seven null hypotheses were developed. These hypotheses investigated 1) the influence of personal belief on perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction, 2) variation in the influence of locus of
control belief and role variables on perceived job satisfaction, and 3) the strength of each variable in predicting job satisfaction.

The review of the literature highlighted research derived from role theory, social learning theory, and research that integrated these two theoretical approaches. Special emphasis was placed on research that had implications for the understanding of employee job satisfaction. The review of role theory research asserted that role conflict and role ambiguity are key variables in employee job satisfaction. Social learning theory provided the theoretical basis for a belief in internal or external locus of control. The review summarized the research on the effects of role variables and the locus of control variable on employee job satisfaction. It was asserted that significant relationships exist among these variables. However, the review did not provide agreement as to the nature or extent of these relationships. It was the theoretical perspective of this study to provide additional evidence to assess the nature and the extent of the relationships in question.

In order to assess this theoretical overview, the responses of a national sample of chief housing officers in 104 colleges and universities were analyzed. To measure perceived role conflict and role ambiguity, the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale was administered. The Rotter Locus of Control Scale was used to assess the belief in internality or externality. Employee job satisfaction was
assessed through the administration of the Job Description Index Scale.

Initially, the scores of subjects classified as internal versus external on the locus of control variable were compared on the dependent variables role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. Using role conflict and role ambiguity as independent variables, the job satisfaction scores of subjects classified as low role conflict and low role ambiguity were compared with the job satisfaction scores of subjects classified as high role conflict and low role ambiguity were compared with the job satisfaction scores of subjects classified as high role conflict and high role ambiguity. An assessment was made of the contribution that each variable made toward the explained variance in job satisfaction. And finally, an assessment was made of the strength of each variable in predicting job satisfaction.

The data demonstrated significant differences between internals and externals in perceived job satisfaction. The perceptions of job satisfaction by subjects who scored low on role conflict and role ambiguity differed significantly from subjects who scored high on role conflict and role ambiguity. The findings indicated that role ambiguity accounted for most of the explained variance in job satisfaction and, also, was the best predictor of job satisfaction. Locus of control did not interact significantly with role conflict and role ambiguity.
Some explanations for the findings were offered, along with some possible limitations on the findings. Several implications for colleges and universities were offered followed by some suggestions for future research.
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APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE PERTAINING TO STUDY
December 24, 1982

TO: The Research and Information Committee
    Association of College and University
    Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I)

FROM: Glenn Liddell

RE: Permission to Conduct Doctoral Research

ATT: Mr. Paul K. Jahr

Currently, I am Director of Residential Life and Housing at
Rhode Island College. I've been associated with ACUHO-I since
1973, attending several national conferences and numerous
regional conferences.

In addition to my professional employment within the field
and my long standing association with ACUHO-I, I am an
enrolled doctoral student at Western Michigan University.
I am now approaching the completion of that program, with
dissertation requirements outstanding. It is with this
point in mind that I am addressing this Committee.

I am seeking permission to conduct dissertation research
using chief housing officers of ACUHO-I member institu-
tions as subjects. On the following page, a brief descrip-
tion of the nature of the research, the target population,
and research instruments to be used is presented.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation in the com-
pletion of this project.
June 7, 1983

Mr. Glenn Liddell, Director
Residential Life and Housing
Rhode Island College
Providence, RI 02908

Dear Glen:

I am in receipt of your letter of May 24 and accompanying information regarding your research project. Thank you very much for providing me with this information. Your study appears to possess the potential to provide the members of our organization with some very interesting information. I look forward to receiving the final results of your study. Once your study is complete, I would also like to talk with you about ways in which we could share this information with the membership of ACUHO-I.

Best of luck with your research efforts and if I can be of additional assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Paul K. Jahr, Chair
Research and Information Committee
Assistant Director of Housing/Residence Life
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
Carbondale, IL 62901
Glenn Liddell  
Office of Student Housing  
Rhode Island College  
Providence, RI 02908

Dear Mr. Liddell:

You are my permission to use the I-E Scale for your doctoral research.

Very truly yours,

Julian B. Rotter
Professor of Psychology

JBR/JSW
Permission to reprint 100 copies of the JDI for doctoral research.

Must include "Copyright by Bowling Green State University, 1975" in reprinting.

check no. 790 received

amount due
Dear Colleague:

The accompanying research instruments are being used by Mr. Glenn Liddell, Director of Residential Life and Housing at Rhode Island College, in the completion of his doctoral research. The Research and Information Committee of ACUHO-I request your cooperation in this endeavor.

Mr. Liddell's research will attempt to explicate some of the factors involved in Chief Housing Officers' perception of job satisfaction and organizational role conflict and ambiguity. The successful completion of this research should bring about additional understanding of our roles as educational administrators.

The information gained in this study will be useful to our association and will be made available to the general membership. Therefore, please take the necessary time to complete the questionnaires.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Paul K. Jahr, Chair
Research and Information Committee
Assistant Director of Housing/Residence Life
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
Carbondale, IL 62901

PKJ:w
Enclosures
Dear Colleague:

As a fellow Chief Housing Officer, I am seeking your assistance in a research project that will conclude my doctoral studies at Western Michigan University.

As the enclosed letter from Paul Jahr indicates, this research involves Chief Housing Officers' perceptions of job satisfaction and organizational role conflict and ambiguity. In particular, the research will attempt to measure the degree of relationship between certain individual beliefs and perceived job satisfaction, role conflict, and role ambiguity within the organizational structure.

I realize that it is a busy time of year for you and that vacation is on the horizon. However, please take a few minutes to assist me by responding to and returning the enclosed questionnaires (an addressed, stamped envelope is provided at the end of the questionnaire booklet).

I thank you for your assistance and wish you an enjoyable summer!

Cordially,

Glenn Liddell
Director
Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS USED IN STUDY
Personal Data Questionnaire (PDQ)

1. Institution__________________________ 2. Public___ Private___
3. Position title__________________________________________
4. Age______ 5. Sex:  Male___ Female___
6. Race/ethnic origin (check one) (1)___White
   (2)___Black
   (3)___Hispanic
   (4)___Asian American or Pacific Islander
   (5)___American Indian or Alaskan Native
7. Highest degree earned...........  ____B.A./B.S.  ____M.A./M.S.
   ____Ph.D/Ed.D
8. Length of time employed in higher education... ___years
9. Length of time employed in current position... ___years
10. Your annual length of appointment is for... ___months
11. Your gross annual cash salary is........... $________
12. The number of professional employees reporting
to you........................................____
13. The number of student employees reporting to
you..............................................____
14. Check those areas listed below for which you have
responsibility........................................
   (1)___Single Student Housing  (5)___Facility Maintenance/
   (2)___Married/Family Housing  Custodial Service
   (3)___Student Life Programs  (6)___Budget Preparation,
   (4)___Food Service        Payroll, & Purchasing
   (7)___Room Assignments/
       Housing Contracts
15. Do you have other non-housing responsibilities? YES___ NO___

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
16. If yes, list all non-housing responsibilities

__________________________  __________________________

__________________________  __________________________

17. To what position do you report? (Title)____________

18. How many departments report to this position? ______

19. This position is now held by........ Male___ Female___

20. Race/ethnic origin of person holding this position.....
   (1)___White
   (2)___Black
   (3)___Hispanic
   (4)___Asian American or
       Pacific Islander
   (5)___American Indian or
       Alaskan Native

21. Highest degree earned by the person holding this position........___B.A./B.S. ___M.A./M.S.
   ___Ph.D/Ed.D

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale (RCA)

The statements listed below will describe some specific characteristics about your particular job. For each job characteristic, you are asked to give a rating. Using the following rating scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely NOT TRUE</th>
<th>Extremely TRUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of my job 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>of my job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Read each characteristic, and select the scale number that best reflects your opinion. Enter the number you select in column (A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Characteristic</th>
<th>(A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have enough time to complete my work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel certain about how much authority I have.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I perform tasks that are too easy or boring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clear, planned goals and objectives for my job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have to do things that should be done differently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lack of policies and guidelines to help me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am able to act the same regardless of the group I am with.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am corrected or rewarded when I really don't expect it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I work under incompatible policies and guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I know that I have divided my time properly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I receive an assignment without the manpower to complete it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. I know what my responsibilities are.

13. I have to buck a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment.

14. I have to "feel my way" in performing my duties.

15. I receive assignments that are within my training and capability.

16. I feel certain how I will be evaluated for a raise or promotion.

17. I have just the right amount of work to do.

18. I know that I have divided my time properly.

19. I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently.

20. I know exactly what is expected of me.

21. I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.

22. I am uncertain as to how my job is linked.

23. I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.

24. I am told how well I am doing my job.

25. I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it.

26. Explanation is clear of what has to be done.

27. I work on unnecessary things.

28. I have to work under vague directives or orders.

29. I perform work that suits my values.

30. I do not know if my work will be acceptable to my boss.
The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you are concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief: obviously there are no right or wrong answers.

Your answers to the items on this inventory are to be recorded in the blank space adjacent to each question. Answer these items carefully but do not spend too much time on any one item. Be sure to find an answer for every choice.

1.a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.  
   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

2.a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.  
   b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

3.a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.  
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4.a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.  
   b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

5.a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.  
   b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

6.a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.  
   b. Capable people who fail to be leaders have not taken advantages of their opportunities.
7.a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
   b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

8.a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
   b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what one is like.

9.a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
   b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

10.a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
   b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

11.a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
   b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

12.a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
   b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

13.a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
   b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14.a. There are certain people who are just no good.
   b. There is some good in everybody.

15.a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
   b. Many times we might just as well decide to do by flipping a coin.

16.a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
   b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
17.a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.

b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.

18.a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.

19.a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.

b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

20.a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.

b. How many friends you have depends on how nice a person you are.

21.a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.

b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

22.a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.

b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23.a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.

b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24.a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.

b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25.a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.

b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

26.a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.

b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27.a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.

b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
28.a. What happens to me is my own doing.
   b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

29.a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
   b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.
Job Description Index (JDI)

Each of the five scales was presented on a separate page.

The instructions for each scale asked the subject to put "Y" beside an item if the item described the particular aspect of his or her job (work, pay, etc.), "N" if the item did not describe that aspect, or "?" if he or she could not decide.

The response shown beside each item is the one scored in the "satisfied" direction for each scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Promotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income adequate for normal</td>
<td>Good opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expenses</td>
<td>for advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Satisfactory profit sharing</td>
<td>N Opportunity some-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>what limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Barely live on income</td>
<td>Y Promotion on ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Bad</td>
<td>N Dead-end job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Income provides luxuries</td>
<td>Y Good chance for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Insecure</td>
<td>promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Less than I deserve</td>
<td>N Unfair promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Highly paid</td>
<td>policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Underpaid</td>
<td>N Infrequent promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y Regular promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y Fairly good chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Fascinating</td>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Asks my advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> Routine</td>
<td><strong>N</strong> Hard to please</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Satisfying</td>
<td><strong>N</strong> Impolite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> Boring</td>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Praises good work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Good</td>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Tactful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Creative</td>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Influential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Respected</td>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Up-to-date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> Hot</td>
<td>Doesn't supervise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Pleasant</td>
<td><strong>N</strong> enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Useful</td>
<td><strong>N</strong> Quick-tempered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> Tiresome</td>
<td>Tells me where I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Healthful</td>
<td><strong>Y</strong> stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Challenging</td>
<td><strong>N</strong> Annoying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> On your feet</td>
<td><strong>N</strong> Stubborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> Frustrating</td>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Knows job well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> Simple</td>
<td><strong>N</strong> Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> Endless</td>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives sense of</td>
<td>Leaves me on my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> accomplishment</td>
<td><strong>Y</strong> own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong> Around when needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N</strong> Lazy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People

Y  Stimulating
N  Boring
N  Slow
Y  Ambitious
N  Stupid
Y  Responsible
Y  Fast
Y  Intelligent
N  Easy to make enemies
N  Talk too much
Y  Smart
N  Lazy
N  Unpleasant
N  No privacy
Y  Active
N  Narrow interests
Y  Loyal
N  Hard to meet
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