

## Job and Life Attitudes of Male Executives

Timothy A. Judge, John W. Boudreau, and Robert D. Bretz, Jr.

Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies

School of Industrial and Labor Relations

Cornell University

Ithaca, NY 14853-3901

Working Paper #93-13

In Press: Journal of Applied Psychology, October 1994.

Running Head: EXECUTIVE ATTITUDES

This paper has not undergone formal review or approval of the faculty of the ILR School. It is intended to make results of Center research, conferences, and projects available to others interested in human resource management in preliminary form to encourage discussion and suggestions.

### Abstract

Despite executives' important positions in organizations, their attitudes have not received much research attention. In an attempt to remedy this deficiency, the present study tested a hypothesized model of executive attitudes involving job satisfaction, life satisfaction, job stress, and work-family conflict. Using data gathered from a large, representative sample of male executives (due to the small number of female executives in the study, the analyses were confined to males only), LISREL results indicated support for the overall model and the specific relationships within the model. These results are the first to simultaneously consider job and life satisfaction, job stress, and work-family conflict, and also constitute the most comprehensive evidence to date on executive attitudes. The meaning and contributions of the findings are discussed.

### Job and Life Attitudes of Male Executives

Executives occupy positions of high pay, power, and prestige. Their decisions have significant consequences for large numbers of employees as well as for shareholders, communities, and other stakeholders. This is true both for their personal decisions, such as whether to stay or leave an organization, and their decisions about policies and strategies affecting others. These decisions are undoubtedly driven, in part, by the attitudes of executives toward their work. Executive work attitudes, and their antecedents and consequences, thus represent an important area of study. Better understanding of these attitudes may provide insight into behaviors such as executive job search or performance. Moreover, executives may make decisions about their organizations' policies based on beliefs that others are like them. If executive's work attitudes differ from those of others, such decisions may be based upon a faulty premise, and thus be flawed. In fact, researchers calling for increased diversity in executive ranks have used this argument (Cox, 1991).

Unfortunately, little research currently exists on executive attitudes. Previous research on executives has focused on topics such as executive pay (e.g., Kerr & Bettis, 1987), personal characteristics of executives (e.g., Miller, Kets de Vries, & Toulouse, 1982), and the influence of executives on organizational effectiveness (e.g., Gupta & Govindarajan, 1984). Some prior research has been conducted on executive stress (Cooper & Marshall, 1978; Glowinkowski & Cooper, 1987; Marshall & Cooper, 1979). Although this research has revealed interesting insights into the antecedents and consequences of executive stress, it has not specifically addressed the relationship between executive work and life attitudes, nor the combined effects of these attitudes on executive job stress. We know surprisingly little about executive work attitudes, despite the fact that programs such as compensation and work-family assistance are often designed to affect executive attitudes, and that attitudes such as stress and work-family conflict would seem to be particularly relevant to executives.

While the lack of research on the interrelationships among executive attitudes is conspicuous, equally important is the piecemeal nature in which employee attitudes in general have been studied. For example, although job satisfaction is one of the most studied concepts in the organizational sciences, research investigating the reciprocal relationship between job and life satisfaction is relatively recent (see Judge & Watanabe, 1993, for a review). Similarly, although considerable research has been published investigating the relationship between job satisfaction and job stress (Kahn & Byosiere, 1992), the possible reciprocity of this relationship has been ignored. Near (1984) noted the lack of causal research on the relationship between work and nonwork a decade ago, and the situation has improved only marginally since then. Thus, while some research has addressed the nature and determinants of several important job and life attitudes, these studies have focused one or two of these variables at a time, and generally have not considered bidirectional relationships among the constructs. Furthermore, of the constructs of central interest in this study, only job stress has received any empirical attention with respect to executives. Therefore, the purpose of the present study is to propose and test a model of male executive job and life attitudes which includes job satisfaction, life satisfaction, job stress, work→family conflict, and family→work conflict. This study provides the most comprehensive evidence to date on the relationships among job and life attitudes, and the first published evidence of the relevance of these attitudes for executives.

Before proceeding we should note that we consider conflict between work and family roles and job stress to be attitudes with cognitive and emotional characteristics. It is not uncommon for researchers to define these concepts in this manner (e.g., Motowidlo, Packard, & Manning, 1986). On the other hand, others may prefer to think of as work-family conflict and stress as processes or outcomes. While these definitional issues are important, they are unresolved by past research (see Kahn & Byosiere, 1992, in terms of job stress, and Higgins & Duxbury, 1992, in terms of work and family conflict) and

unresolvable in this paper. Therefore, we refer to work→family conflict, family→work conflict, and job stress as attitudes, realizing that other researchers, with equal justification, may prefer to define them differently. Thus, while the core constructs themselves may be processes or outcomes, they are operationalized using attitudinal measures.

### Model of Executive Attitudes

A causal model was hypothesized consisting of five key constructs: job satisfaction, life satisfaction, job stress, work→family conflict, and family→work conflict. To ensure that the model was relatively inclusive, and to avoid biased parameter estimates resulting from omitted variables, the relationships among the core constructs were embedded in a network of other variables. The hypothesized model of the five core constructs (i.e., endogenous variables) is displayed in Figure 1. Included in the model estimation, but not displayed in Figure 1, are the independent or exogenous variables that were used as controls. The core hypothesized links are discussed first, then the exogenous variables are considered.

-----  
Insert Figure 1 About Here  
-----

### Job Satisfaction to Life Satisfaction

Life satisfaction is typically defined as the degree to which individuals judge the quality of their lives favorably, and can be equated with happiness (Veenhoven, 1991). Researchers often consider life satisfaction, happiness, and positive and negative affect to comprise the same construct, labeled subjective well-being (Diener, 1984; Veenhoven, 1991). The question of whether these constructs are ephemeral states or fixed traits remains unanswered, but existing evidence suggests that life satisfaction is partly a function of genetic characteristics or early childhood experiences, and partly a state which can fluctuate depending on other factors present in individuals' lives (e.g., quality of life, marital status, age) (Veenhoven, 1991).

Research indicates that the relationship between job and life satisfaction is significant (Tait, Padgett, & Baldwin, 1989), and job satisfaction appears to exert a causal effect on life satisfaction (Judge & Watanabe, 1993; Schmitt & Bedeian, 1982). The rationale for the effect of job satisfaction on life satisfaction is intuitive when one recognizes the considerable impact of work on individuals' lives (Judge & Hulin, 1993; Kornhauser, 1965). Assuming that most executives make a significant lifestyle investment in their jobs, it is reasonable to expect that executives' affective reactions to their work will have a large effect on the satisfaction they derive from their lives. The positive link from job satisfaction to life satisfaction is included in Figure 1.

#### Life Satisfaction to Job Satisfaction

Although a number of studies have supported the effect of job satisfaction on life satisfaction, causal research has suggested that job and life satisfaction are reciprocally related (Judge & Watanabe, 1993; Schmitt & Bedeian, 1982). In fact, Judge and Watanabe found that the reciprocal effects of job and life satisfaction were not significantly different at one point in time, suggesting that both links must be included in the model. Some researchers have argued that the influence of life satisfaction on job satisfaction represents a dispositional effect (Judge & Hulin, 1993; Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986). The psychology underlying this dispositional effect can be illuminated by research from cognitive psychology, which suggests that individuals in positive affective states recall positive material more often (Bower, 1981). Thus, individuals satisfied with their lives may be more likely to be satisfied with their jobs because their positive disposition toward life influences their recall and interpretation of job conditions and past job events (Judge & Watanabe, 1993). As shown in Figure 1, it is hypothesized that life satisfaction will positively influence job satisfaction.

Work→Family Conflict and Family→Work Conflict to Job Stress

The last few decades have witnessed a rapid increase in dual-income couples and single heads of households (Zedeck, 1992). Because these changes have increased the potential conflict between work and family life, researchers have become increasingly interested in the antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict (e.g., Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Higgins, Duxbury, & Irving, 1992). Although much research has implicitly assumed that work-family conflict is a unidimensional construct (for an exception see Kabanoff, 1980), two recent studies are notable in their distinction between work→family conflict and family→work conflict. According to Gutek, Searle, and Klepa (1991), work→family conflict reflects the interference of work with family activities (e.g., long hours at work prevent performance of duties at home and spending time with one's family, thoughts of work consume the time spent with family), while family→work conflict represents the interference of family activities with work responsibilities (e.g., care-giving obligations prevent adequate time for work, thoughts of family represent distractions at work). Because most workers report that family is more important than work (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Gutek, Repetti, & Silver, 1988), Gutek et al. (1991) hypothesized and found that workers report a higher degree of work→family conflict than family→work conflict. Building upon the work of Gutek et al. (1991), Frone et al. (1992) and O'Driscoll, Ilgen, and Hildreth (1992) found that work→family conflict was distinct from family→work conflict.

Several relevant theories support the prediction that conflict between work and family roles leads to job stress. Role theory proposes that individuals experience role conflict when presented with incompatible demands such that compliance with the expectations of one role makes performance of the other more difficult (Katz & Kahn, 1978). One form of role conflict is that which may exist between work and family roles. Conflict between work and family roles may lead to job stress because inter-role conflict (of which work-family conflict

is an example) requires that individuals enact incompatible behaviors in different domains (e.g., spend substantial time with one's family and work long hours) (Cooke & Rousseau, 1984; Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; O'Driscoll et al., 1992). As noted by Frone et al. (1992), the prediction that work-family conflict leads to job stress is also consistent with the tenets of self-identity theory (Schlenker, 1987). Self-identity theory maintains that individuals seek to construct desired images of themselves, and anything that blocks construction of these desired images represents threats to self-identification. Since conflict between work and family roles constitutes impediments to goals of self-fulfillment, threats resulting from work-family conflict likely lead to job stress.

It is reasonable to expect that both work→family and family→work conflict will induce job stress because both represent inter-role conflict and impediments to self-identification that make one's job stressful. Work→family conflict is likely to lead to job stress because when work interferes with family life, pressure is often placed on individuals to spend less time at work and more time with their families. Similarly, family→work conflict is likely to lead to job stress because familial time demands may lead to too few hours being spent at work, thus leading to increased stress on the job. This is particularly likely when explicit or implicit work standards are high and highly visible work roles facilitate social comparisons. Pressure from fellow executives and constituents to perform work duties may only exacerbate the pressure at work caused by familial demands.

The effect of work-family conflict on job stress has been consistently supported by empirical evidence (e.g., Frone et al., 1992; Parasuraman, Greenhaus, & Granrose, 1992; O'Driscoll et al., 1992). Although these studies generally have not distinguished between work→family and family→work conflict, O'Driscoll et al. did make this distinction and found that job stress was significantly correlated with both job interference (a close approximation of work→family conflict) and off-job interference (representing family→work conflict). Both Frone et al. and O'Driscoll et al. found that the relationship between

work→family conflict and job stress was stronger than the relationship between family→work conflict and job stress. Thus, theoretical and empirical evidence supports the hypothesis that both work→family conflict and family→work conflict influence job stress, and findings by Frone et al. and O'Driscoll et al. suggest that the effect of work→family conflict on job stress will be stronger than the effect of family→work conflict on job stress. These hypothesized links are shown in Figure 1.

#### Work→Family Conflict to Life Satisfaction

Since family activities contribute to life satisfaction (Near, Smith, Rice, & Hunt, 1984; Veenhoven, 1991), when work interferes with family activities, lower life satisfaction should result. When work→family conflict is perceived it is the non-work domain that is impeded; therefore work→family conflict should influence life satisfaction directly. Furthermore, Bedeian, Burke, and Moffett (1988) noted that when work interferes with family life, this conflict is often released upon the family, causing poor marital adjustment, which further contributes to lower levels of life satisfaction. Consistent with these arguments, empirical evidence suggests that work-family conflict results in lower levels of life satisfaction (Bedeian et al., 1988; Parasuraman et al., 1992). Thus, as displayed in Figure 1, it is expected that work→family conflict will negatively influence life satisfaction. Executives who feel their work interferes with family life are expected to report lower levels of life satisfaction than executives who perceive no such interference.

#### Family→Work Conflict to Job Satisfaction

Because family→work conflict represents the interference of family activities with work, executives are expected to be less satisfied with their jobs when these impediments are perceived. Jobs vary in the degree to which nonwork activities interfere with them due to the demands that various jobs impose upon individuals. For example, some jobs may be so all-consuming that virtually any family activity represents an interference with work. In such a case, it is expected that executives will perceive their jobs to be less fulfilling. The

link between family→work conflict and job dissatisfaction is supported by a number of studies (e.g., Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Kopelman, Greenhaus, & Connolly, 1983); this link is displayed in Figure 1.

Because work is an important part of executives' lives, it is possible that family→work conflict influences life satisfaction as well as job satisfaction. However, since the job rather than the life in general is directly affected by family→work conflict, a link between family→work conflict and life satisfaction is not hypothesized in the model, but an alternative model is estimated which includes this link. Clearly one's life may be affected by family→work conflict, but since it is the work domain that is impeded, the influence of family→work conflict should mainly operate through job satisfaction.

#### Job Stress to Job Satisfaction

Most empirical evidence supports a negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction (see Kahn & Byosiere, 1992, for a review). From the perspective of person-environment fit theory, job stress signifies a poor fit between the demands of the work environment and what the individual is equipped to handle (French, 1963). Since most employees are aversive to job stress (Gupta & Beehr, 1979), it seems likely that high levels of job stress suggest person-job misfit, which in turn should lead to job dissatisfaction (Assouline & Meir, 1987). In fact, Jamal (1990) found that person-environment misfit was associated with job stress and, in turn, job dissatisfaction. Thus, it is hypothesized that job stress will negatively influence job satisfaction (see Figure 1).

#### Job Satisfaction to Job Stress

As noted above, the literature consistently supports a significant negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. In almost all cases this has been assumed to represent a causal effect of job stress on job satisfaction. However, as Bedeian et al. (1988) noted, the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction may be reciprocal. In fact, O'Driscoll et al. (1992) found a purported causal link from job satisfaction to job stress.

The rationale behind such a link is that job dissatisfaction motivates a desire to change job features, and this desire for change creates anxiety or tension (Roznowski & Hulin, 1992). The assumption that the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction is unidirectional appears to be questionable on both empirical and conceptual grounds, so we hypothesize that the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction is reciprocal. Job stress is hypothesized to be both a significant influence on, and consequence of, job satisfaction, as shown in Figure 1.

#### Exogenous Influences on Core Constructs

An extensive series of control variables were derived from past research. The explanation of the exogenous influences on each endogenous variable is explained below, grouped by the endogenous influence.

Exogenous influences on life satisfaction. Diener's (1984) comprehensive review of the subjective well-being literature served as the basis for deriving the influences on life satisfaction. Age was included as an influence on life satisfaction because Diener's (1984) review of recent evidence suggests that life satisfaction increases with age. Married individuals have higher levels of life satisfaction than unmarried individuals (Diener, 1984; Veenhoven, 1991). Accordingly, it is expected that marital status will significantly influence life satisfaction. Diener's and Veenhoven's reviews clearly indicate that health and life satisfaction are positively related. Therefore, health was included as an exogenous variable. Finally, leisure activities have been found to be a significant source of life satisfaction (Diener, 1984). Thus, time devoted to leisure activities was expected to positively influence life satisfaction.

Exogenous influences on job satisfaction. Hulin, Roznowski, and Hachiya's (1985) theoretically-based model of job satisfaction served as the basis for selecting relevant influences on job satisfaction. Hulin et al. (1985) proposed that job satisfaction is a function of the balance between work role inputs, what the individual puts into the work role (e.g.,

education), compared to role outcomes, what is received (e.g., pay). As outcomes received relative to inputs invested increase, job satisfaction is hypothesized to increase. In the present study, education level, hours worked, and, as a measure of quality of contribution, the appraised quality of the executive, were selected as representations of work role inputs. Thus, controlling for work-role outcomes, the more inputs the executive has invested, the lower job satisfaction is predicted to be.

Cash compensation was chosen as the most obvious manifestation of work role outcomes, and was expected to influence job satisfaction positively. Several other outcome variables that are relevant to executives were expected to influence job satisfaction. Organization success or failure is likely to be quite salient to executives because their rewards (e.g., stock options, bonuses) and future employment depend substantially on the performance of their organization. Working in an unsuccessful organization may be intrinsically dissatisfying to executives, and may lead to reduced extrinsic rewards and employment security. Thus, it is expected executives working in organizations they perceive as successful will be more satisfied with their jobs. Finally, based on the assumption that work-family issues are of concern to executives in this sample (an apparently reasonable assumption given that most executives were married and had children), organization work-family policies are expected to positively influence job satisfaction of executives.

Hulin et al. (1985) also hypothesized that an individual's frame of reference, which they defined as past experience with relevant outcomes, influences how current outcomes are perceived. In other words, individuals become accustomed to a certain level of outcomes, and those experiences influence how they evaluate outcomes. As a frame of reference variable, job tenure is expected to relate negatively to job satisfaction (holding outcomes constant). Individuals who have had past experience with a certain level of outcomes are more likely to be critical in evaluating a particular level of job outcomes (Judge & Watanabe, 1993). Furthermore, consistent with Judge and Hulin (1993) and Judge and

Locke (1993), the executive's current salary relative to his past salary is expected to positively influence job satisfaction; executives who feel that their present salary is higher than what they have received in the past are expected to be more satisfied with their job, and vice-versa. Finally, ambition is expected to act as a frame of reference variable in judgments of job satisfaction. Since individuals use their aspirations (goals) as standards of self-satisfaction (Bandura, 1986), people with high goals should be harder to satisfy than people with modest goals. This suggests that high ambition should be associated with low satisfaction because ambitious executives are less likely to be satisfied with their present job. In fact, Erez (1994) and Judge and Locke (1993) found that ambition significantly negatively predicted job satisfaction. Because organizational structures differ across organizations, and since most executives in the sample work in different organizations, it is important to adjust the measure of ambition for organization hierarchy. Thus, relative ambition was defined as the number of levels an executive wished to advanced less the number of levels he thought it was possible to advance in his organization.

Exogenous influences on job stress. Since working in unsuccessful organizations is expected to be stressful to executives, organization success was expected to negatively influence job stress. In fact, Allen, Hitt, and Greer (1982) found a significant relationship between organization success and executive job stress. Thus, in addition to the expected inverse relationship between organization success and job satisfaction, organization success also was expected to positively affect job stress. Research has suggested that another potential influence on job stress is job level (Parasuraman & Alutto, 1981; Schuler, 1980). Job level may be positively associated with job stress because high level jobs include responsibility for greater numbers of employees and often have high role demands, which are characteristics that increase job stress (Kahn & Byosiere, 1992). Therefore, job level was expected to positively influence job stress (although the restricted range in job level among this sample of high-level executives may attenuate this effect).

Exogenous influences on work→family and family→work conflict. With respect to work→family conflict, a number of exogenous variables were expected to be relevant. Hours worked per week were expected to positively influence work→family conflict while hours spent per week on dependent care were expected to positively influence family→work conflict (Bedeian et al., 1988; Gutek et al., 1991; O'Driscoll et al., 1992). As several authors (e.g., Brett, Stroh, & Reilly, 1992; Higgins & Duxbury, 1992; Schner & Reitman, 1993) have noted, it is important to examine differences in work and family outcomes between traditional versus dual-career families, and between individuals with children versus those without children. Traditional families allow male executives to spend more time at work with fewer household responsibilities, thus male executives in traditional family structures were expected to report lower levels of job stress and family→work conflict than male executives in dual income family structures. Because parental demands, and the felt need to spend time with one's family, may depend on the number of children one has, and the youth of those children (Bedeian et al., 1988), these variables were expected to influence work→family and family→work conflict. Since organization work-family policies may allow greater flexibility to spend time with one's family, such policies were expected to negatively influence work→family conflict. Finally, work schedule may be an important variable in predicting work→family conflict. Because working evenings represents time spent away from family, the number of nights an executive works per week was expected to positively influence work→family conflict.

## Method

### Subjects and Procedure

Subjects were male executives contained in the data base of Paul R. Ray & Company, the fifth largest executive search firm in the U.S. The following descriptive information (presented only for male executives who were part of the study) helps characterize the sample. All members of the sample were working in the U.S. at the time

of the study and most were U.S. citizens (96%). Ninety-eight percent of male executives were White. Average age of the male executives was 45.87 years. Ninety-three percent of male executives were married and 51% had 1 or more children. In terms of family structure, of those male executives who were married, 53% of the wives did not work outside the home. The average male executive spent 55.81 hours per week in paid work, spent 4.74 hours per week caring for dependents, and devoted 12.94 hours per week to leisure activities. Average annual cash compensation was \$129,580 ( $SD = \$91,656$ ). On average, male executives had earned 6.5 promotions in their career, their last promotion occurred 3.25 years ago, and the typical male executive was positioned 2 levels below the chief executive officer of the organization. The average male executive had been in his current position 3.1 years. Education of respondents was distributed as follows: undergraduate degree=45%; masters degree=46%; doctorate degree=9%. Forty-six percent of male executives had some international work experience. On average, male executives reported being satisfied with their jobs 53.58% of the time, and reported that their organizations were 65.87% successful in meeting their strategic goals during the last 2 years. The average number of workers employed in the executive's organization was 5,099; average annual sales of the employing organization were \$1.46 billion per year.

Surveys were mailed to a sample of 3,581 male executives (a 50% random sample of the data base). Accompanying the survey was a cover letter from the chief executive officer of Paul Ray & Company soliciting the executives' participation, and a stamped envelope addressed to the authors. In order to reduce reliance on self-report data, surveys were encoded so that those returned could be matched with information contained in Paul Ray & Company's data base. Executives were told in the cover letter that while their responses were not anonymous, all responses were strictly confidential. Of the surveys that were mailed out, 1,388 useable surveys were returned (1,309 of these were from male executives), representing a response rate of 39%. This response rate compares favorably

with other mail survey research (Dillman, 1978). A MANOVA model, simultaneously considering the interrelated effects of all variables, was used to determine if respondents were representative of the larger sample. In no case did any variable in the search firm's data base (marital status, number of children, evaluation of executive quality, citizenship, age, employer size defined in terms of sales volume or number of employees, cash compensation, international work experience, job tenure, or education) differ significantly at the .05 level between respondents and nonrespondents. Thus, it appears that our sample was representative of the larger population. Moreover, there appears to be no reason to believe that the male executives listed in Paul Ray & Company's data base are different from the predominantly male executive population in general (Lucht, 1991).

#### Measures

Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured with 3 items, 2 of which Scarpello and Campbell (1983) suggested were valid measures of job satisfaction, exhibiting psychometric properties as favorable as more established measures of job satisfaction. These measures were the Gallup Poll measure of job satisfaction (where respondents indicate whether they are satisfied with their job by responding "YES" or "NO"), and the non-graphic version of the G. M. Faces Scale. Additionally, an adapted version of the Fordyce Percent Time Happy Item was used, where the individual reported the percent time they are satisfied with their job on average. This item was used because it has received favorable evaluations in other research (Diener, 1984, 1990; Judge, 1990). Each of the 3 items was placed in different parts of the survey, and since these items were comprised of different response formats, the possibility of a response set seems unlikely. Because the 3 items were measured on different scales, they were standardized prior to computation of the composite measure. The coefficient alpha ( $\alpha$ ) reliability estimate for this three-item composite measure was .85.

Life satisfaction. Life satisfaction was measured with the Satisfaction With Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). Evidence suggests that the Satisfaction With Life Scale displays favorable psychometric properties (Pavot, Diener, Colvin, & Sandvik, 1991), and it has been used successfully in other organizational research (George, 1991; Judge & Bretz, in press; Judge & Hulin, 1993; Judge & Locke, 1993). In the present study, the  $\alpha$  of the five-item scale was .87.

Job stress. Although a number of apparently adequate measures of job stress exist (see Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987, for a review), existing measures possessed several of disadvantages which prevented their use in the present study. First, most measures of job stress are extremely long. As examples, the Stress Diagnostic Survey (see Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987) contains 60 items; the Hassles and Uplifts Scales (Lazarus, 1984) contain 117 items. We consulted with several representatives of Paul Ray & Company who had extensive experience with surveys and interviews with executives. These consultations suggested it was impractical for executives to complete such a lengthy scale. Second, most scales contained some individual items which were not appropriate for executives. For example, the Stress Diagnostic Survey has a large number of items which assess quality of supervision. Since many of these executives had no supervisor (or supervisor was not a relevant concept to them), this scale was not appropriate. Due to these limitations, a new scale was constructed which was relatively brief (16 items), but incorporated the most appropriate items from existing measures. In this scale, respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which the items produced stress at work for them, rated on a 1=produces no stress to 5=produces a great deal of stress scale. Four items were derived from the Michigan Diagnostic Survey (e.g., "The number of projects and/or assignments I have," "The amount of time I spend in meetings") (French & Kahn, 1962). Eight items were adapted from the Stress Diagnostic Survey (e.g., "The inability to clearly understand what is expected of me on the job," "The volume of work that must be accomplished in the allotted

