

## An Exploration of Locus of Control among Substance Abusers and Non Abusers: A Comparative Study in Kashmir

Syed Andleeb Andrabi<sup>1\*</sup>, Mohd Rafiq Dhobi<sup>2</sup>, Shobina Akther<sup>3</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The present project work entitled, “Locus of Control of Substance Abusers and Non Abusers of Jammu and Kashmir” was carried out with the objectives to study and evaluate the Locus of Control among substance abusers and non abusers. One hundred participants were selected in the study. The present study will consist of fifty (50) substance abusers and a controlled group of fifty (50) non abusers selected purposively from Jammu and Kashmir. Only Males were included in the study. In this study, Non probability purposive sampling technique was used. Locus of control will be measured by Levenson’s locus of control scale modified by Sanjay Vohra in 1992. This 24 - item, 5 point Scale, measures three dimensions of locus of control viz. a) Individual Control (i.e. internal), b) Powerful Others (i.e. external) and c) Chance Control (i.e. external). Responses to the 24 items (8 statements per scale) are evaluated on a 5 point Scale. The data was collected by using a standard questionnaire and SPSS – 16 versions was used to calculate Descriptive statistics, and t-test etc. It was found that, the internal ( $t = -1.24$ ) and chance control ( $t = .14$ ) dimensions of locus of control was statistically insignificant, while as the dimension powerful others ( $t = -2.332$ ) of locus of control was statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance with respect to Marital Status. However, it was found that, the internal, powerful others and chance control dimensions of locus of control was statistically insignificant at 0.05 level of significance with respect to Residence, Family type as well as for Nature (Abuser & Non Abuser). The limitations of the study and the suggestions for future research have been mentioned.

**Keywords:** Locus of Control, Substance Abusers, Non Abusers, Kashmir

Julian Rotter originated psychological construct in 1954 called locus of control and the full name Rotter gave the construct was locus of control of Reinforcement and was of the opinion that behavior was largely guided by “reinforcement “and these rewards and punishments come to hold beliefs about what causes their actions, with the result these kinds of attitude guide people’s behavior to adopt and same understanding is coincide with the famous psychologist Philip Zimbardo. It is a belief about whether the outcomes of our actions

<sup>1</sup>M.A Student, Dept. of Psychology, IGNOU, Lajoora Pulwama, Kashmir, India

<sup>2</sup> Research Scholar, Dept. of Psychology, IGNOU, New Delhi , India

<sup>3</sup> M.A Student, Dept. of Psychology, IGNOU, Qazigund, Kashmir, India

\*Responding Author

Received: January 17, 2019; Revision Received: February 21, 2019; Accepted: February 24, 2019

## **An Exploration of Locus of Control among Substance Abusers and Non Abusers: A Comparative Study in Kashmir**

dependent on what we do (internal control orientation) or things, events outside our personal control (external control orientation). (Zimbardo, 1985, p.275). Locus of control refers to tendency of people which resides them internally (within them) or externally with others (or the situation). Locus may be defined as a position, point or place, in simple a location where something occurs. Control may be defined as the power to determine outcomes by directly influencing actions events and people. It was believed that in world some people had internal or external locus of control or some had balance among both views varying with situation. The individuals with internal locus of control believe in their ability and influence the world around them. It was believed that individuals with internal locus of control are confident, more motivated, and success-oriented and are more politically motivated. The individuals with internal locus of control are more specific and considering each situation as unique. The individuals with internal locus of control also accept blame or failures. On the other hand people with external locus of control had little control over events, they even believe that others will have control over them and they are just accepting authority. They tend to be fatalistic, becomes observer only and little can do about it. This property tends to them as passive and accepting authority only. When they succeed in their life, they attribute it to fate or luck rather than own efforts. In case of internal locus of control, they have expectancy shifts seeing similar events as likely to have different results and are always engage in fruitful activities. In comparison to external locus of control they are less likely to have expectancy shifts and seeing similar events with similar results and hence step back from events and accepting that they cannot change events. Individuals with internal locus of control are willing to take actions irrespective of their results, while individuals with external locus of control looks always around them as part of success or failure. They sometimes believe in team aspect rather than that focus on the internal locus of control. Individuals with internal locus of control constantly analyze what is going wrong around them while as individuals with external locus of control blames environment, team players rather than focuses on personal control. It was observed that middle aged people had high internal locus of control while as younger people had high external locus of control. People with internal locus of control pay attention to the feelings of others with the result others were willing to work with you otherwise seems arrogant and may not work with you. When we believe that we have power to control our own destiny and determine our own actions, then we have a strong internal locus of control and have an important attitude to become successful. They ultimately work hard and preserve longer but it cannot be said that individuals with external locus of control are always bad; there are some situations where it works well.

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Abbott (1984) conducted a study to evaluate the ability of two measures of locus of control that is drinking- related internal-external (DRIE) and generalized measure (IE) among 106 patients. Socio-demographic and psychological data were also gathered. A weak relationship was found between locus of control and treatment participation. It was also found that drinking-related internal external one (DRIE) fared better than generalized measure (IE) in predicting outcome. Also, drug related locus of control can easily predict substance abuse being modifiable through treatment. Elizabeth (2001) conducted study on 553 abusers admitted in treatment program for 15 days. Clients were interviewed by trained interviewers and it took 45 minutes to complete the interview. Urine sample were also taken from the sample to detect presence of drugs (cocaine, cannabinoids, methadone, opiates, propoxyphene, barbiturates, amphetamines, benzodiazepines', phencyclidine, methadone) and alcohol. It was found that clients with more external LOC may gravitate (or maybe referred) towards a different modality than those with a more internal locus of control. Singh

## **An Exploration of Locus of Control among Substance Abusers and Non Abusers: A Comparative Study in Kashmir**

& Singh (2010) investigated the personality characteristics and locus of control among 100 Alcoholics and 100 non-Alcoholics (18-30 years) with the help of Levenson's Locus of control and Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire scales. The result highlighted that there were significant difference between locus of control and personality characteristics among alcoholics and non-alcoholics. Weissmann et al, (1976) conducted study entitled "Comments on the relationship between locus of control and alcohol abuse" and reviewed numerous studies to know the relationship between internal-external locus of control and substance abuse. But the findings were inconsistent, for example Naditch (1975) highlighted that problem drinkers have more external locus of control than social drinkers. Also Joe (1971) found the same results but contradictory findings were reported by Goss and Morosoko (1970) that alcohol abusers have internal locus of control. Similar findings were also reported by Gozali and Sloan 1971; Obziel, Obitz, and Keyson 1972). Rohsenow & O'Leary (1978) conducted a study entitled "Locus of control research on alcoholic population: A review. I. Development, scales and treatment" and summed up that alcoholics become more internal over treatment but the relationship of treatment with locus of control is unclear. Weissman et al, (1976) also found among 60 male drinkers that locus of control may be related to age and social desirability but may not be related to alcohol abuse. Dielman et al, (1987) conducted school based alcohol misuse prevention study on 2589 5th and 6th grade students, in order to determine levels of marijuana, alcohol, cigarettes and the problems associated with it. They administered questionnaire for concerning susceptibility to peer pressure, health locus of control and self-esteem. They reported that susceptibility to peer pressure, self-esteem, and health locus of control correlates with the adolescent substance abuse.

All these studies reveal that studying locus of control in relation to substance abuse is highly relevant and recommended.

### ***Research Objectives***

The research objectives of the study are as follows:

- To assess locus of control amongst substance abusers.
- To compare locus of control of substance abusers and non abusers.
- To study the effect of socio-demographic variables like marital status (Married/Unmarried), family type (nuclear/joint family) and area of residence (rural/urban) on locus of control amongst substance abusers.
- To suggest suitable intervention strategy based on the results obtained.

### ***Hypothesis***

On the basis of above objectives the following hypotheses have been formulated as:

- Ho<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference in the sample group of substance abusers and non abusers in terms of locus of control.
- Ho<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference in the sample group of substance abusers and non abusers in terms of locus of control with regard to marital status.
- Ho<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference in the sample group of substance abusers and non abusers in terms of locus of control with regard to family type.
- Ho<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference in the sample group of substance abusers and non abusers in terms of locus of control with regard to area of residence.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### ***Sample***

The present study will consist of 50 substance abusers and a control group of 50 non abusers selected purposively from Jammu and Kashmir (District, Anantnag) only males will be

## An Exploration of Locus of Control among Substance Abusers and Non Abusers: A Comparative Study in Kashmir

included in the study. Among the substance abusers those addicted with tobacco, alcohol, cannabis and amphetamine will be considered for the study. The substance abusers will be selected for the study by the purposive sampling method.

### **Research design**

The present study is based on non experimental design. Standardized tools will be used to measure the locus of control. Ethics will be followed while carrying out the research. Informed consent will be taken and confidentiality will be maintained.

### **Tools for Data Collection**

The tools for the present investigator to collect the data are as under:

1. *Personal Data Sheet*: A personal data sheet will be used to collect socio-demographic and other information about the participants.
2. *Modified Locus of control scale by Sanjay Vohra (1992)*: Locus of control will be measured by Levenson's locus of control scale modified by Sanjay Vohra in 1992. This 24- item, 5 point scale, measures three dimensions of LOC viz. a) Individual control (i.e. internal) b) Powerful others (i.e. external) and c) Chance control (i.e. external). Responses to the 24 items (8 statements per scale) are evaluated on a 5 point scale (5 strongly agree to 1 strongly disagree). The scale has been found with reliability 0.69 & validity 0.54.

### **Tools for Statistical Analysis**

1. Descriptive statistics will be used to measure the locus of control of the substance abusers and non-abusers.
2. 't' test will be used to study the significant difference between the two sample sub groups of substance abusers and non abusers & also with respect to marital status, family type and area of residence.

## RESULTS & INTERPRETATION

**Table 1: Showing Frequency Distribution and Percentage of sample groups:**

DIMENSIONS	LOW		AVERAGE		HIGH	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
INTERNAL	19	19%	67	67%	14	14%
POWERFUL OTHERS	14	14%	66	66%	20	20%
CHANCE CONTROL	21	21%	67	67%	12	12%

From the above table, it is evident that in internal locus of control 19% scored low, 67% scored average and 14% scored high ; In Powerful others 14% scored low , 66% scored average and 20% scored high and In Chance Control 21% scored low, 67% scored average and 12% scored high.

**Table 2: Showing the Descriptive Statistics and Normality Check:**

DIMENSIONS	MEAN	Std. DEVIATION	SKEWNESS	KURTOSIS
INTERNAL	3.6475	.62193	-.409	-.363
POWERFUL OTHERS	2.9712	.49456	-.126	-.882
CHANCE CONTROL	3.4188	.61066	-.725	.140

**An Exploration of Locus of Control among Substance Abusers and Non Abusers: A Comparative Study in Kashmir**

The above table highlights that the data set is having Skewness and Kurtosis within the acceptable limits, there by supporting the fulfillment of normality assumption of the data set to be analyzed.

**Table 3: Showing comparison of mean scores with respect to Nature (substance abusers vs. non substance abusers.)**

NATURE	NATURE	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t – value
INTERNAL	ABUSER	50	3.5725	.63842	-1.209
	NON-ABUSER	50	3.7225	.60202	
POWERFUL OTHERS	ABUSER	50	3.0275	.46859	1.139
	NON-ABUSER	50	2.9150	.51782	
CHANCE CONTROL	ABUSER	50	3.4875	.54178	1.127
	NON-ABUSER	50	3.3500	.67101	

As is evident from the table, that the calculated t – value for internal, powerful others and chance control are; -1.209, 1.139 and 1.127 are insignificant with respect to nature. Hence, our null hypothesis (Ho<sub>1</sub>) that, “There is no significant difference in the sample group of substance abusers and non abusers in terms of locus of control” is accepted.

**Table 4: Showing comparison of mean scores with respect to Marital Status:**

MARITAL STATUS	MARITAL STATUS		Mean	Std. Deviation	t – value
INTERNAL	MARRIED	39	3.6378	.65255	1.24
	UNMARRIED	61	3.6537	.60699	
POWERFUL OTHERS	MARRIED	39	2.8301	.45023	2.332*
	UNMARRIED	61	3.0615	.50395	
CHANCE CONTROL	MARRIED	39	3.4295	.60548	.14
	UNMARRIED	61	3.4119	.61886	

As is evident from the above table, that the calculated t – value for internal and chance control are; -1.24 and .14, which are insignificant and the t – value for powerful others is 2.332 which is significant with respect to Marital status. Hence, our null hypothesis ( Ho<sub>2</sub>) that, “There is no significant difference in the sample group of substance abusers and non abusers in terms of locus of control with regard to marital status.” stands rejected.

**Table 5: Showing comparison of mean scores with respect to Family Type:**

FAMILY TYPE	FAMILY TYPE		Mean	Std. Deviation	t – value
INTERNAL	NUCLEAR	67	3.6903	.53846	.980
	JIONT	33	3.5606	.76618	
POWERFUL OTHERS	NUCLEAR	67	3.0280	.46457	1.649
	JIONT	33	2.8561	.53957	
CHANCE CONTROL	NUCLEAR	67	3.4254	.59235	.154
	JIONT	33	3.4053	.65553	

## An Exploration of Locus of Control among Substance Abusers and Non Abusers: A Comparative Study in Kashmir

As is evident from the table, that the calculated t – value for internal, powerful others and chance control are; .980, 1.649 and .154 are insignificant with respect to Family Type. Hence, our null hypothesis (Ho<sub>3</sub>) that, “There is no significant difference in the sample group of substance abusers and non abusers in terms of locus of control with regard to family type” stands accepted.

**Table 6: Showing comparison of mean scores with respect to Residence:**

RESIDENCE	RESIDENCE	Mean	Std. Deviation	t – value
INTERNAL	RURAL	95	3.6487	.083
	URBAN	5	3.6250	
POWERFUL OTHERS	RURAL	95	2.9632	-.711
	URBAN	5	3.1250	
CHANCE CONTROL	RURAL	95	3.4079	-.773
	URBAN	5	3.6250	

As is evident from the table, that the calculated t – value for internal, powerful others and chance control are; .083, -.711 and -.773 which are insignificant with respect to Residence. Hence, our null hypothesis (Ho<sub>4</sub>) that, “There is no significant difference in the sample group of substance abusers and non abusers in terms of locus of control with regard to area of residence.” stands accepted.

### DISCUSSION

The present study aimed to explore the locus of control and demographic variables among substance abusers and non substance abusers. There is no significant difference in the sample group of substance abusers and non abusers in terms of locus of control. The results are in line with Marchiorie et al, (1999) found in Alcoholics and non Alcoholics, that there is no significant difference between Alcoholics and non Alcoholics with respect to locus of control. Christo & Franey (1995) also found no significant difference between abusers and non abusers with respect to locus of control. But contradictory findings were reported by Costello and Wicoff (1984) who found locus of control to be internal among Alcoholics. Natera et al (1988); Mills & Taricone (1991) also found internal locus of control among Alcoholics. Theakston et al (2004) found that internal locus of control is responsible for alcohol and other drug use. There is no significant difference in the sample group of substance abusers and non abusers in terms of locus of control with regard to marital status. Our study was supported by Horowitz & White, 1991; Miller-Tutzauer, Leonard, & Windle, 1991; Roberts, Leonard, & Senchak, 1992a, 1992b found that married individuals were less indulged in substance abuse. But Booth et al (1992) are against this finding. Moreover, Klassen, Wilsnack, Schur, & Wilsnack, 1991; Roberts et al., 1992b found that lack of intimacy in marriage predicts substance abuse behavior. Savada and Pak (1994) found that unmarried individuals were more prone to substance abuse as compared to married individuals. There is no significant difference in the sample group of substance abusers and non abusers in terms of locus of control with regard to family type. Chhabra & Sen (1988) found that addiction is prevailing in joint families rather than nuclear families. This construct needs more explore at large sample so that actual position come out. There is no significant difference in the sample group of substance abusers and non abusers in terms of locus of control with regard to area of residence. Our results are same as found by Penar-Zadarko et al (2008) who found that rural college smokers have more internal locus of control than urban college smokers. But, Angelova (2016) have found no significant relationship between locus

## **An Exploration of Locus of Control among Substance Abusers and Non Abusers: A Comparative Study in Kashmir**

of control and area of residence (Rural /Urban). Naik (2015) conducted study on 171 college students and found no significant difference between locus of control among Rural and urban college students.

### **CONCLUSION**

The present study focuses on some of the dimensions of locus of control. The sample chosen for the study was substance abusers and non abusers taken from different areas of Kashmir valley. After analyzing the data, the main findings obtained from the study are:

- The Abusers and Non Abusers mean score for internal locus of control was found to be 3.57 & 3.72, for Powerful Others it was found to be 3.03 & 2.91 and for Chance Control it was found to be 3.49 & 3.35.
- Internal, Powerful Others and Chance Control dimensions of locus of control are statistically insignificant with respect to nature (Abuser Vs Non abuser).
- Internal and Chance Control dimensions of locus of control are statistically insignificant while as, the dimension Powerful Others was significant with respect to Marital Status.
- Internal, Powerful Others and Chance Control dimensions of locus of control are statistically insignificant with respect to Residence.
- Internal, Powerful Others and Chance Control dimensions of locus of control are statistically insignificant with respect to Family Type.
- It was found that, in Internal locus of control 19% scored low, 67% scored average and 14% scored high ; In Powerful others 14% scored low , 66% scored average and 20% scored high and In Chance Control 21% scored low, 67% scored average and 12% scored high.
- The dimension Internal, locus of control has -.409Skewness and -.363Kurtosis. The dimension Powerful Others has -.126Skewness and -.88Kurtosis. While as, the dimension Chance Control has -.725 Skewness and .140Kurtosis.

### **LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

As we all know that research is a continuous process and is never completely perfect due to certain unavoidable circumstances. Every research carries certain flaws that give insights for new research. Keeping in view the above facts, the present piece of work is also subject to certain limitations which the investigator has realized/understood during the research process. These limitations are:

No doubt, the tools used for data collection were translated into Urdu language but still the translated version of scales needs to be applied on large population to ascertain their reliability and validity.

- 1) The technique used for project/research is purposive sampling, which brings element of deliberate selection in the selection of sample and weakens the generalization of results of this study.
- 2) Due to certain constrains only males were included in the study. Hence, the results obtained are gender biased.
- 3) The sample size is too small.
- 4) Other Districts of J&K not included in the study.

### **SUGGESTIONS**

Further research need to be carried out on the basis of present study in Kashmir with certain considerations to improve authenticity of the results for policy makers and other concerned

## An Exploration of Locus of Control among Substance Abusers and Non Abusers: A Comparative Study in Kashmir

authorities for preparing action plans for the eradication of such type of menace in the society. Some of the suggestions that investigator has realized are listed here:

- 1) Such type of research need to be carried on female sample groups.
- 2) There is also need to use Random Sampling method to select sample from different sections of the population with adequate proportions, in order to eliminate judgmental bias in selection of sample.
- 3) Tools used for such type of studies should be developed/adopted taking into consideration socio-cultural aspects of the target population.

### REFERENCES

- Abbott, M.W. (1984). Locus of control and treatment outcomes in alcoholics. *Journal of studies on Alcohol*, 45(1), 46-52.
- Angelova, N. V. (2016). Locus of Control and Its Relationship with Some Social-Demographic Factors. *Psychological Thought*, Vol. 9(2), doi:10.5964/psyc.v9i2.179.
- Booth, P. G., Dale, B., & Slade, P. D. (1992). A follow-up study of problem drinkers offered a goal preference option. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 53:594–600.
- Chhabra, S., & Sen, A. (1988). Psychological perspectives of some smack addicted cases: An explorative study. *Indian Journal of Community Guidance Service*, 5, 1-15.
- Christo, G., & Franey, C. (1995). Drug users' spiritual beliefs, locus of control and the disease concept in relation to Narcotics Anonymous attendance and six-month outcomes. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 38, 51-56.
- Costello, M. F., & Wicoff, K. A. (1984). Impression management and testing for control locus in an alcoholic sample. *International Journal of the Addictions*.19, 45–56.
- Curie, R. F., Perlman, D., & Walker, L. (1977). Marijuana use among Calgary youths as a function of sampling and locus of control. *British Journal of Addiction*.72.159-165.
- Dielman, T. E., Campanelli, P. C., Shope, J. T., & Butchart, A. T. (1987). Susceptibility to peer pressure, self-esteem, and health locus of control as correlates of adolescent substance abuse. *Health Education and Behavior*, vol. (14), pp. 207-221.
- Elizabeth, A. H. (2001). Feelings about drug abuse-drug related locus of control. *Semel Institute of Neuroscience and Human Behavior*.
- Goss, A., & Morosko, T. E. (1970). Relation between a dimension of internal-external control and the MMPI with an alcoholic population. *Journal of consulting and clinical Psychology*, 34, 189-192.
- Gozali, J. & Sloan. J. (1971). Control orientation as a personality dimension among alcoholics. *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 32:159-61.
- Horowitz, A. V., & White, H. R. (1991). Becoming married, depression, and alcohol problems among young adults. *Journal of Health and Social Behaviors*, 32, 221-237
- Joe, V. C. (1971). Review of the internal-external control construct as a personality variable. *Psychological Reports*, 28(2), 619-640. Doi: 10.2466/pr0.1971.28.2.619
- Klassen, A. D., Wilsnack, S. C., Schur, B. E., & Wilsnack, R. W. (1991). Predicting onset and chronicity of women's problem drinking: a five-year longitudinal analysis. *American Journal of Public Health*. 81(3):305-18.
- Marchiorie, E., Loschi, S., Marconi, P. L., Mioni, D., & Pavan, L. (1999). Dependence, Locus of control, Parental Bonding, and Personality Disorder: A Study in Alcoholics' and Controls. *Alcoholics and Alcoholism*, volume 34, Issue 3, Pages 396–401.
- Mardane, M., Rafiey, H., Masafi, S., & Rezae, O. (2013). The Relationship between loci of control with Success in Methadone Therapy in Substance Abuse Disorder. *International Journal of Collaborative Research on Internal Medicine & Public Health*, Vol. 5 No. 2.



## An Exploration of Locus of Control among Substance Abusers and Non Abusers: A Comparative Study in Kashmir

- Miller-Tutzauer, C., Leonard, K. E., & Windle, M. (1991). Marriage and alcohol use: A longitudinal study of "maturing out." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 52(5), 434-440.
- Mills, J. K., & Taricone, P. F. (1991). Interpersonal dependency and locus of control as personality correlates among adult male alcoholics undergoing residential treatment. *Psychological Reports*.68, 1107–1112.
- Naditch, M. P. (1975). Locus of control and drinking behavior in a sample of men in Army basic training. *Journal of Consulting and clinical Psychology*, 43(1),96.
- Naik, A. R. (2015). A Study on Locus of Control among College Students of Gulbarga City. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology* .ISSN 2348-5396 (e) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (p) Volume 2, Issue 4.
- Natera, G., Herrejon, M. E., & Casco, M. (1988). Locus of control in couples with different patterns of alcohol consumption. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 22,179–186.
- Obziel, J. L., Obitz, F. W., & Keyson, M. (1972). General and specific perceived locus of control in alcoholics. *Psychological Reports*, 3, 957-958.
- Penar-Zadarko, B., Zadarko, E., Binkowska-Bury, M., & Januszewicz, P. (2008). Prevalence of tobacco smoking university students and health locus of control. *Przegląd lekarski*, 66(10), 705-708.
- Roberts, I. J., Leonard, K. E., & Senchak, M. (1992a). Alcohol use and the transition to marriage. Paper presented at the symposium on transitions in alcohol consumption: The Third Decade of Life, 21st Annual International Medical Advisory Conference, La Jolla, CA.
- Roberts, I. J., Leonard, K. E., & Senchak, M. (1992b). Changes in drinking patterns during a life transition: husbands and wives in their first year of marriage. Poster presented at the Annual Convention of the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy, Boston, MA.
- Rohsenow., & O’Leary. (1978). Locus of control research on alcoholic populations: a review. I. Development, scales, and treatment. *International Journal Addict*. 13 (1):55-78.
- Rotter, J.B. (1954). Social learning and clinical psychology. NY: Prentice-Hall.
- Savada, S. W., & Pak, W. (1994). Problem drinking and close relationships during the third decade of life. *Psychology of Addiction*, 8(4), 251-258.
- Singh., & Singh. (2010). Personality Characteristics, Locus of Control and Hostility among Alcoholics and Non-Alcoholics. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*. Vol. 3, No. 1.
- Theakston., Jennifer, A., Stewart., Sherry, H., Dawson., Marliese, Y., Knowlden, L., Sarah, A. B., & Lehman, D. R. (2004). Big-Five personality domains predict drinking motives. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37.5, 971-984.
- Weissbach, T. A., Volger, R. E., & Compton, J. V. (1976). Comments on the relationship between locus of control and alcohol abuse. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 32:484-6.
- Weissman, A. T., Vogler, E. R., & Compton, J. V. (1976). Comments on the Relationship between locus of control and alcohol abuse. *Journal of clinical Psychology*, Vol 32, No.2.
- Zimbardo, P. G. (1985). *Psychology and Life* (11<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

### Acknowledgements

The authors profoundly appreciate all the people who have successfully contributed in ensuring this paper is in place. Their contributions are acknowledged however their names cannot be able to be mentioned.

**An Exploration of Locus of Control among Substance Abusers and Non Abusers: A Comparative Study in Kashmir**

***Conflict of Interest***

The authors carefully declare this paper to bear not conflict of interests

**How to cite this article:** S.A. Andrabi, M.R. Dhobi, and S. Akther. (2019). An Exploration of Locus of Control among Substance Abusers and Non Abusers: A Comparative Study in Kashmir. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 7(1), 373-382, DIP:18.01.042/20190701, DOI:10.25215/0701.042