SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Stress is a major threat to employee well-being and performance and an inescapable aspect of modern working life. A large number of studies have dealt with the relationship of occupational/organizational stress with various indicators of well-being. In addition to other findings, these studies show that (i) the magnitude of the relationship between occupational/organizational stress and well-being varies with the occupation related differences, type of role stress studied, the nature of well-being indicators and coping measure, and (ii) the magnitude of such an association is by and large on the lower side. Since a large amount of variance remains to be accounted for, the primary research focus in recent years has shifted from main effect models to more complex moderator models which assume that stressful experiences have a deleterious impact on well-being/health only under specific individual differences - genetic, acquired and dispositional. The moderating dispositional variables include locus of control, extraversion-introversion, neuroticism, sex-role orientation, positive job attitudes, Type-A behaviour and coping strategies/styles (Pareek 1993, Pestonjee, 1992; Sharma, 1988). Coping strategies (or styles), as the accumulated evidence suggests, plays a major role in an individual's physical and psychological well-being when he or she is confronted with life/occupational stress. Over the past decade, the
proliferation of research on coping is representative of the importance that coping is seen to play in mediating between antecedent stressful events and outcomes such as anxiety, depression, psychological distress and somatic complaints. If there is a consensus in the coping literature, it is on the important distinction between emotion-focused and problem-focused coping. The understanding of these two basic coping modes is that problem focused coping refers to a task orientation, whereas emotion-focused coping strategies refer to person orientation. Avoidance coping can include either person oriented strategies or task oriented strategies. An individual can avoid a particular stressful situation by seeking out other people or by engaging in another task rather than the task at hand. Those making greater use of avoidance- coping relative to the total coping effort have avoidance as a dominant coping style. Likewise, those making greater use of approach coping relative to the total coping effort have approach as a dominant coping style. A number of studies in the West and a few in India (mostly on male groups) have shown that approach-coping markedly alleviated and avoidance-coping strategies intensified the harmful effects of occupational/organizational stress on well-being/health. It is becoming increasingly important to study/evaluate the stresses, well-being problems and coping styles of female professionals within a male dominated work environment. Because coping is linked to psychological functioning it offers a potential point for intervention for counsellors.
The present study examined the relation of organizational role stress and psychological well-being (negative indicators: anger, trait-anxiety and depression; positive indicators: job satisfaction and general well-being) and also the moderating effect of approach-avoidance coping strategies in respect of a sample of 200 female secondary school teachers.

A. OBJECTIVES

I. To determine the nature and magnitude of the relationship of perceived organizational role stress with negative indicators (anger-expression; anger-out, anger-in, anger-control, trait-anxiety and depression) and positive indicators (job satisfaction, on-the-job satisfaction, off-the-job satisfaction and general well-being) of psychological well-being.

II. To determine the moderating effects of the coping strategies (avoidance and approach) on the direction or the strength of the relationship between organizational role stress with negative indicators (anger-expression; anger-out, anger-in, anger-control, trait-anxiety and depression) and positive indicators (job satisfaction, on-the-job satisfaction, off-the-job satisfaction and general well-being) of psychological well-being.
III. To determine the differences between the coping strategies (avoidance and approach) with respect to the organizational role stress, negative indicators (anger-expression; anger-out, anger-in, anger-control, trait-anxiety and depression) and positive indicators (job satisfaction, on the job-satisfaction, off-the-job satisfaction and general well-being) of psychological well-being.

IV. To determine the differences in the effects of sub coping strategies (avoidance-internality, avoidance-externality, approach-internality, approach-externality) with respect to organizational role stress, negative indicators (anger-expression; anger-out, anger-in, anger-control, trait-anxiety and depression) and positive indicators (job satisfaction, on-the-job satisfaction, off-the-job satisfaction and general well-being) of psychological well-being.

B. HYPOTHESES

I.A The relationship Organizational Role Stress with the negative indicators (anger-expression; anger-out, anger-in, anger-control, trait-anxiety and depression) of Psychological well-being will be positive.

I B. The relationship of Organizational Role Stress with the
positive indicators (job satisfaction, on-the-Job satisfaction, off-the-job satisfaction and general well-being) of Psychological Well-Being will be negative.

II. Coping strategies (Avoidance and Approach) will have a moderating effect, in that these will influence the direction or strength of the relationships between organizational role stress with negative indicators (anger-expression; trait-anxiety, depression) and positive indicators (Job satisfaction, general well-being) of Psychological well-being.

III.A The teachers in the avoidance coping group will score higher on organizational role stress and negative indicators of psychological well-being (anger-expression; anger-out, anger-in, anger-control, trait-anxiety, depression) as compared to their approach coping counterparts.

III.B The teachers in the avoidance coping group will score lower on positive indicators of psychological well-being (job satisfaction, on-the-job satisfaction, off-the-job satisfaction and general well-being) as compared to their approach coping counterparts.

IV. Stress sub coping strategies (avoidance-internality,
avoidance-externality, approach-internality and approach-externality) will have differential effects on organizational role stress, its components and psychological well-being as indexed by its negative indicators (anger-expression, trait-anxiety and depression) and positive indicators (job satisfaction and general well-being) of psychological well being.

C. SAMPLE

200 female secondary school teachers (Mdn age: 39 yrs) participated in this study on voluntary basis and these teachers worked in state owned schools located at Shimla town (H.P.)

D. TOOLS USED

(a) Organizational Role Stress scale (Pareek, 1981, 1983).

(b) Anger Expression (Ax) Scale (Spielberger, 1986; Krishna, 1988; Rana, 1990)

(c) Hindi version of A-Trait scale of State-Trait-Anxiety Inventory (STAI, Spielberger, Sharma & Singh, 1973).

(d) Zung Self-Rating Depression Scale (Zung, 1965).

(e) S.O. Employees' Inventory (SOEI Pestonjee, 1981).

(f) PGI general Well-Being Scale (Verma, Dubey & Gupta, 1983).

(g) Role PICS (O) (Pareek, 1983)
E. **PROCEDURE**

All measuring instruments were administered individually to all respondents under standard conditions/instructions. The order of the presentation of the measure was as follows: ORS scale, anger expression (Ax) scale, T-Anxiety scale of STAI, Zung's depression scale, S-D Employees' inventory, PGI general well being scale and Role PICS(O). The scoring of each measure was carried out with the help of standard scoring keys as provided in respective manuals.

F. **STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED**

The data were processed with the help of Pearson product moment correlation, partial correlation, sub group analyses and chi square analyses (see Barron & Kenny, 1986; Zedeck, 1971).

G. **FINDINGS**

**I Organizational role stress (ORS) and Indicators of Psychological Well Being (PWB).**

(i) A positive significant relationship emerged between organizational role stress and negative indicators of psychological well-being (PWB) i.e., anger-out and anger-control dimension of anger-expression, trait-anxiety and depression.

(ii) There was a significantly negative relationship between organizational role stress with positive indicators of PWB i.e overall job satisfaction, its on the job and off the job facets and general well-being.
II. Dominant Coping strategies, Organizational Role Stress (ORS) and Psychological Well-Being (PWB)

(i) Negative Indicators of Psychological Well-Being

In case of avoidance copers, organizational role stress was strongly and positively related to anger-out and to a lesser degree to anger-in and anger control. With respect to the approach copers, there was a decrease in the magnitude of organizational role stress with anger-out and a change in the direction of association of organizational role stress with anger-in and anger-control.

Further the organizational role stress was more strongly and positively related to higher trait-anxiety and depression in case of avoidance copers. However, a significant reversal was observed for the relationship of organizational role stress with measures of trait-anxiety and depression in case of approach copers.

The findings demonstrated that the use of avoidance (dysfunctional) and approach (functional) coping strategies markedly alter the strength and/or the direction of the association between perceived role stress and the negative indicators of psychological well-being (anger-expression, trait-anxiety and depression). Thus it could be said that the coping strategies (avoidance/approach) moderated the relationship between organizational role stress and negative indicators of psychological well-being.

(ii) Positive Indicators of Psychological Well-Being

In the case of the group using avoidance as a dominant
mode of coping, the organizational role stress was strongly and negatively related with the total job satisfaction and its two facets (on-the-job satisfaction and off-the-job satisfaction). Likewise organizational role stress had a highly negative and significant relationship with overall well-being.

On the contrary, in the case of the group using approach as a dominant mode of coping there was a reversal in the direction of association of organizational role stress and the positive indicators of psychological well-being. The organizational role stress was positively related to the total job satisfaction and one of its facets i.e., off-the-job satisfaction. Further overall well-being was also positively and significantly related to organizational role stress.

As was the case with the negative indicators of psychological well-being, in case of the positive indicators of psychological well-being also a complete reversal of the direction of the relationship of organizational role stress with psychological well-being was observed, indicating clearly the moderating role of coping strategies in case of organizational role stress-psychological well-being (ORS-PWB) connection. Specifically approach (functional) coping was associated with better psychological well-being while avoidance (dysfunctional) coping was associated with lower psychological well-being.
III. Differences on Organizational Role Stresses and Psychological Well-Being in respect of Avoidance Copers and Approach Copers

(i) The avoidance coping group reported a higher organizational role stress as compared to its approach coping counterpart. Thus the former group perceived significantly more organizational role stress (overall and componentwise) than the latter group.

These findings are further supported by the chi square analysis which showed that the greater use of avoidance coping relative to the total coping effort was evident in the higher organizational role stress group while more frequent use of approach coping was evident in the lower organizational role stress group.

(ii) The avoidance coping group had significantly higher anger-out than its approach coping counterpart. Thus the avoidance copers tended to make greater use of anger-cut than the approach copers. Moreover the avoidance coping group scored significantly higher on trait-anxiety and depression than its approach coping counterpart, thereby showing that the former experienced more trait-anxiety and depression than the latter group.

These findings are also supported by two separate chi square analyses which revealed a significantly greater use of avoidance coping relative to the total coping effort in higher trait-anxiety and higher depression groups or significantly more frequent use of approach coping in lower trait-anxiety and lower depression groups.
The avoidance coping group reported a lower total job satisfaction, its two facets (on-the-job satisfaction and off-the-job satisfaction) as well as general well-being than its approach coping counterpart.

The 2x2 chi square analyses also revealed a greater use of approach coping relative to the total coping effort in higher job satisfaction group and general well-being group or a more frequent use of avoidance coping in the lower job satisfaction and lower general well-being groups. When taken together, the preceding analyses in terms of partial correlations and sub-group comparisons amply demonstrated that the use of avoidance coping strategies markedly intensified and the use of approach coping strategies attenuated the adverse effects of organizational role stress on psychological well-being.

IV. Differences on Organizational Role Stress (ORS) and Psychological Well-Being in respect of Avoidance Sub Coping Strategies (Avoidance Internality, Avoidance-Externality) and Approach sub coping strategies (Approach-Internality, Approach-Externality).

(i) There were no significant differences between the two avoidance sub coping groups (avoidance-internality and avoidance-externality) with respect to total organizational role stress and also its components.

Like wise there were no significant differences between
the two approach sub-coping groups (approach-internality and approach-externality) with respect to total organizational role stress. However the approach-externality group reported higher resource inadequacy component of organizational role stress than its approach-internality counterpart.

This implied that splitting the avoidance and approach coping groups in terms of internality and externality vis-a-vis organizational role stress did not provide any significant information and therefore internality/externality or locus of control (LOC) as operationalized by Pareek (1993) does not appear to be a significant factor.

(ii) There were no significant differences between the two avoidance sub-groups (avoidance internality, avoidance-externality) with respect to the two indices of anger-expression (anger-in, anger-control), trait-anxiety and depression. However the avoidance-internality group scored higher on anger-out as compared to its avoidance-externality counterpart. Similarly there were also no significant differences between the two approach sub coping groups (approach-internality, and approach-externality), with respect to anger-out and anger-in. However, approach-externality group reported higher anger-control as compared to its approach-internality counterpart. Further no significant differences between these two groups were observed on trait-anxiety and depression.

(iii) There were no significant differences between
the two avoidance sub coping groups (avoidance-internality, avoidance-externality) with respect to the positive indicators of psychological well-being i.e., job satisfaction and its facets (on-the-job satisfaction, off-the-job satisfaction). However avoidance-externality coping group had higher general well-being than its avoidance-internality counterpart.

Likewise there were no significant differences between the two approach sub coping groups (approach-internality, approach-externality) with respect to job satisfaction, its two facets (on-the-job satisfaction, off the job satisfaction) as well as general well-being.

Barring a couple of indicators of psychological well-being the further categorization of either avoidance or approach copers in terms of their internality or externality orientations did not provide significant and differential effects on various indicators of psychological well-being.

(iv) Avoidance-internality group had a higher score on total organizational role stress and its components than the approach internality group (with internality kept identical for both the groups).

Likewise avoidance-externality group scored higher on total organizational role stress and its components than approach-externality group (with externality kept identical for both the
These findings are similar to those with avoidance and approach dominant coping strategies where highly significant differences were seen in terms of organizational role stress and its components. Therefore the internal/external orientation of the locus of control did not alter the general trend of findings which were observed with the avoidance and approach coping groups.

(v) There were no significant differences between avoidance-internality and approach-internality with respect to anger-in. However Avoidance-internal group had higher anger-out and anger-control than its approach internality counterpart. Moreover, avoidance-internality group scored higher on both trait-anxiety and depression (with internality kept identical for both the groups).

The two groups (avoidance-externality, approach-externality) did not differ significantly on any dimension of anger-expression (anger-out, anger-in, anger-control). However avoidance-externality group had higher trait-anxiety and depression than its approach externality counterpart (with externality kept identical for both the groups).

In this case also the findings with the internality/externality component when added to the avoidance or approach coping groups are somewhat similar to those reported for avoidance and approach modes of coping disregarding the locus of
control orientation.

(vi) The approach-internality group scored significantly higher on the two facets of job satisfaction, (on-the-job satisfaction, off-the-job satisfaction) and general well-being than its avoidance-internality counterpart (with internality kept identical for both the groups).

The approach-externality group had a higher score on all positive indicators psychological well-being i.e., job satisfaction, its two facets (on-the-job satisfaction and off-the-job satisfaction) as well as general well-being, than its avoidance externality, counterpart (with externality kept as identical for both the groups).

However, the internal/external orientation of the locus of control (LOC) did not alter the general trend of findings which have been observed with avoidance and approach coping groups.

The non-significant trends of findings in terms of sub-coping strategies could probably be due to the sample size taken in the present study which resulted in smaller sub-groups with respect to sub-coping strategies. Moreover, studies are inconsistent regarding locus of control vis-a-vis stress and well-being in Western and Indian contexts.

The findings have been discussed in the light of earlier
research and suggestions for future research and implications of the present research have also been provided.

IMPLICATIONS

This study confirmed on a sample of female school teacher that effective strategies, in general are approach strategies, which confront the problem of organizational stress as a challenge, and increase the capability of dealing with it. In this category of coping persons face the reality of stress consciously, take some action to solve the problems themselves or with the help of other people. These active approaches, are termed as 'functional' styles of dealing with stressful situations and are also more approved by behavioral scientists as these have been empirically documented to be more effective and healthy when compared to avoidance (dysfunctional styles), the latter are passive strategies where persons decide to suffer from, accept or deny the experienced stress, or put the blame on somebody (self or others) or on something for being in that stressful situation. In addition, Pareek (1993) has discussed in details as to how one can overcome self role distance through "role integration"; interrole distance through role negotiation; role stagnation through "role transition", role isolation through "role linkage"; role ambiguity through "role clarification"; role expectation conflict through "role making"; role overload through "role slimming"; role erosion through "role development"; resource inadequacy through "resource generation" and personal inadequacy
through "role linkage". All the above functional strategies can be made a part of stress management package involving channelizing stress toward productive purposes, preparing role occupants to understand the nature of stress, helping them to understand their strengths and usual styles, and equipping them to develop approach strategies for coping with stress. In other words, when female or male professionals seek counselling for organizational role stress or work related stress, careful attention to the pattern of coping strategy is warranted. Because peer and supervisor support is important, the possibility that organizational support is distributed unequally to men and women must be explored. Further, counselors ought to facilitate exploration of the values and beliefs generally reflected in female professionals' concern with interpersonal conflicts and develop efficacious interventions.

LIMITATIONS

The sample of the present study comprised female secondary school teachers working in and around Shimla town of Himachal Pradesh and consequently the rural based teachers were not included. The role stresses and coping styles were assessed through Pareek's Organizational Role Stress Scales (ORS Scales) and Role Pics (O) respectively, both these instruments have been standardized primarily for use with professionals in Industrial organizations so as to match/assess coping styles in relation to ten organizational
roles. The role Pics (0) — a semi projective instrument was preferred to self report coping Inventories. Nevertheless, it will be more useful in case teacher specific stresses are identified and content analyzed to arrive at a more comprehensive view of their unique stresses in their work environment and consequent coping strategies (functional and dysfunctional). Lastly the findings of this study highlight the moderating influence of avoidance and approach coping styles on perceived organizational stress and its subsequent consequences on psychological well-being. More important, however, are mediating variables for they address to the question of *HOW* and *WHY* such effects occur. The present attempt, like all the related previous investigations, could not address itself to such a *process* explanation.