CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

In the previous chapter results of the present investigation have been recorded based on the statistical analyses. Different types of Role Stress were treated as dependent variables. Extraversion and Neuroticism, Managerial Talent, Motivational Climate in the organisation and demographic variables of Age and Work Experience were treated as independent variables. Each independent variable was analysed at two levels i.e. higher vs lower (cutting point = median value). In case of Extraversion and Neuroticism, groups were formed on the basis of standard scoring key. The executives who had a score of more than or equal to 10 on Extraversion were designated as 'Extraverts', whereas the executive who had a score of less than 10 were labelled as 'Introverts'. Similarly the executives who had a score of more than or equal to 10 were considered/treated as 'Neurotics' and those who had a score of less than 10 were considered to be 'Stables'. The two groups in respect of every independent variable were compared (two tail 't' test) to see if they differed significantly from one another in their perception of different types of Role Stress as well as of total Role Stress. Correlation analyses were performed to find out if there existed significant relationships between
independent and dependent variables. Factor analysis was performed mainly with the purpose to work out (i) the best combinations for multiple regression analyses, (ii) to explore the construct validity of the various tools used, and (iii) to prove the factorial independence of these tools. Finally, the multiple regression analyses were performed to establish cause and effect relationship between dependent and independent variables and also to find out the individual, the joint and the comparative contributions of personality, situational and demographic variables in explaining the variance in the perception of different types of Role Stress as well as the Total Role Stress.

6.1. Descriptive Analyses

6.1.1. Extraversion and Neuroticism as variables in Role Stress:

The findings on the basis of comparisons of groups are summarised below:

(i) Extraverts and Introverts differed significantly in their perception of Resource Inadequacy, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Overload, Inter Role Distance, Role Isolation, Personal Inadequacy, Role Ambiguity and Total Role Stress. Extraverts tended to score lower on these types of Role Stress as compared to Introverts i.e. Extraverts perceived
different types of Role Stress to be of lower degree as compared to their Introverted counterparts. However, Extraverts and Introverts did not differ significantly in their perception of Role Stagnation, Role Erosion and Self Role Distance (vide table 2.1, p. 136)

(ii) Neurotics and Stables differed significantly from one another in their perception of all types of Role Stress as well as Total Role Stress. Neurotics perceived all types of Role Stress to be of higher degree than their Stable counterparts (vide table 2.2, p. 137)

On the basis of these directional indications it is concluded that whereas the Extraversion affected the perception of Role Stress in a negative direction, i.e., higher the Extraversion, lower were the different types of Role Stresses; Neuroticism affected it in a positive direction, i.e. higher the Neuroticism, greater were the different types of Role Stress (indices of low well-being).

There are no direct studies concerning group comparisons in relation to these personality dimensions and different types of Role Stress. But there are studies which have investigated, group differences in relation to various 'Strain' experienced by the employees in a work
The relationships between stress and strains (response to stress) are well-established in research literature (see chapter 3). Eyesenck (1976) observed that Introversion was a factor in mental ill health. Heilzer (1975) suggested that Neurotic-Introversion and Impulsive-Extraversion represented the most common maladjustment dimensions. Hallam (1976) found his phobic patients to be Introverts. Consistent group differences were reported in studies relating depression and Introversion (e.g., Bianchi & Fergusson, 1977; Eyesenck, White & Eyesenck, 1976; Pollitt, 1975). Earlier Prusoff (1973) reported that hysterical personalities were more Extraverted, oral dependent personalities were more Introverted, and obsessive personalities were in between. Studies have shown suicide attempters to be Introverted. Eastwood, Henderson and Montgomery (1972) found that 92 attempters were Introverted, Neurotic and hostile in comparison to standardised norms for the general population. Similar were the findings in studies by Pallis and Birtchnell (1976), Pallis and Jenkins (1977). Black (1972) in his review of literature suggested that psychopathic group was higher in both Extraversi-on and Neuroticism. However, with adult prisoners a minority of the studies were supportive of the theory, with one actually indicating that prisoners were more introverted than normals. Although the findings of studies concerning
the relationship of Extraversion and Criminality are more consistent in showing higher Extraversion scores in criminals than in normals, there continues to be a mixture of negative findings in the literature (e.g. Burgess, 1972; Hughes and Johnson, 1975; Heskin, Bolton, Banister and Smith, 1977). Extraversion was reported to be a factor in smoking, generally considered as a behavioural symptom of high stress (e.g. Smith, 1969; Rustin, Kittel, Dramaix, Karnitzer & De Backer, 1978; Cherry & Kiernan, 1976). But Bloch (1972) found no differences between smokers and non-smokers on Extraversion under stress situation. Revelle, Amaral and Turiff (1976) argued that Extraverts smoked more and drink more coffee in stressful situations not to reduce stress or anxiety but rather to increase concentration and arousal to the level at which they can perform best. Introverts, who might smoke for the tranquilizing effects of nicotine on their high arousal levels, have nothing to gain from the arousing effects of caffeine intake. Similarly, the findings are mixed and inconsistent in case of alcoholics as related to Extraversion-Introversion (e.g. Holland, 1977; Lorefice, Steer, Fine & Schut, 1976; Ciotola & Peterson, 1976; Dewinne & Johnson, 1976).

Although the findings are mixed and inconsistent, yet there is enough evidence to believe that these dimensions of personality are the significant factors in the perception of task based stress (Lawler, 1971). This proposition can
be well extended to the perception of different types of Role Stress as is indicated in the present study. It is apparent that there are no direct studies on these variables vis-a-vis stress at work.

6.1.2. Managerial Talent as a Variable in Role Stress:

In the present study, Managerial Talent consisted of six dimensions, namely, Supervisory Ability, Intelligence, Self Assurance, Decisiveness, Achievement Motivation and Self Actualization. As the trend of the findings was almost same (vide tables 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 & 2.8) for all the dimensions, the findings are being reported collectively as they were related to overall index of Managerial Talent:

The executives who had different level (higher vs lower) of Managerial Talent differed significantly in their perception of Personal Inadequacy, Role Overload, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Ambiguity, Role Isolation, Resource Inadequacy, Inter Role Distance, Self Role Distance, Role Stagnation and Total Role Stress. The executives who were higher on Managerial Talent tended to perceive these types of Role Stress to be of a lesser degree as compared to their counterparts with lower Managerial Talent. However, these two groups did not differ significantly in their perception of Role Erosion (vide Table 2.9, P > .05).
Once again directly related studies on such group differences are not available, however, there is enough evidence on the importance of abilities, personality traits and motivation in stress research. For example, McGrath (1976) suggested that in comparing two individuals, identical except for ability, the individual with more ability should have less stress than the individual with less ability, because he should perceive less uncertainties in dealing with the same conditions of opportunities constraints and/or demand. Salancik and Pfeffer (1975) argued that knowledge of an individual's needs and values whether inna-te or learned via social information processing facilitate understanding and prediction of whether the individual will experience stress from a perception of an opportunity, constraint or demand and the importance of the resolution of that stress.

It is, therefore, concluded that Managerial Talent was a significant factor in perception of all types of Role Stress except for Role Erosion. Higher the Managerial Talent, lower was the degree of the perception of the different types of Role Stress. Since no study in India has considered these important variables i.e. Managerial Talent vis-a-vis occupational job or organisational role stress. It is, therefore, essential that future studies ought to include this important variable not only as a
correlate but also as a predictor of stresses of different kinds in various occupational groups.

6.1.3. **Motivational Climate as a Variable in Role Stress:**

The findings are summarized below:-

(i) The executives (higher vs lower) in respect of Achievement, Expert power and Affiliation dimensions of Motivational Climate differed significantly in their perception of all types of Role Stress. The executive who perceived climate to be highly Achievement, Expert Power and Affiliation-oriented, tended to perceive all the types of Role Stress as well as the Total Role Stress to be of lower degree as compared to their counterparts who perceived climate to be less Achievement, Expert Power and Affiliation-oriented (vide Tables 2.10, p.150; 2.11, p.151; 2.14, p.156).

(ii) The executives (higher vs lower) in respect of control and Dependency dimensions of Motivational Climate differed significantly in their perception of all the types of Role Stress as well as Total Role Stress. The executives who perceived climate to be highly Control and Dependency-oriented, tended to perceive all the types of Role Stress as well as Total Role Stress to be of higher degree as compared to their counterparts who perceived Motivational Climate to be less Control and Dependency-oriented. Thus the direction of difference got reversed in this case. (vide Tables 2.13, p.154; 2.15, p.160)
(iii) Two groups of the executives (higher vs lower) in respect of Extension dimension of Motivational Climate differed significantly in their perception of only Role Overload, Role Isolation, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Ambiguity and Inter Role Distance and Total Role Stress. The executives who perceived the Motivational Climate to be highly Extension-oriented perceived these Role Stresses to be of lower degree than their counterparts who perceived Motivational Climate to be less Extension-oriented. Thus the Extension dimension of Motivational Climate turned out to be significant factor only in the case of a few Role Stresses. However, the executives did not differ significantly in their perception of Resource Inadequacy, Role Stagnation, Role Erosion and Personal Inadequacy (vide Table 2.12, P < 0.05).

Once again there is no direct study that dealt with such group difference on Motivational Climate. However, Pestonjee and Singh (1982) studied these group differences as they were related to job satisfaction. They found that Achievement, Extension, Control and Expert Power dimensions of Motivational Climate predicted the perception of on-the-job, off-the-job as well as overall index of job satisfaction. However, they did not find significant results with Affiliation and Dependency dimensions of Motivational Climate. This highlighted the importance of considering the dimensions of Motivational Climate separately. The negative relationships between Role Ambiguity, Role Conflict and job
satisfaction is well established (Sharma, 1988). A few studies have dealt with some dimensions of organisational climate and their relationships with other indices of well-being (e.g. Franklin, 1975; Gemill, 1972; Invancevich & Donnelly, 1970; Litwin & Stringer, 1968), and have highlighted their role in psychological well-being.

To conclude, on the basis of such an analysis it can be only said that there are significant differences in the perception of Role Stress due to variation in the perception of different dimensions of Motivational Climate, of course, no cause-effect generalisations can be made at this stage.

6.1.4. **Age and Work Experience as Factors in Role Stress:**

Following were the findings:

(i) The executives in the two age groups (higher or vs lower) differed significantly in their perception of Role Stagnation, Inter Role Distance, Role Erosion and Total Role Stress. The executives with higher Age perceived all these Role Stresses to be of higher degree than the executives with lower Age. However, they did not differ significantly in their perception of Self Role Distance, Role Expectation Conflict, Personal Inadequacy, Role Overload, Role Ambiguity, Resource Inadequacy and Role Isolation (vide Table 2.16, p 160).
(ii) The executives with two categories of Work Experience (higher vs lower) differed significantly in their perception of Role Stagnation, Inter Role Distance, Self Role Distance and Total Role Stress. The executives with longer Work Experience perceived these Role Stresses to be of higher degree than their counterparts who were lower in their Work Experience. However, in these two groups the differences in respect of Role Expectation Conflict, Role Ambiguity, Resource Inadequacy, Personal Inadequacy, Role Overload, Role Erosion and Role Isolation were not statistically significant (vide Table 2.17, p.167).

McGrath (1976) suggested the importance of Work Experience in his paradigm for stress research. He postulated that past experience in the form of familiarity with the situation, past exposure to the stressor condition and/or practice or training in response to deal with the situation can operate to effect the level of subjectively experienced stress from a given situation or to modify reactions to that stress.

Natha (1980) found that mean scores of Role Conflict decreased as the length of service increased. The difference in subjects' mean scores of Role Conflict, in regard to all categories of Job Tenure (High, Medium, Low) were significant at each level of organizational hierarchy. Jick and Murray (1982) similarly posed that decision makers who have had minimal past experience with budget cuts of a similar nature and extent will be more likely to perceive them as reverse
crises and thus likely to experience more felt anxiety. Support for this hypothesis was also found by Dunbar and Goldberg (1978); Starbuck et al. (1978); and Anderson et al. (1977).

However, the findings of the present study are not consistent with earlier research. This may perhaps be due to the nature and type of the stresses studied. The differences were significant and in contradiction to the existing research with respect to Role Erosion, Role Stagnation and Self Role Distance. The nature of these types of stress is such that with the increase in age and concomitant increase in work experience, they also tend to increase. This is understandable in the present socio-cultural and work contexts since aspirations are going up with greater speed than the available opportunities.

Taken as a whole, it can be concluded that personality dimensions of Extraversion and Neuroticism, Managerial Talent, Motivational Climate in the Organization and Age/Work Experience turned out to be important factors in the perception of different types of Organizational Role Stress. However, a wider dispersal of Age/Work Experience might provide different results. The efficacy of such tentative conclusions will have to be tested across occupational groups.
6.2. Correlation Analyses

6.2.1. Extraversion and Neuroticism as related to Role Stress:

The findings are summarised below:-

(i) Significant negative relationships emerged between Extraversion on the one hand and Resource Inadequacy, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Overload, Inter Role Distance, Role Isolation, Role Ambiguity and Total Role Stress on the other. But Extraversion did not relate significantly with Role Stagnation and Self Role Distance (vide Table 3.1, p. 166).

(ii) There was no significant relationship between Neuroticism and any of the types of Role Stress as well as the Total Role Stress. (vide Table 3.1, p. 166)

As highlighted earlier, direct studies are not available regarding the relationships between Extraversion and Neuroticism on the one hand and different types of Role Stress on the other. But there are a few studies concerning the relationships between these personality dimensions and various measures of strain viz. job dissatisfaction, job anxiety, tension, depression, boredom and mental ill health (all indices of felt stress or its concomitants). A significant aspect of stress is its cognitive appraisal, and this determines stress response. Such perceptions have been observed to be influenced by Extraversion and Neuroticism. For example, Rim (1977) reported that peoples' perceptions
on the degree of significance of their work were influenced by Extraversion. Eysenck (1976) also found a positive relationship between Introversion and mental ill health. Positive relationship has also been found between Introversion and depression on the one hand and Extraversion and mania on the other by some researchers (e.g. Bianchi and Fergusson, 1977; Eysenck, 1976). However, Hill (1975) reported no relationship between Extraversion and the amount of boredom experienced by the workers engaged in simple, repetitive tasks. Studies have also indicated that the differences of Extroversion and Introversion dimensions within psychic groups bear some relationships to the symptomatology and severity of the disorder (Verm & Eysenck, 1973; Armstrong, Johnson & Holmes, 1977). Positive relationship was also indicated between Extraversion and hostility and between Extraversion and aggression (e.g. Brand, 1972; Edmunds, 1977). Hill (1975) found Neurotics to be negatively related with degree of boredom experienced on job. However, a general conclusion from such can be that either the findings are inconclusive or they vary with the nature of work, task difficulty and stimulation/stimulation in task setting (Baird, 1976; Cooper & Payne, 1969; Iwanecich, 1979; Vijay-Kumar, 1983; Stewart, 1972). For example, Hammer and Organ (1978) suggested that the nature of task to be performed may interact with the extraversion dimension of personality in terms of worker- responses. This means that
what is important is not personality *per se* but its interaction with the situational factors.

The findings of the present investigation are somewhat in contradiction to those already reported in the literature. In this study, Neuroticism dimension of personality did not correlate significantly with any of the Role Stresses. But the inverse relationship between Extraversion and different types of Role Stress was unexpected (see Verma, 1983). Unfortunately, the subjects of the present study were not widely scattered on either Extraversion or Neuroticism continua. Larger groups, however, might provide significant results.

6.2.2. Managerial Talent as related to Role Stress:

(i) There were significant, negative relationships between all the dimensions of Managerial Talent and all the types of Role Stress as well as the Total Role Stress except for Role Stagnation, Role Erosion and Self Role Distance (vide Table 3.2, p. 168).

(ii) Only the Intelligence and Achievement Motivation dimensions of Managerial Talent had significant, negative relationships with Role Stagnation. The other dimensions had non-significant relationship with Role Stagnation (vide Table 3.2, p. 168).
(iii) Self Role Distance had a significant, negative relationship only with Supervisory Ability dimension of Managerial Talent. The relationships were non-significant with all the other dimensions of Managerial Talent (vide Table 3.2, p. 168).

(iv) There were non-significant relationships between Role Erosion and all the dimensions of Managerial Talent (vide Table 3.2, p. 168).

(v) Managerial Talent (the Overall Index) had significant, negative relationships with all the types of Role Stress and with Total Role Stress except for Role Stagnation, Role Erosion and Self Role Distance.

It is apparent that the relationship of Managerial Talent (taken as a whole or dimensionwise) was associated with less Role Stresses, but the magnitude of the association varied with the nature of the Role Stress.

In the research literature, abilities, traits and motivations have largely been treated as moderator and not correlational variables of stress-strain-well-being relationship. Studies, so far, have dealt with some aspects that are covered under Managerial Talent. For example, Sales (1970) and French and Caplan (1973) demonstrated that both Role Overload, an aspect of Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity were negatively related to self-esteem.
Additionally, Beehr (1970) found Role Ambiguity to be associated with low self-esteem as well as depressed mood. These relationships may be extended to other traits, abilities and motivations as there was a very high, positive relationship between the various dimensions of Managerial Talent (vide Table 3.3, P. 172). It is apparent that a comprehensive index of Managerial Talent vis-a-vis Role Stress has not been considered so far. Moreover, it is essential to consider a wider variety of Role Stresses.

6.2.3. **Motivational Climate as related to Role Stress:**

The findings are summarised below:-

(i) There were significant, positive relationships between Affiliation and Expert Power dimensions of Motivational Climate on the one hand and all the types of Role Stress and Total Role Stress on the other hand (vide Table 3.4, p. 173).

(ii) There were significant positive relationships between Achievement dimension of Motivational Climate and all the types of Role Stress and Total Role Stress except for Self Role Distance (vide Table 3.4, p. 173).

(iii) There were significant, inverse relationships between Control and Dependency dimensions of Motivational Climate and all the types of Role Stress as well as Total Role Stress (vide Table 3.4, p. 173).
(iv) Extension dimension of Motivational Climate had no significant relationship with any of the types of Role Stress and Total Role Stress (vide Table 3.4, p. 173).

It must be noted here that the higher score on any dimension of Motivational Climate indicated the lack of that Climate or vice-versa; whereas the higher score on different types of Role Stress indicated the prevalence of greater Stress or vice-versa. Thus a positive relationship indicated higher stress and lack of particular climate; negative relationship indicated lower stress and prevalence of Motivational Climate. In a study conducted on 32 managerial staff of Bharat Engineering Ltd., Brahmmam and Pareek (1981) found significant relationships between Achievement, Dependency, Extension and Expert Power Climate and Role Efficacy. They reported significant positive relationships between Affiliation and Control Climate and Role Efficacy. The data indicated two clusters of Motivational Climate as observed in our study, however, there is different clustering of dimensions. Later, Das (1982) found negative relationships between anxiety-based stress and power in group, group support, open communication in group and knowledge-based risk taking. Earlier, Oaklander and Fleishman (1964) reported a negative relationship between consideration dimension of leadership and intraunit stress in three hospitals. Later, Morris, Steers and Koch (1979) also found significant negative relationships between Role Conflict/Role Ambiguity and
Participation in decision making and formalisation. They further showed significant positive relationships between Role Conflict and Supervisory span, work group size and span of subordination. A significant positive relationship was also found between span of subordination and Role Ambiguity. Bedeian, Armenakis and Curran (1981) also documented negative relationships between Role Ambiguity/Role Conflict and communication flow, decision making practices, concern for employee well-being and motivational conditions. There were also significant, negative relationships between Role Ambiguity/Role Conflict and supervisory support, supervisory goal emphasis, supervisory work facilitation and supervisory interaction facilitation. Earlier Rizza, Lirtzman and House (1970) reported that formalisation was negatively related to Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity. Zalznik and Howard (1978) argued that if the individual experiences a sense of powerlessness in affecting organisational life, the susceptibility to stress seems to increase.

All these findings indicated that there was a significant relationship between Motivational/Organisational Climate or its dimensions and felt Stress. Favourable Climate had negative relationship and unfavourable Climate had positive relationship with different types of Organizational
Stress. In the present study the favourable climate comprised dominance of Achievement, Expert Power and Affiliation and lack of Control and Dependency. These findings in general were in agreement with earlier research. However, the non-significant relationship of Extension Climate with various types of Role Stress is not consistent with reported research. It appears that because marketing role is basically a field job, the executives are far less concerned with the developmental policies of organisational and more concerned about their relationships with their clients (dealers). Also, the marketing is a result-oriented role and as such Achievement dominant organizational culture is more relevant to their needs and job requirements.
6.7.4 Demographic Variables as related to Role Stress:

The relevant findings are summarised as under:

(i) There was a significant, positive relationship between Age and Role Stagnation. All the other relationships were non-significant (vide Table 3.5, p. 177).

(ii) There were significant positive relationships between work Experience and Role Stagnation, Inter Role Distance and Total Role Stress. All other relationships were non-significant (vide Table 3.5, p. 177).

Morris, Steers and Koch (1979) found significant, negative relationships between Age and Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity. But the relationships between Job Tenure on the one hand and Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity on the other were non-significant. Madhu and Harigopal (1980) reported a significant, positive relationship between Age and Role Conflict but the relationship of Age with Role Ambiguity was statistically non-significant. In this study, relationships between Job Tenure and Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity were reported to be non-significant. Singh, Agarwala and Malhan (1979) reported that the relationships between Age and Job Tenure on the one hand, and Intra-sender Role Conflict, Inter Sender Role Conflict, Inter Role Conflict and Person Role Conflict on the other hand were non-significant.

Blau (1981) on a sample of bus operators, found that Job
Stress factor of physical danger increased as the length of service increased; passenger intra-company stress decreased as the length of service increased. A careful perusal of the literature reveals that the direction of relationships depends upon the type of Role Stress, whereas certain types of Role Stress increase with the Age and Work Experience, others decrease and some remain unaffected. In this study, a strong positive relationship has been found between Age/Work Experience and Role Stagnation. It is understandable since the lack of career progression assumes greater stress-inducing properties with increasing Age and Work Experience. Other Role Stresses can also increase with these demographic factors, however, a wide scatter on these variables might show such trends.

So far we have dealt with either comparisons based on group differentiation (not very sharp) as well as on correlational analyses. This helped to identify more significant correlates (Extraversion, Managerial Talent, Motivational Climate, Age/Work Experience). However, such analyses did not warrant cause-effect generalization. Since the main objective of the present study was to predict various Role Stresses from such predictors, Multiple Regression Analyses were attempted. Prior to this, Factor Analysis was also employed to determine the factorial structure of different tools used
as well as to determine and to identify most plausible/relevant combinations for Multiple Regression Analyses.
6.3. **Factor Analysis**:  

Such analysis highlighted the following important issues:—  

(i) There was a complete factorial independence of all the tools used in the present study.  

(ii) Managerial Talent emerged to be a unidimensional concept (vide Table 4.5, p. [32]).  

(iii) Motivational Climate turned out to be bidimensional concept (vide Table 4.4, p. [33]).  

(iv) Different types of Role Stress were unique in nature as they did not form a cluster anywhere (vide Table 4.2, p. [31]). (Also see Pareek, 1983),  

(v) Managerial Talent, Organisational Climate and Demographic variables loaded differently on different types of Role Stress.  

(vi) Motivational Climate explained 27.43 per cent of the variance; Managerial Talent explained 26.93 per cent; Demographic variables explained 11.06 per cent, and Extraversion and Neuroticism explained 7.95 per cent of the total variance.  

(vii) 82.61 per cent of the Total variance in data was explained by personality, situational and demographic variables when taken together.
(viii) Extension Climate turned out to be a unique variable.

(ix) Self Role Distance and Role Erosion clustered at one place and they had inverse relationship with one another.
6.4. Regression Analyses:

6.4.1. Extraversion and Neuroticism as Predictors of Role Stress:

The findings were as follows:-

(i) Extraversion was a significant predictor of Resource Inadequacy, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Overload, Inter Role Distance, Role Isolation and Total Role Stress. But Extraversion was not a significant predictor of Role Stagnation, Role Erosion and Self Role Distance (vide Table 5, p. 138).

(ii) Neuroticism dimension of personality was not a significant predictor of any of the types of Role Stress as well as Total Role Stress.

Thus cause and effect relationships have been established. It can now be concluded that the executives who were higher on Extraversion perceived Resource Inadequacy, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Overload, Inter Role Distance, Role Isolation and Total Role Stress to be of lower degree as compared to the executives who were lower on Extraversion.

There is no study that considered Extraversion as an independent and Role Stress as the dependent variables. However, there are studies in which Extraversion and Neuroticism dimensions of personality have predicted the stress-strain-well-being relationship. Kahn and
Wolfe (1964) found that under a given role pressure the perceived amount of tension, trust and respect people experienced with their associates varied with the degree of Extraversion, with Introverted persons showing more tension, and less persons' trust and respect for associates under high pressure. People with high neuroticism have been shown to be characterised by a higher degree of sensitivity to environmental stress and a higher degree of tension experienced (Eysenck, 1965; Hamner & Organ, 1978). Thus there is an indication in literature that the Extraversion dimension of personality can be a predictor of the various types of Role Stress. The failure of Neuroticism to emerge as a significant predictor of Role Stresses was expected in view of the low coefficients of Correlation. This apparently resulted from the less number of executives in this group. Obviously, in view of this limitation this finding cannot be regarded as sound.

6.4.2. Managerial Talent as a Predictor of Role Stress:

(i) Managerial Talent was a significant predictor of Personal Inadequacy, Role Overload, Role Ambiguity, Resource Inadequacy, Role Isolation, Role Expectation Conflict, Self Role Distance, Role Stagnation and Total Role Stress. But it was not a significant predictor of Self Role Distance and Role Erosion (vide Table 6, p. 190).
It is concluded that executives who were higher on supervisory ability, intelligence, self assurance, decisiveness, achievement motivation and self actualisation, perceived various types of role stress to be of lower degree as compared to the executives who were lower on these dimensions of managerial talent. Once again, like extraversion, managerial talent emerged as a significant predictor for most of the role stresses.

Parasuraman and Alluto (1978) had indicated that an individual's functional speciality, skill level and task characteristics contributed to perceived sources of role stress. Earlier, Johnson and Stinson (1975) reported that need for achievement moderated the relationship between inter sender role conflict and satisfaction; and between task ambiguity and satisfaction; while the need for independence moderated the relationship between inter sender conflict and satisfaction. The relationship between inter sender conflict and satisfaction was more negative for both high need for achievement subjects and need for clarity subjects than the subjects low in these characteristics. The relationship between task ambiguity was more negative for high need for achievement subjects than for those low in need-for-achievement. Moderating effects of need for achievement were confirmed in a study by Abdel Halim (1980). In India, Srivastava (1985) found that need-for-achievement markedly moderated the relationship of job stress and anxiety. Earlier,
French and Caplan (1973) suggested that high self-esteem may serve to buffer the detrimental effects of Role Stress on affective and behavioral outcomes. Wells and Marwell (1976) showed that under conditions of high Role Stress, individuals with low self-esteem perform less well as compared with those of high self-esteem. The moderating influence of self-esteem on the conflict-performance relationship has also been confirmed by Massholder, Bedeian and Armenakis (1981). Later Ponderton (1983) reported that low self-esteem was significantly associated with high scores on various strains among police officers. Creativity was found to have moderating effect on the relationship of Role Ambiguity and Job satisfaction in a study by Pampern, Bluefracis. (1982). Individuals with high creativity perceived more Role Conflict than the low creative subjects.

Thus there is an enough indication in the literature that abilities, traits and motivations are the predictors of different types of Role Stress and stress-strain relationships. The findings of the present study are consistent with the research literature to the extent the relevant variables were considered. However, it is desirable to take a comprehensive measure of Managerial Talent as was done in the present study for meaningful results.
6.4.3. **Motivational Climate as a Predictor of Role Stress:**

The findings are summarised as under:-

(i) Motivational Climate was a significant predictor of all the types of Role Stress except for Self Role Distance and Role Erosion (vide Table 7, p.192).

(ii) Control and Dependency dimensions of Motivational Climate were more dominant than the Achievement, Expert Power and Affiliation dimensions (vide Table 7.1, p.194).

(iii) Extension Climate was non-significant predictor of different types of Role Stress (vide Table 7.1, p.194).

It is concluded that the executives who perceived Motivational Climate to be dominated by Achievement, Expert Power and Affiliation Motivations, experienced the different types of Role Stress to be of lower degree as compared to their counterparts who perceived climate to be less Achievement, Expert Power and Affiliation-oriented. The executives who perceived climate to be dominated by Control and Dependency perceived the different Role Stresses to be of higher degree as compared to their counterparts who perceived organisational climate to be less Control and Dependency-oriented. (vide Table 7.1, p.194).
Brahmam and Pareek (1981) found that Motivational Climate was a significant predictor of Role Efficacy. They also observed that dominant Motivations were Dependency and Control; and Extension was the least dominant. They found that Role Efficacy was positively correlated with Affiliation and Expert Influence, i.e., Role efficacy was higher in Achievement and Expert Power-oriented Climates whereas it was lower in Affiliation and Control-oriented Climate. Das (1982) indicated that 43 per cent of the variation in Managerial Stress was accounted by the five organisational Climate variables. He reported that the Climate of knowledge based risk taking in solving problems and perceived power were the significant explanatory variables, with former being the more powerful predictor. The findings also suggested that a feeling of powerlessness induced by organisational arrangements (such as authoritarian, leadership or excessive rule boundedness), and reckless risk taking in decision making may be two important and independent contributors to managerial anxiety.

Earlier, Cummings and Decotiis (1973) studied stress as the perceived reaction to organisational climate. After performing the factor analysis four components were derived. They were named as, (i) Organisational Support and Clarity, (ii) Organisational objectivity and rationality, (iii) Stress, and (iv) Administrative
rationality. All the variables that met the loading criteria were negatively correlated with each of the stress variables defining the stress factor. Rogers (1977) identified work load, organisation structure, design, management responsibility, communication and interpersonal interaction to be the stress factors after performing factor analysis. Cluster analysis yielded five groups of individuals with different stress and frequency patterns. These groups were labelled as Organization-centred, Achievement-Centred, Ambiguity-Centred, Equalization-Centred and Self-Actualization-Centred.

Morris, Steers and Kac (1979) found that participation in decision-making, supervisory span, span of subordination and formalisation were the significant predictors of Role Conflict. All of them except for supervisory span were the significant predictors of Role Ambiguity also.

Relationship-orientation has been found to be a moderator of stress perception by . . . (1974). The prevalence of Control has been shown to be a contributing factor in enhancing the stress and strain (e.g. Beehr, 1976; Borg, 1976; Zelznik, 1978).

The findings of the present investigation are supported by such empirical literature. It can be concluded that the favourable climate defined in terms of dominance of achievement, Expert Power Affiliation and
and lack of Control and Dependency made an executive to perceive different Role Stresses to be at lower degree. More studies on different occupational groups or groups at various job hierarchy in the same organisation would be required.

6.4.4. Demographic Variables as Predictors of Role Stress:

Following were the findings:-

Age and Work Experience were the significant predictors of Role Stagnation, Inter Role Distance and Total Role Stress. But they were non-significant predictors of Role Expectation Conflict, Role Overload, Role Erosion, Role Isolation, Self Role Distance and Resource Inadequacy. (vide table 8, p. 197).

It is concluded that the executives with higher Age and Work Experience perceived Role Stagnation, Inter Role Distance and Total Stress to be of higher degree as compared to those who were lower in Age and Work Experience.

While correlational studies are available that highlight the association of Age/Work Experience with some Role Stresses, no study is available that considered Age and Work Experience as predictors of Stress Perception. However, it must be noted that these demographic variables do not significantly predict the variance in all the types of Role Stress.
6.4.5. **Personality, Climate and Demographic Variables as Joint Predictors of Role Stress:**

The findings are summarised as under:

(i) Extraversion, Managerial Talent, Motivational Climate and Age/Work Experience were significant predictors of all the types of Role Stress except for Self Role Distance and Role Erosion (vide Table 9, p. 198).

(ii) 81 per cent of the variance in Total Role Stress was explained by these independent variables when considered jointly. They jointly explained 79 per cent of total variance in Role Overload, 77 per cent in Role Stagnation, 70 per cent in Role Expectation Conflict; 70 per cent in Role Isolation; 77 per cent in Role Ambiguity; 67 per cent in Inter Role Distance; 65 per cent in Resource Inadequacy; and 59 per cent in Personal Inadequacy (vide Table 9, p. 198).

Very few studies have investigated the joint effect of personal, organisational and demographic factors on stress perception and stress-well-being relationship. Abdel Halim (1980) studied the joint moderating impact of need for achievement or external locus of control and job scope characteristics on the role ambiguity - effective response relationship. He reported that when low need for achievement or external locus of control was combined with enriched low scope job, employees' responses to perceived Role Ambiguity were
strongly negative while no such relation existed when need-for-achievement or internal locus of control was combined with enriched high scope jobs. Mossholder, Beddan and Armenakis (1981) concluded that the combined effect of organisational level and self-esteem on Role Ambiguity and Role Conflict was such that differences in self-esteem diminished the negative effects of these Role Perceptions. Earlier, Schuler (1977) reported that the moderating impact of employee ability on role ambiguity varied according to the organisational level to which an employee belonged. The nature of moderating effect was such that high ability operationalised by education and work experience, attenuated the negative effects of Role Ambiguity on satisfaction and performance at lower organisational level only. No study in India has so far considered the joint effects of personality, socio-demographic and contextual (situational) variables, on the perception of various organisational Role Stresses.

6.4.6. Relative Contribution of various Independent Variables in explaining the variance in Role Stress:

From Table 10 (p.200), the following conclusions were drawn:

(i) The order of importance of various independent variables in respect of their relative contribution towards Inter Role Distance was (i) Motivational Climate, (ii) Managerial Talent, (iii) Extraversion, and (iv) Demographic Variables.
(ii) **Role Stagnation** was best predicted by **Demographic** variables. **Managerial Talent** and **Motivational Climate** were the second and third best predictors whereas **Extraversion** was a non-significant predictor.

(iii) The comparative strength of various independent variables in predicting **Role Expectation Conflict** was in the following order: Motivational Climate, Managerial Talent, and Extraversion. Demographic variables were not significant in this case also.

(iv) None of the predictor variables emerged significant in explaining variance in Role Erosion.

(v) The ranks of various variables in predicting **Role Overload** were: (i) Motivational Climate, (ii) Managerial Talent, (iii) Neuroticism with Demographic variables as non-significant predictors.

(vi) Motivational Climate, Managerial Talent and Extraversion were the significant predictors of **Role Isolation** in that order. Once again the Demographic variables turned out to be non-significant.

(vii) Managerial Talent, Motivational Climate and Extraversion respectively were the significant predictors of **Personal Inadequacy**. Here too, the Demographic variables were non-significant.

(viii) None of the predictor variables were significant as far as **Self Role Distance** was concerned.
Managerial Talent, Motivational Climate and Extraversion were the significant predictors of Role Ambiguity in the order given. Demographic variables were non-significant in this case also.

Motivational Climate, Managerial Talent and Extraversion respectively were the significant predictors of Resource Inadequacy. Once again the Demographic variables were non-significant.

In case of Total Role Stress, Motivational Climate was the best predictor followed by Managerial Talent, Extraversion and Demographic variables.

Thus it is clear that all the predictor variables differed in their predictive strength towards various types of Role Stress. Also a particular Role Stress was affected by a particular set of predictor variables. The important implication of such findings is that personality, socio-demographic and situational factors should be considered together in studies on stress at work or stress in general. These findings attest to the validity of Person X Situation interactional approach that is currently the main theme in Psychology, Management and the related disciplines.

However, the study is not without its implications. In addition to the relatively small sample size (N = 115),
the data were derived from self report measures from four different private sector organisations. The problems of confoundedness, priming, response consistency and other related social desirability phenomena might have affected the quality of data based on self-report techniques in spite of best possible precautions. However, the highly consistent results obtained in group comparisons, correlational analyses, factor analysis and multiple regression analyses allow us to place greater faith in the findings of the present study.
6.5. Implications of the Study:

Some of the important implications of the present study are in the areas of (i) stress management, (ii) personnel selection, (iii) placement, (iv) performance appraisal, and (v) climate assessment.

Organisations have to develop stress management programmes peculiar to their own set up, so as to minimise its cost in terms of reduced performance as well as human responses (Pestonjee, 1987).

Since differential perception of task and expectancy do occur among executives depending on their personality, therefore, their superiors can have additional insights on the probability of success in job redesigning as well as job enrichment by matching the personality of the role occupant with job requirements. This study also showed that the executives with Extraverted tendencies could yield a more appropriate match between them and their jobs. This factor can be kept in view at the selection and placement stages.

Managerial Talent emerged as an important variable in stress perception and in empirical research, it has been found to be affected by such processes as performance appraisal and supervisory support etc. (Thareuoui, 1979). In order to enhance Self Actualisation and Achievement Motivation, organisations should as far as possible, arrange relevant training programmes in this direction.
It should, however, be noted that any systematic attempt to increase Managerial Talent such as employee self-esteem should be considered a long term process. However, non-threatening performance appraisal interviews, cohesive co-worker interaction (Walton, 1975) and 'Considerate' supervision (Beehr, 1976) have all been identified as means for facilitating self-esteem growth. Organisations should also provide opportunities to their employees to make full utilization of their Managerial Talent by job enrichment, systematic feedback and arranging programmes of Self-Awareness.

Motivational Climate was found to be an important predictor of various types of Role Stress. Obviously, those dimensions of Motivational Climate that reduce the Role Stresses must be strengthened; and those that enhance it must be restructured, so, at least minimize their deliterious effects on role occupants.

This study has also highlighted the importance of considering various Organisational Role Stresses separately. Consequently, the interventions have got to be matched with the type of Role Stress. Thus an overall 'treatment package' will not be sufficient and specific interventions would be needed.

It must be noted that this research, like the rest of the Third World, was conceived in the light of
theoretical models developed in the Euro-American settings. The issue is not the origin of knowledge but its uncritical acceptance. Obviously, more genuine cross-cultural studies would be needed to get an 'Olympian View' of antecedents and consequences of stress at work.
6.6. **Suggestions for Future Research**:

1. Studies on the relationship of Type A Behaviour Pattern with occupational/role stress, as well as the moderating influence of this variable on Occupational Stress - Well-Being relationships are needed (Evans, Palasane & Carrere, 1987; Pittner & Houston, 1980).

2. Locus of Control as a correlate or moderator of stress-well-being relationship be investigated. More especially, one needs to identify the stress-coping strategies of persons with internal or external locus of control orientation (Parker, 1984).

3. Studies on daily hassles of working women and their impact on psychological well-being are necessary. This group is generally neglected in research on stress in India.

4. Occupational stresses of vulnerable groups like Medics, Nurses, academe, blue collar workers etc. are also required (Keenan & Perlberg, 1987).

5. The research on coping with stress should aim at (i) developing a typology of coping processes, and (ii) study the influence of coping processes on adjustment/mental health (Aldvin & Revenson, 1987; Srivastava & Singh, 1987).

6. Measures of stresses that are peculiar to a particular job should be developed in preference to omnibus measures (Latack, 1987).
7. Comparative studies of stresses and well-being of different occupational groups are required (Sharma, 1987).

8. The role of social/organisational support as a buffer of stress-well-being relationship needs to be empirically determined both for males as well as females (Sharma, 1988b).


10. The future stress research must provide for personal and contextual factors as independent variables in determining interactive influence not only on perceived stress but its impact on mental/physical health via coping strategies (Holahan & Moos, 1987; Marino & White, 1985).

11. All such studies, to the extent possible, must be conducted within inter-disciplinary framework and within cross-cultural perspectives (Sharma, 1985).