Chapter - III

Methodology
METHODOLOGY

This study is an attempt towards making Indian organisations more effective and helping managers in actualizing their full potentials. As middle managers have to interact with people (subordinate, colleagues, top management, customers) and major portion of their working time is utilized in people work therefore, various components job burnout - emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and diminished personal accomplishment are found among them at large. Lee and Ashford (1993) viewed that though very few studies focused on managers despite the apparent prevalence of burnout at managerial level. The managerial burnout appears to have detrimental effects on the attitude and behaviour of the people that managers, serve and lead. The stress experienced by middle managers has been explained by Albrecht (1979) in the following way, "in many ways, middle management can be one of the most frustrating areas of organisational life". Hence keeping in view, the present investigation is aimed to measure 'the influence of organisational role stress, organisational climate and social support on job burnout among middle managers of private and public undertakings'.

HYPOTHESES

In the light of the available literature related to study the following hypotheses are formulated:

H(a) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Organizational Role Stress dimension.

H(b) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Organizational Climate dimension.
H(c) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Social Support dimension.

H(d) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Job-Burnout dimension.

H(e) Organizational Role Stress dimension and its ten components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(f) Organizational Role Stress dimension and its ten components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(g) Organizational Climate dimension and its nine components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(h) Organizational Climate dimension and its nine components will act as predictor of Emotional Exhaustion feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(i) Social Support dimension and its three components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(j) Social Support dimension and its three components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of public sector middle managers.
SAMPLE

In the present investigation the sample was randomly selected from various parts of Delhi. It consists of (N=300) middle managers, 150 each from private and public undertaking (Lausreb International, Ottoagn, K.K. Kohli and brother, Orient Craft, Shoff Eye Centre, Suk'dah Home, Indian Oil cooperation, Maruti Yudeog, Indian Aluminium, Bilai Steel Plant, etc.) Delhi. The gender of the sample was not taken into consideration. The methodology of the study was planned systematically keeping in view its lofty objectives.

VARIABLES AND MEASURES

The present research investigation incorporates four variables, namely, organisational role stress, organisational climate, social support and job burnout. A brief description of the measures used in this study is presented in the following manner.

MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY

The Maslach burnout inventory is used to measure the burnout among middle managers of public and private undertakings. The MBI consists of 22 items that are divided into three subscales:

(i) EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION (EE):

Emotional Exhaustion is caused by excessive psychological and emotional demands made on people in helping profession. Emotional Exhaustion is often considered to be the most significant component of burnout (Gaines and Jermier, 1983; Maslach, 1982). It is directly related to high levels of work demand (Shirons, 1989), the primary determinants of emotional
exhaustion reflects organisational and personal demands placed upon employees. The qualitative and quantitative demands of interpersonal interactions also affect the levels of emotional exhaustion (Jackson, Schwab and Schuler, 1986; Maslach, 1982).

(ii) DEPERSONALIZATION (DP):

Depersonalization refers to treating people like object and development of negative attitude towards one's self, work and life. Depersonalization is generally conceptualized as a response to the broader aspects of the job or work environment which is perceived as being bureaucratic, impersonal, rigid, or controlling (Cordes and Dougherty, 1993). It is characterized by cynical, detached and emotional calloused behaviour toward the organization and those with whom one interacts - regardless of whether these interactions involves clients, coworkers, subordinates, or professional contacts outside of the organisation. Levels of depersonalization will be higher in a work environment characterized by receipt of non-contingent punishment (Jackson et al., 1986).

(iii) PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT (PA):

Personal accomplishment is the demotivational effects of feeling of inefficiency about their ability related to recipients that may result in a self-imposed verdict of failure. Feelings of diminished personal accomplishment result from factors suggesting one is unappreciated or that one's efforts are ineffective (Jackson, Turner and Brief, 1987) or from factors that suggest one's competence or performance is low (Burke, Shearer and Deszca, 1984). The perception of self-efficacy is at the core of the personal accomplishment component (Lee and Ashforth, 1990).
The items comprising these sub-scales are presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-scales</th>
<th>Items No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Depersonalization</td>
<td>10, 11, 12, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each item is rated 1 (very mild) to 7 (very strong). A place is provided for the respondent to check never "if the feeling or attitude described is never experienced. According to Maslach and Jackson person with higher scores in the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation sub-scales and with low scores on Personal Accomplishment sub-scale would be perceiving themselves as burnout. Thus, a person is not classified as "burnout" or "not burnout" but rather placed on a continuum from "more burnout" to "less burnout". Maslach & Jackson reported alpha coefficient for the three subscales as presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-scales</th>
<th>N= 407 (Teachers)</th>
<th>N=1025 (People in Helping Profession)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Depersonalization</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha reliabilities for teachers and person in helping profession, supporting the validity of the measures. Burnout scores have been found to increase stressful job setting and to predict job turnover and absenteeism. Maslach & Jackson (1979) in their research on helping
professions reported that correlation between the frequency and intensity dimension across subscales ranged from .35 to .73 with a mean of .56, the correlation between these dimension for teachers varied form .75 to .94 with a mean of .87, while the helping profession in general. There has been found a moderate relationship between how often one experiences various feelings associated with burnout, whereas for teachers this relationship is fairly strong. On the average the total variance is common between the frequency and intensity scores on a subscale for person in the helping profession.

The scores on all three subscales were summed separately. Respondents with high scores on the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization subscales and with lower scores on a personal accomplishment subscales would perceive themselves as burnout in the present study as suggested by Maslach & Jackson.

**SCORING**

The scoring range from 1 to 7 with corresponding qualitative categories. These are presented below:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Somewhat moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Somewhat strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS SCALE

Concept of organisational role stress developed by Pareek (1983) is based on role theory. Role is the similarity in the response of different individuals to some situation. According to Pareek (1987) role can be defined as a set of functions which an individual perform in response to the expectation of the significant members of social system and his/her own expectations about the position that he/she occupies in it.

Pareek's (1983) organisational role stress scale (ORS) was used to measure role stress of middle managers at the level of private and public undertakings.

Organisational Role Stress Scale is comprised of the following role stress dimensions:

(i) Intra Role Distance (IRD)
(ii) Role stagnation (RS)
(iii) Role Expectation Conflict (REC)
(iv) Role Erosion (RE)
(v) Role Overload (RO)
(vi) Role Isolation (RI)
(vii) Personal Inadequacy (PI)
(viii) Self Role Distance (SRD)
(ix) Role Ambiguity (RA)
(x) Resource Inadequacy (RIN)
The organisational role stress scale is 5 point rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>If you never or rarely feel that way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>If you occasionally feel that way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If you sometimes feel that way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If you frequently feel that way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>If you frequently or always feel that way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the scores for each role stress dimension range from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 20 and total scores ranges from 0 to 200, as this scale has 10 dimension and each dimension has five items. Validity of this scale was determined by item analysis. Retest reliability of this scale has acceptable reliability. Sen (1981) used ORS on the sample of 500 bank employees and retest reliability coefficient were found for total role stress (0.73) and for the dimension of role stress SRD (0.45), IRD (0.58), RS (0.63), RS (0.65), RO (0.53), RE (0.37), RI (0.58).

**SCORING**

For 5 point scale of ORS, scoring was made as 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4 for the responses categories, if you never or scarcely feel that way, if you occasionally feel that way, if you frequently feel that way or if you very frequently or always feel that way, respectively. On the ORS scale individual could get minimum score of 0 and maximum score of 200.

**ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE**

In this study organisational climate questionnaire developed by Litwin and Stringer (1968) has been employed in order to measure employees...
perception towards organizational climate of their concerned organisations. This questionnaire consisted of 50 items with four response categories, namely, strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree. The prevailing questionnaire measures employee's attitude toward following important aspects of their respective organisations.

(i) STRUCTURE :

This dimension measures the feeling that employees have about the contacts in the group, how many rules, regulation, procedures there are? Is there an emphasis on red tape and gapping. Through channels or is there a loose and informal atmosphere.

(ii) RESPONSIBILITY :

This dimension measures the feeling being your own basis not housing a double check all your decision when you have a job to do knowing that it is your job.

(iii) REWARD :

This dimension measures the feeling of being rewarded for a job well done, emphasizing positive, rewarded rather than punishments the perceived fairness of the pay and promotion policies.

(iv) RISK :

This dimension measures the sense of riskiness and challenge in the job in the organisation, is there an emphasis on taking calculated risk or is playing it-safe the best way to operate.
(v) WARMTH:
This dimension measures the feeling of general goal fellowship that period in the work group atmosphere the emphasis as the being well lobed the prevalence of friendly and informal social group.

(iv) SUPPORT:
This dimension also measures perceived helpfulness of the managers and other employees in the group and emphasis on mutual support from above and below.

(vii) STANDARDS:
This dimension measures the perceived importance of implicit and explicit goals and performance standards, the emphasis on doing a good job, the challenge represented in personal and group goal.

(viii) CONFLICT:
This dimension measures the feeling that manager and other worker want to hear different opinions, the emphasis placed on getting problems out of the open rather than smoothing them over or organising them.

(ix) IDENTITY:
This dimension measures the feeling that you belong to a company and you are a valuable member of a working team.

The reliability of the nine sub-scales of the organisational climate questionnaire was determined with the help of split-self method. The indices of the coefficient of correlation between the scores on the sets of the items of this scale has been recorded carefully in the following
manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Prior Scale</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCORING

The scores range from 1 to 4 with corresponding qualitative categories as follows.

1. Definitely disagree
2. Inclined to disagree
3. Inclined to agree
4. Definitely agree

SOCIAL SUPPORT SCALE

In order to measure different levels of social support, a modified version of the interpersonal support evaluation list (I.S.E.L.) was used. The original form of this scale consists of 40 statements concerning the perceived availability of potential social resources. The present social support scale was developed by some important academicians known:
Cohen, Merlstein, Kamarek and Hoberman (1985). Finally the modified version of this scale consisted of 18 items with two possible responses probably true or probably false (Appendix-B).

The original interpersonal support evaluation list (I.S.E.L.) falls in 4 subscales consisting 18 items each while its modified version consist of 3 sub-scale of 6 items each (Kapoor 1995, Vashistha 1998). There are 3 important aspect of social support known as Appraisal Support, Belonging support and Tangible support.

The tangible sub-scale is intended to measure perceived availability of retinal aid, the appraisal sub-scale is intended to measure the perceived availability of someone to take about one's problems and the belonging sub-scale is intended to measure the perceived availability of people with whom one person may adjust easily and can obtain help from him or her time to time. However the three important dimensions of this scale have the following different items against each aspect as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept of social support</th>
<th>Serial of items constituting different dimensions in the ISEL</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appraisal support</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Belonging support</td>
<td>7,8,9,10,11,12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tangible support</td>
<td>13,14,15,16,17,18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VALIDITY**

The general population scale correlates 0.30 with the MOSS Family Environment Scale FES; MOOS, 1981, correlation with subscales of FES
were 0.21 with expressiveness 0.46 with number of close friends 0.46 and
with no. of relatives 0.42. The general population ISEL also correlates
with the partner Adjustment scale (Mermelstien, Lichtentein 1983) a
measure of quality of marital or living partnership.

RELIABILITY

Internal reliability (Alfa coefficient) of the total general population of
ISEL ranges from 0.88 to 0.90. In different studies it ranges from 0.70-
0.82 for appraisal, 0.73-0.78 for belonging and 0.73-0.81 for tangible
support. SDC month test retest correlation were 0.74 for the entire ISEL,
0.49 for the tangible subscale, 0.54 for self esteem 0.68 for belonging
and 0.60 for appraisal subscale.

CORRELATION BETWEEN SUBSCALES

The subscale ISEL were independent of one another i.e. subscales did not
measure the same thing. The correlation between subscales were 0.41 -
0.81 which indicate that subscale were highly inter-correlated. Complete
independence of these scales is neither desirable nor possible since
people receive different kinds of resources from the same person in their
network.

SCORING OF ISEL

The ISEL is scored simple by counting the number of responses indicating
support. Out of 18 items constituting the scale three appraisal support
items were negative and remaining three were positive, four belonging
support items were positive and remaining two items were negative. Three
tangible support items were positive and three were negative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-scales</th>
<th>Positive terms</th>
<th>Negative terms</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal Support</td>
<td>1,3,6</td>
<td>2,4,6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging Support</td>
<td>7,9,10,11</td>
<td>8,12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible Support</td>
<td>14,16,18</td>
<td>13,15,17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICAL TREATMENT OF DATA

The data collected through the tools were scored for each dimension separately. Then after, the data was further processed in the computer and the following statistics was carried out using SPSS package.

Statistical treatment of data has been made out in the light of the following techniques such as:

i) descriptive analysis

ii) Stepwise multiple regression analysis

(I) DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS:

Initially descriptive analysis was done in order to know the Mean, and SD of all the variable in each group. Significance of difference was calculated to see whether the groups are differing on each variables by using t-test.

(II) STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS:

Lastly, stepwise multiple regression analysis was computed thrice in order to know the impact of relative importance of different variables which predicted criterion variable, i.e. burnout.