2.1. Concept of Job-Satisfaction:

Job-satisfaction is a specific subset of attitudes held by an organisation's members. It is the attitude one has towards his or her job. Job satisfaction is a concept which has received much attention in the past and deserves to receive more in the future. By periodically measuring job-satisfaction in organisations, it is possible to understand better the extent to which organisations are meeting employees' needs and expectations. This information provides a valuable input in to decision about the design and implementation of the human resource systems within organisations (Mc Cormick and Ilgen, 1987). Liu Michel (1973) has aptly observed, that, in considering job-satisfaction, it is essential to recognize that workers' priorities in what they want from their job vary according to situation, context and circumstances.

In an analysis of job factors that were important to 3000 employees in various state and Urban governments, Katz and Van Manen (1977) identified three clusters of
factors which they termed as the factors of work satisfaction:-

i) The job itself:- Corresponding to intrinsic-factors

ii) The interaction Context: Corresponding to those contextual factors which had to do with co-workers, supervisors and other people in the job environment.

iii) Three Organizational Policies: Corresponding to those contextual factors which had to do with pay, promotional policies, working conditions, and other issues not under the direct control of the employee or the supervisor.

Each of these above three areas was found to be related to job-satisfaction to some degree.

According to Blum and Naylor (1984), Job-satisfaction is a general attitude which is the result of many specific attitudes in certain areas, namely, specific job factors, individual characteristics, and group relationships outside the job. Landy and Turmbo (1976) concluded that job-satisfaction plays a role in theories of work motivation. This role is generally one of an
emotion or feeling which an individual gets as a result of some job-related characteristic or event.

The efficiency of a worker is dependent on a number of factors related to his work and working conditions. If his attitude towards these factors and conditions is positive, his efficiency will definitely be greater than that of one who has negative attitude. Psychologically, the attitude that a person has towards the different factors of his job is termed as "job-satisfaction" (Porwal, 1987). Job-satisfaction is most likely a reflection of overall effect towards one's job (Weaver, 1980).

Korman (1971) pointed out that the most rational of the theories of Job-satisfaction is the need of fulfilment theory which states that (i) a person is satisfied, if he gets what he wants, and (ii) the more he wants something, or the more important it is to him, the more satisfied he is when he gets it and the more dissatisfied he is when he does not get it. Job-satisfaction and dissatisfaction are a function of the perceived relationship between what one expects and obtains from one's job and how much importance or value he attributes to it (Locke, 1976; Mabley and Locke, 1970).
According to Putti and Ling (1987) job-satisfaction may be affected by various factors, such as supervision, the work group, wages, work conditions, job content and promotional opportunities.

Verma and Roy (1988) defined job-satisfaction as an attitudinal section of the job. It represents the feeling of the employees about how happy or unhappy he or she is with various aspects of the job. It has been observed that employees' dissatisfaction with certain conditions of job causes serious industrial problems and on the other hand employees' satisfaction with job leads to organisational goal of productivity.

Job-satisfaction is a nebulous concept. It is axiomatic to state that people differ in regard to the extent to which they are satisfied with their job. In a study conducted by Hinger (1986) factors such as, the work group, job-content, wages, promotional opportunities and hours of work were found to be related to job satisfaction.

According to Pestonjee (1973) the concept of job-satisfaction essentially relates to human needs and their fulfilment through work. It is in fact, generated
by an individual's perception of how well his job satisfies his various needs.

According to Aggarwala (1988), "Job-satisfaction is the result of various attitudes in all probability, activated by worker's needs and their fulfilment (through work), a worker exhibits towards his job, towards related factors, and towards life in general. More explicitly explained, a worker's experiences of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with his job, or any aspect of it, is in large part, a consequence of the extent of his positive or negative attitudes. Fundamentally, the satisfaction, which people experience in their jobs, is very much related to motivation and performance, such as satisfaction of higher level needs, fairness and justice effort reward linkage etc. Gunthy and Singh (1982) concluded that job-satisfaction is the result of various attitudes the employee holds towards his job, towards related factors, and towards life in general.

Srivastava (1984) asserted that persons differently situated in the organisational hierarchy, have different opportunities to satisfy various needs. Hierarcny is a basic organisational characteristic, but it has the most profound psychological implication for individual
members. In organisations persons work together, but are rewarded differently. Those at higher levels are not only paid more, they are awarded greater psychological rewards as well. Those at higher occupational levels are thus able to satisfy their needs to a greater extent than those at lower levels, organisational interests become compatible more or less with the self interests of individuals, depending at least partly on where they are in the organisational hierarchy. Thus, those serving at higher occupational levels seem to develop a more positive attitude towards their jobs as compared to those working at lower level. On other hand, job-satisfaction occurs whenever conditions at work and life are such that they block the gratification of strongly desired human needs. It appears that this phenomenon is more likely to occur at lower occupational levels than at higher levels. The nature of the job and the rewards (both physical and psychological) its offers are hardly adequate to gratify these needs (physical, security, social and egoistic) to a desired extent at lower occupational levels. This may lead to a feeling of deprivation. Since, a job is very much instrumental in the satisfaction of these needs, an Individual may displace these feelings to the job.

Job-satisfaction refers to a person's feeling of
satisfaction on the job, which acts as a motivation to work. Positive attitudes towards the job are conceptually equivalent to job-satisfaction. At various times it has been linked to production, motivation, absenteeism, tardiness, accidents, mental health, physical health, general life satisfaction and job-involvement (Rajendran, 1987; and Singh and Kumari, 1988). According to Chaudhary and Hinger (1991) job-satisfaction is a feeling of happiness a person experiences from all aspects of his job.

Kaur (1984) has defined that job-satisfaction is basically an individual matter. Employees search for those aspects of job, which are related to their value system. Some give more value to income and others attach more importance to the job situation, or the type of job. Considering that, while individual vary in their values, there is moderate consistency in the cherished value of the individual with a specific group.

Researchers have differentiated between job-satisfaction and work-satisfaction. The satisfaction from the intrinsic content of job is defined as job-satisfaction, while the satisfaction from the various aspects of a job is termed as work-satisfaction, i.e. satisfaction from the various facets of life (Arya,
1984) work satisfaction refers to an individuals' subjective experience of his work situation, his responses on the level of feelings, towards different facets of his work role. Work-satisfaction is not a unitary concept. It is a composite of many dimensions and factors (Kakar, 1974).

In true sense, job-satisfaction does not mean a perpetual smirk on the face of employees. It does not mean turning work into a hobby, undertaken, just for the pleasure of it. However, satisfied the employees they cannot be expected to find absolute and unalloyed pleasure in it. Job-satisfaction essentially means economy of effort, getting rid of avoidable tension, utilizing the energies of employees for better performance of work instead of allowing them to be dissipated needlessly (Bhatia, 1986). The overall job-satisfaction of the industrial manager seems to be influenced by the personal and job related factors, and the degree of satisfaction appears to depend on the satisfaction of the number of job facets as well as their importance (Khaleque and Choudhary, 1984).

Job-satisfaction refers to the feelings and the emotional aspects of the individual's experience towards his job as different from his intellectual or rational
aspects. The experience of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with one's work and various aspects of it, is, in large part, the consequence of one's positive or negative job-attitudes (Srivastava, 1986).

2.1.1. Measures of Job-Satisfaction:

Pareek and Rao (1974) reported seven different approaches for developing indigenous scales of job-satisfaction, besides using adaptation of Brayfield and Rothe's job-satisfaction index and Fried Lander's job-satisfaction questionnaire. It seems that job-satisfaction was considered to be a significant construct yet the efforts lacked in giving serious thought to it. Nevertheless, the exception was Pestonjee's multiscale job-satisfaction that purportedly measured satisfaction with job, management, social relations and personal adjustment.

Joyce, Slocum and Von-Glinow (1982) developed a model. This model suggests that the characteristics of both environment and the individual are important determinants of behaviour and implies a perspective that the greater the degree of congruence the greater is the job-satisfaction.
Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) scale reported five elements of job-related satisfaction—satisfaction with work, supervision, co-workers, pay and promotion.

Plez and Andrews (1966) developed a scale. The scale measured satisfaction regarding four aspects of the job-satisfaction. These were institutional participation, recognition, environment and affiliation with work.

Kavanagh, Mackinney and Wolins (1970) scale designed to measure two general job-satisfaction dimensions—group morale and individual satisfaction.

Veroff, Douvan and Kulka (1981) has developed a schema to measure job-satisfaction. This schema categories as (i) extrinsic factors—economically oriented (wages, salary or job-security); (ii) extrinsic factors—non economically oriented (Job environment, hours, convenience, or employee benefits); (iii) ego-satisfactions—achievement related (complexity or responsibility of work or the feeling of competence as a result of work); (iv) ego-satisfactions—power related (independence, prestige or leadership opportunities) and (vi) interesting work (intrinsic qualities of job tasks).
For the purpose of the present study, a standardized scale developed in India, has been used to find out the job-satisfaction level of respondents. This measure has been developed and standardized by Pestonjee (1973) as per the situation of the country.

Pestonjee (1973) aptly pointed out that job-satisfaction, like any other attitude, represents a complex assemblage of cognitions (beliefs and knowledge), emotions (feelings, sentiments or evaluations) and behavioural tendencies. He further stressed that a job is not an entity but a complex interrelationship of tasks, roles, responsibilities interactions, incentives and rewards etc. Thus according to him, a thorough understanding of job-attitude require that the job be analysed in terms of its constituent elements. Pestonjee, therefore, considered job-satisfaction as a summation of employees' feelings in four important areas with their related aspects as follows:

(i) Job: Nature of work, hours of work, fellow workers, opportunities on the job etc.

(ii) Management: Supervisory treatment, participation,
rewards and punishment, praises and blames etc.

(iii) Social Relation: Neighbours, friends and associates, attitudes towards people in community etc.

(iv) Personal Adjustment: Emotionality, health, home and living conditions etc.
2.2. **Concept of Role Stress**

2.2.1. **Stress**

Stress is a dynamic condition in which an individual is confronted with an opportunity, constraints or demand relegated to what he or she desires and for which the outcome is perceived to be both uncertain and important (Robbins, 1989). McGrath (1976) hypothesized that there are six possible sources of stress in an organisational settings. There are task based stress, role based stress, stress intrinsic to the behaviour setting, stress arising from the physical environment, stress arising from the social environment, and stress with in the person system.

McGrath (1970) has shown that past experience. (either in the form of familiarity with the situation due to past exposure or in the form of practice and training to cope with the situation) can significantly alter the level of subjectivity experienced stress and change relation to that stress. Various researches has shown that level of perceived job-related stress is associated with physical health (Cooper and Marshall, 1976; Cooper and Payne, 1978; French and Caplan, 1973; Hyman and Hahnson, 1970).
Stress is an external force operating on a system, be it an organisation or a person. Strain is the change in the state of the internal system, which results from this external stress. Stress and strain are not synonymous (Hall and Mansfield, 1971). McGrath (1976) defined stress in terms of a set of conditions as having stress in it. "Stress involves an interaction of person and environment. Something happens "out there" which presents a person with a demand or a constraint or an opportunity for behaviour." Psychologically, stress has been defined as the reaction accompanying the perceived or assumed inability to deal with the systems input (Welford, 1973; Sanders, 1980).

Whereas, Selye (1976) states that, "stress is the non-specific response to any demand... an external force operating on a system, be it an organisation or a person." Douglass (1977) defines stress as, "any action or situation that places special demands upon a person." Anything abnormal can imbalance a person's equilibrium. The state of disequilibrium causes a reaction to restore equilibrium. This reaction causes stress.

In India, Pestonjee (1987) has observed that images of action can have as much of an effect as action itself. Ideas and imagery can arouse the same type of
internal physiological changes as the actual actions do. Thus, blood pressure rises even when one thinks of being angry. Most threats are either self contrived or born out of misunderstanding and defective cognitive structuring.

The term "stress" is generally used either to label situation that tax person's physical or psychological resources or to refer to the emotional response of the person to such situation (Dhar, 1991). Mishra (1983) stated that stress is, "a mentally or emotionally disruptive or disquieting influence (which may be a factor in disease causation). So, a stressed person is an individual who is over loaded.

2.2.2. Stress in Organisations Job-Stress:

"Job-stress" and "burnout" have become two of the buzzwords of the 1980s. Burnout stress syndromes (BOSS), the consequences of high levels of job stress, personal frustration, and inadequate coping skills, have major personal, organisation and social costs - and these costs are probably increasing (Paine, 1982). Cox and Mackay (1977) stated, "stress ... arises as a result of an imbalance between the persons' perceptions of the demands made upon him, and his perception of his ability
to cope when coping is important.

Stress has also been defined in terms of a misfit between a person's skills and abilities and demands of the job and a misfit in terms of a person's needs supplied by the job-environment (French, Rogers and Cobb, 1974). Caplan, Cobb, French, Van Harison and Pinneau (1975) defined stress as any characteristic of the job environment which poses a threat to the individual either demands which he may not be able to meet or insufficient supply to meet his need ... On the other hand strain refers to any deviation from normal responses in the person (a) psychological strains. (b) psychological strains...... (c) behavioural symptoms of strains...... .

Additive and synergistic effects have also been reported from combination of environmental stressors (Poulton, 1978) which may also interact with work characteristics such as: kind of work, duration of work, familiarity with the work and with the stressors, the level of incentives and the presence of other stressors in the working situation (Sharit and Salvendy, 1982). So stress can be caused by too much or little work, time pressure and dead lines having too many decisions (Sofer, 1970).
A review of epidemiological studies of work stress led Kasl (1978) to conclude that "stress at work" had not achieved any kind of closure as a concept, but he identified two major "versions" of stress at work: the first was concerned with an excess of environmental demands over the capability to meet them; and the second, broader version was that of an inadequate person-environment fit, which includes the relation of need in the work environment to meet such needs. Cooper and Marshal (1976) indicated, "by occupational stress is meant negative environmental factors or stressors (i.e. work overload, role conflict/ambiguity, poor working conditions) associated with a particular job".

Beehr and Newman (1978) after an extensive review of selected research on stress define, "job stress as a condition where job related factors interact with the worker to change (disrupt or enhance) his/her psychological or physiological condition such that the person (mind and/or body) is forced to deviate from normal functioning. Payne (1979) defined that "stress" is experienced as (negative emotion) when the demands of the worker are not matched to their level of skill (or skill potential) and that this state is exacerbated, when the worker is constrained in coping or receives little support for coping from others."
The growing body of literature concerning organisational stress, although still in conclusive, strongly suggest at least two conclusions. First, stress at work is a critical factors in the determination of employee health and well-being also has important implications organisational effectiveness. Secondly, there is a critical need for research that rigorously evaluated the many potential strategies for managing organisational stress (Ganster, Mayes, Wasley, and Gerald, 1982). Newman and Beehr (1979) review addressed a wide range of stress management strategies, ranging from such techniques as meditation, diet, and exercise to organisational interventions in task design. For virtually all of these strategies, evaluations employed only subjective assessments of effectiveness made in settings lacking experimental control.

The conceptual basis of the professional women's stress experience is proposed in model by Nelson and Quick (1985). This model identifies the common as well as unique stressors that lead to stress for professional women. The model also incorporates the individual consequences of stress, which may be relating to health and well being or distress, strain and disease. Quick and Quick (1984) classified stressors faced by individuals in organisations as role demands, job
demands, environmental demands, interpersonal demands, and extra organisational demands.

Wan (1971) summarises the rationale for stress induced by status inconsistency as the role conflict generated from incompatible expectations of a social position which may yield psychological disturbances and frustrations, which in turn from part of the stress disease linkage. Stressors which are not so specifically characterised as blue collar but which are associated with work include role ambiguity (Caplan et.al., 1980), which is a measure of workers' perceptions of the clarity of the work situation and role conflict, a measure of the conflicting demands that a worker sees as present in the job.

Sharit and Salvendy (1982) concluded a review of occupational stressors with the observation that "the number of factors qualifying as potential sources of occupational stress is seemingly limitless. However, if any one variable were to be singled out as the predominant underlying source of occupational stress, it would be uncertainty." They predicted that with current rapid technological changes in work processes, uncertainty would probably become a more prevalent source of occupational stress.
Cooper and Marshall (1978) identified 40 interacting factors which they grouped into seven major categories of occupational (managerial) stressors: (i) factors intrinsic to the job including working conditions such as pacing, demand for physical effort, repetitive tasks and both quantitative and qualitative workload; (ii) role in the organisation, conceptualized as role ambiguity, role conflict, responsibility for people and other role stressors such as having too little responsibility, lack of managerial support, little participation in decision making and keeping up with rapid technological changes; (iii) relationship at work; (iv) career development (Presumed to be especially relevant for managers); (v) organisational structure and climate; (vi) extra-organisational sources of stress including family problems, life crises, financial difficulties and conflict of company with family demands; (vii) Characteristics of the individual, focused mainly on personality differences between high and low stressed individuals and in particular, the relationship between type-A behaviour patterns and the incidence of coronary heart disease.

A list of stressors claimed to be specifically relevant to blue collar worker identifies four objective
factors; "a man's play, a man's safety at work, the quality of his work setting and the stability of his job (Shostak, 1980), and four subjective factors: status, supervision, sociability (work group affiliation) and satisfaction (Shostak, 1980). Schuler (1980), in his study on stress in organisations, stated that stress was a dynamic conditions in which an individual was; (a) confronted with an opportunity for being/having/doing what(s) he desires; (b) confronted with a constraint on being/having/doing what(s) he desires and/or (c) confronted with a demand on being/having/doing what(s) he desires and for which the resolution perceived to have uncertainty but which will lead (upon resolution) to important outcomes.

Stress in general and organisational stress in particular is a universal and frequently disabling human phenomenon and these concepts have been a part of vocabulary of every man for considerable time. Stress has been assumed to be a threat to quality of work life and influencing the behaviours of executives (Singh, 1990). Bose (1978) defined that the concept of organisational stress is not binary presence or absence, nor a discrete variable. It is a capability to receive and a capability to respond continuum. Operationally, the magnitude of organisational stress is measured in
terms of the subjective perception of the discrepancy between the capability to meet the demand by the sub system.

Sukla (1990) in a study of managerial stress experiences has concluded that it may be more accurate to look at stress as a pattern of interrelated experiences, rather than as one single experience. The stress due to lack of freedom at work is as real as the experiences of stress due to an interpersonal encounter. He has also conceded that pattern of stressful experiences appears to be unique to an individual, or a group of individuals and it may be determined by the life situations of the individual(s), as well as their personality.

2.2.3. Organisational Role Stress:
Definition of Role:

Kahn and Quinn (1970) have classified role stress under three main findings: (i) expectation generated stress, in which they include role ambiguity and role conflict, (ii) expectation resource discrepancies, in which they include role overload; (iii) responsibility – authority dilemma and inadequate technical information, and role and personality.
Cooper and Marshall (1976, 1978 a) offer five clusters of work stressors: those intrinsic to the job, and those resulting from one's role in the organisation, career development, relationships with others, and organisational structure and climate. Quick and Quick (1984) proposed four categories of stressors: task demands, role demands, physical demands (elements in one's physical setting or environment) and interpersonal demands. Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) also divided stressors into four categories: physical environment, individual level (a mixture of role and career development variables) group level (primarily relationship-based) and organisational level (a mixture of climate, structure, job design and task characteristics) Schuler (1982) identified seven categories of work stressors in organisations: job qualities, relationships, organisational structure, physical qualities, career development, change and role in the organisation.

The relationship of potential sources of role stress and its outcome with moderating variables can be properly understood with the following model of stress propounded by Cooper and Payne (1976):
# A Model of Stress

## Potential Sources

### Environmental Factors

- Economic uncertainty
- Political uncertainty
- Technological uncertainty

### Organisational Factors

- Individual Differences
- Perception
- Job Experience
- Belief In Locus of control
- Type A Behaviour
- Psychological Symptoms
- Headaches
- High Blood Pressure
- Heart Diseases
- Sleep Disturbances
- Depression
- Decrease in Job Satisfaction
- Organisation leadership
- Experienced stress

## Consequences

- Economic uncertainty
- Political uncertainty
- Technological uncertainty
- Individual Differences
- Perception
- Job Experience
- Belief In Locus of control
- Type A Behaviour
- Psychological Symptoms
- Headaches
- High Blood Pressure
- Heart Diseases
- Sleep Disturbances
- Depression
- Decrease in Job Satisfaction
- Organisation leadership
- Experienced stress
3. Individual Factors

Behavioural Symptoms

Family Problems

Productivity Absenteeism

Economic Problems

Turnover Accidents.

In India, Dhar (1991) has identified eight determinants of organizational role stress. These are personality characteristics, role over-load, role conflict, role ambiguity, role stagnation and mid-life crisis, absence of social support, role incompatibility and management of stress.

Parasuraman and Alutto (1981) identified a number of sources of stress (stressors) in the work environment and examined the relationship of contextual, task and role related variables to such stressors. In the recent past, researchers in India have expressed serious concern about stress inducing factors like role ambiguity, role conflict etc. and their implications (Dhar, 1982; Dhar, 1983; Pareek, 1981; Sharma, 1983; Sharma, Dhar and Dhar, 1986).
Fareek (1976, 1988) has given a very comprehensive classification of role stress. He has proposed two systems of role concept 'role space and role set'. An organisation can be defined as a system of roles. However, role itself is a system. From the point of view of an individual two role systems are important, the system of various roles, the individual carries and performs, and the system of various roles of which his role is a part, and in which his role is defined by the other significant roles. The first is called 'role space' and the second is known in the literature of 'role set'.

(A) Role-Space conflicts :- Role space can be defined as the dynamic interrelationship both between the self and the various roles an individual occupies, and amongst these roles. Role space has three main variables: self, the role under question, and other roles he occupy. Any conflicts within this field are referred to as role space conflicts or stress. These conflicts may be the following :-

i) Self-Role Distance :- Stress arises out of the conflict between the self-concept and the expectations from the role as perceived by the role occupant. If a
person occupied a role which he may subsequently find is conflicting with his self-concept, he feels the stress.

ii) **Intra-Role Conflict** :- Since the individual learns to develop expectations as a result of his socialization and identification with significant others, it is quite likely that he sees some incompatibility between the expectations (functions) from his own role.

iii) **Role-Stagnation** :- As the individual grows physically, he also grow in the role he occupies in an organization with the advancement of the individual his role changes, and with this change in role, the need for his taking his new role, becomes crucial. This is the problem of role growth. This becomes an acute problem especially when an individual has occupied a role for a long time, and he enters another role in which he feels less secure. However, the demand of the new role is for the individual to outgrow his previous role and occupy the new role effectively. This produces some stress in the individual.

iv) **Inter-Role Distance** :- The individual occupies more than one role. These may be conflicts between two roles he occupies. For example, an executive often faces the conflict between his organizational role as an executive
and his familial role as the husband and the father. The
demand from his wife and children to share his time may
be incompatible with the organizational demands on him
for spending a lot of time on organizational problems.
Such inter-role conflicts are quite frequent in modern
society when the individual is increasingly occupying
multiple roles in various organizations and groups.

v) **Role Boundedness** :- If an individual feels highly
obliged to the expectations of significant role senders
and sacrifices his own interests, preferences, values,
comforts etc., he may be said to be role bounded. He may
experience the conflict between his tendency to live as
a person, and live as a role (Pareek, 1976).

(B) **Role-Sets Conflicts** :- Role set has been conceived
as a system of relationships between a role and other
related roles in a social system. An individual
occupying a particular role may have some expectations
from his role. Interacting with him may have quite
different expectations from him. Such incompatible
expectations and other problems arising in the role set
are called role set stress or conflicts. These conflicts
are as follows :-
i) **Role-Ambiguity:** When the individual is not clear about the various expectations people have from his role, he faces the conflict which may be called role-ambiguity. Role-ambiguity may be due to lack of information available to the role occupant, or due to lack of understanding of the cases available to him. Role-ambiguity may be in relation to the activities, responsibilities, priorities, norms, or general expectations. Generally role-ambiguity may be experienced by persons occupying roles newly created in the organization, roles in organizations undergoing change, or process roles (with less clear and concrete activities).

ii) **Role Expectation Conflict:** When there are conflicting expectations or demands by different role senders (persons having expectations from the role), the role occupant may experience this stress. These may be conflicting expectations from the boss, subordinates, peers or clients (Pareek, 1988).

iii) **Role Overload:** When the role occupant feels that there are too many expectations from the significant roles in his role set, he experiences role overload. Role overload has been measured by asking questions about the feelings of people whether they could possibly
finish work given to them during a modified work day and whether they felt that the amount of work they did might interfere with how well it was done. Most of the executive role occupants experience role overload. Role overload is likely to occur more in the absence of mechanism of role integration, in the absence of power of role occupants, in the large variations in the expected output, and when delegation or assistants cannot procure more time.

iv) Role Erosion:— A role occupant may feel that some functions which he would like to perform are being performed by some other role. The stress felt may be called role-erosion. Role-erosion is the subjective feeling of an individual that some important role expectations he has from his role are shared by other roles in his role set. Role-erosion is likely to be experienced in an organization, which is redefining its role and creating new roles. In several organization, which were redefining their structure, the stress of role erosion was inevitably felt. In one organization, one role was abolished and two roles were created to cater to the executive and planning needs. This led to a great stress in the role occupants of both roles who experienced role-erosion, and felt that these roles had become less important as compared to the older role.
v) **Resource Inadequacy** :- Resource inadequacy is experienced when the resources required by the role occupant to perform the role effectively are not available viz information, people, material, finance and facilities.

vi) **Personal Inadequacy** :- When a role occupant feels that he is not prepared to undertake the role effectively, he may experience this type of stress. He may feel he does not have time to prepare himself for the role assigned to him. Persons assigned new roles without enough preparation or orientation are likely to experience this stress.

viii) **Role Isolation**:

In a role set, the role occupant may feel that certain roles are psychologically near to him, while some other roles, are at distance. The main criterion of distance is frequency and ease of interaction. When linkages are strong, the role isolation will be low. In the absence of strong linkages, the role isolation may be high. Role isolation can, therefore, be measured in terms of existing and desired linkages. The gap between the desired and the existing linkages will indicate the amount of role-isolation.
2.2.4. **Measures of Organisational Role Stress:**

Rizzo, House and Lirtzman (1970) have developed a stress scale, which is known as organizational role stress scale. This scale measures two types of role stresses, viz. role ambiguity and role conflict. This scale consists of 30 items. Rizzo et al. (1970) and House and Rizzo (1972) have reported its validity and reliability. A revised version of this scale and its factor structure was later reported by Johnson and Stinson (1975). It has also been used in the West as well as in India to measure role ambiguity and role conflict. The scale includes two dimensions each of role conflict and role ambiguity. These dimensions are: (a) Person role conflict with 0.83 reliability coefficient; (b) Intersender role conflict with 0.63 reliability coefficient; (c) Task ambiguity with 0.91 reliability; and (d) Feedback ambiguity with 0.88 reliability coefficient. Rogers and Molnar (1976) has constructed a 14 items role ambiguity scale.

In India, Srivastava and Singh (1981) have developed a 46 item occupation stress index containing 18 'false-keyed' and 28 'true keyed' items. The split-half reliability of this index is 0.935 (N = 200). This scale has been used by many Indian researchers (Dhillon,
Parasuraman and Allutta (1981) has also developed a job stress measure. This scale consists of following dimensions: (i) inter unit conflict; (ii) technical problems; (iii) efficiency problem (iv) role frustration; (v) staff storage; (vi) short time; and (vii) too many meetings. This scale was used by Kallapur and Anantharaman (1988) in their respective studies.

Pareek (1980 a and b) has developed a 20 items role efficacy scale (RES), which considers ten dimensions and has a reliability coefficient of 0.69. This scale has been used by (Sharma and Sharma 1983; Surti, 1983). Pareek (1983) has further developed and standardized the role stress scale (R.S.S.): which is known as organization role stress (ORS) scale. This scale is a modification of "your feelings about your role scale". Organizational role stress scale consists of 50 items. It includes 10 stresses relevant to Organisation life. These are: (i) Inter-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. (RI\textsubscript{n}). This scale has been used by many Indian researchers (Chaudhary and Hinger, 1991; Sharma, 1988; Singh and Nath, 1991) in their related studies. In the present study also this scale has been used.
2.3. **Concept of Personality:**

2.3.1. **Approaches to the Study of Personality:**

Personality refers to the ways people perceive and interpret behaviour. It refers to the attribution of characteristics to individuals or groups of individuals, characteristics that typically are applied without restriction to particular local circumstances or points in time. Each attribution is an observer-observed entity (Fiske, 1978).

Personality research pertains to the extensive area called personality. Personality encompasses all the ways that people look at people. It includes the way one person see another, the way novelists and biographers portray their characters, and the variety of ways that researchers in that area construe the topic. There are, in fact, as many definitions of personality as there are people working on it. There is a plethora of global theories; recently many mini theories also have been propounded. Yet inspite of all these instances all the conceptualizations and perceptions of professionals and non-professionals and the almost infinite number of verbal descriptions and interpretive statements—there is not a real science (Fiske, 1978).
The domain of personality is large and heterogeneous. It has been construed in many diverse ways because the constructs have been based upon perceptions and interpretations of personal experience, rather than upon empirical findings derived from objective observations. A real science must have maximal explicit consensus on its phenomena, concepts, and modes of operation. Personality does not seem to be progressing toward such consensus. (Fiske, 1978).

The term paradigm seems to be open to almost as many interpretations as personality (Masterman, 1970), it seems clear that there is not yet a consensus among most researchers on such fundamentals as a set of constructs and their meanings. There even seems to be a wide range of opinions about what constitute a science. Owens (1973) states, "what a man is and bring to the office in the form of a total personality largely determines what and how he does and with what degree of success. What this mean is that personal growth as a human being underlies becomes, to a great extent, the real foundation upon which managerial and career growth can develop. Managerial success is not a peripheral set of techniques; it is a working out of one's essential being in the form of action."
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According to Mischal (1977) Complex human behaviour tends to be influenced by many determinants, and that it reflects the almost inseparable and continuous interaction of a host of variables both in the person and the situation. In the abstract, this recognition seems as bland and obvious as a cliche, and one wonders if a focus on interactionism and multiple determinism may not be little more than the substitution of new slogans for old varieties. But when examined more concretely, this recognition has deeper implications that sense are being felt independently in other areas of psychology and even in other social sciences.

Personality traits are broad, enduring relatively characteristics used to assess and explain behaviour. Traits account for the fact that, under similar circumstances, one person behaves differently from another. It is part of the nature of traits that although they can change, or they cannot change too much or too quickly. Their stability suggests the behaviour they describe will be the relatively consistent from situation to similar situation, their breadth implies that similar behaviour will be manifested in different situations. (Hirschberg, 1975).
Mischel (1973) has argued that preferences might be important psychological characteristics for the study of personality. If preferences are conceptualized as the end products of desires and beliefs, preference measurement would be one of the immediately useful means of inferring desires. He suggested that variables new to personologists (beliefs and desires) be studied; and that the methodological sophistication of such measures should parallel that found in decision-theory.

London (1978) has advocated two strategies for personality research: first, integrate biological variable into experimental personality research and, second, attack the problem of the personality system.

In India, concept of personality has been brought into organizational psychology in two rather different guises. One approach treats personality as a constant for all individuals. The other is concerned with differences among individuals and organizational implications of such differences (Sayeed, 1980).

From the psychological viewpoint personality is a somewhat stable psychological characteristic of the individual that disposes him with certain distinctive ways (Verma and Upadhyay, 1983).
The human personality has a structure which is made up of different elements. It is made up of three elements: The Id, The Ego, and The Super Ego. Each of these is a system of processes having distinct functions, properties, components, operating principles, dynamisms, and mechanisms. Each of these elements influences the behaviour of man. More often, behaviour arises from a combination of these elements in such a way that it is difficult to disentangle the influence of one from that of the other. Singh and Warrier (1982) discussed these (The Id, The Ego and the Super Ego) as follows:

**The Id** :- The Id is the original element from which the other two elements develop. The id refers to everything in born and inherited including the instincts.

**The Ego** :- Wishfulfillment or the primary process cannot effectively reduce the tension arising from needs. The picture of food, for instance, cannot satiate hunger. For that, real food is necessary. This is where the ego comes into existence.

**The Super Ego** :- The Super Ego contains the do’s and don’ts prescribed by society and internalised by the
individual. The internalisation of social norms takes place primarily through the agency of parents.

Singh and Warrier (1982) further discuss that the id, the ego and the super ego are not little elves or imps within the individual. They are only different sets of psychological processes. Each obeys a different system principle. Normally the three work together, as a team, under the executive leadership of the ego. When the team spirit breaks down, and the three pull in different directions, abnormality develops.

2.3.2. **Eysenck's concept of personality** :-

The personality of an individual has been classified on the basis of attitudes by various psychologists. The most important classification from this point of view has been provided by the well-known psychologist Eysenck (1963). He has classified human personality into two categories: extraversion-introversion (E) and Neuroticism-stability (N).

According to Eysenck and Eysenck (1964) the typical extravert is sociable, likes parties, has many friends, needs to have people to talk to, and does not like reading or studying by himself. He craves excitement, takes chances, often sticks his neck out, acts on the
spur of the moment, and is generally an impulsive individual. He is fond of practical jokes, always has a ready answer, and generally likes change, he is carefree, easygoing, optimistic and likes to "laugh and bemerry". He prefers to keep moving and doing things, tends to be aggressive and lose his temper quickly; altogether his feelings are kept under tight control, and he is not always a reliable person.

The typical introvert is quiet, retiring sort of person, introspective, fond of books rather than people, he is reserved and distant except to intimate friends. He tends to plan ahead, "looks before he leaps", and distrusts the impulse of the moment. He does not like excitement, takes matters of everyday life with proper seriousness, and likes a well ordered mode of life. He keeps his feelings under close control, seldom behaves in an aggressive manner, and does not lose his temper easily. He is reliable, somewhat pessimistic and places great value on ethical standards (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1964).

The most highly developed theory of extraversion is that of Eysenck (1967). Briefly, he postulates that variations in introversion-extraversion reflect individual differences in the functioning of the
reticular activation system. He also hypothesizes that introverts are more highly aroused than extraverts given standard conditions of stimulation. Introverts are supposed to acquire conditioned responses more rapidly than extraverts because their higher arousal facilitates the formation of connections. The difference in condition ability in turn accounts for the different types of abnormal behaviour to which introverts and extraverts are prone. Emotional (high N) introverts develop dysthymic symptoms because of their overready conditioning to normally neutral stimuli.

Gale (1973) suggested that extraverts appeared as more highly aroused when the experimental procedure was either very interesting or excruciatingly boring, otherwise introverts showed higher arousal.

Wilson (1977) conceded that introversion-extraversion is a consistent and identifiable dimension of personality, variation along the extraversion dimension have both hereditary and environmental antecedents.

Whether one deals at a primary factor level (as does Catell) or the second order level (as Eysenck usually does) is a matter of preference and depends on
one's purpose. The primary factors give a more detailed picture of the personality; on the other hand, their reliability and separability are questionable (Eysenck, 1972a), and they may be of less theoretical interest, being more difficult to pin to biological substrata. It will be clear, however, both the factor analysts are agreed upon a hierarchical model of personality. Primary factors have been called traits and second order factors types, but use of the term type should not be taken to imply that people must be categorized as either extravert or introvert, most people are more or less ambiverted.

A good example of the interplay between types of situations and people is found in Revelle's (1976) work on introverts and extraverts. Introverts did not differ greatly from extraverts under ordinary circumstances, but under stress (e.g. time pressure, drugs) the intellectual performance of introverts deteriorated, while the performance of extraverts improved.

The partial separability of these two main components of extraversion is confirmed by factor analysis, the correlation between sociability and impulsiveness subfactors being around 0.5 (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1963). Impulsiveness tends to be an unstable
(neurotic) form of extraversion, whereas sociability is associated with stability or "adjustment". Overall, extraversion is fairly independent of neuroticism. It may be independent of neuroticism. It is to identify several other sub-factors of extraversion at the primary factor level (e.g., activity, liveliness, excitability, optimism), but sociability and impulsiveness emerge as the dearest components and have been the most studied. It is sometimes found that known correlations between extraversion and certain other behaviours are attributable exclusively to the effect of one or other of these two subfactors. It may be ascribed that extraverts generally show faster deterioration of performance than introverts on monotonous tasks such as keeping watch for infrequent signals. A recent study by Thackray, Jones, and Touchstone (1974) revealed that increasing attention lapses of extraverts relative to introverts on a reaction time task were a function of their impulsivity not their sociability. The importance of studying impulsiveness separately from sociability will also be seen when theories of the biological basis of personality are considered. Groy (1972) believes that impulsiveness and not extraversion is a personality "primary".
Among personality characteristics the extraversion-introversion, neuroticism-stability and achievement need appear to be related to work behaviour, specifically to turnover behaviour (Suturia, 1977).

The scientific study of personality is distinguished by consideration of reliability, validity, and objectivity (Stagner, 1972). Personality factors have a direct bearing on the adequacy with which people can fulfill the function of their jobs (Mc Cornick and Iigen, 1987).

Personality is defined by Eysenck (1976) as "more or less stable and enduring organisation of a person's character, temperament, intellect and physique, which determines his unique adjustment to the environment."

In India, Kamlesh (1981) defined personality as to be the unique characteristics of an individual which distinguishes the individual from other, it is therefore a pattern of behaviour which is individual to a person and differentiates him from others.

Personality refers to certain characteristics which predispose the individual to act in a particular way. Personality characteristics of individual can be
understood either through self-perceptions of the individuals, or by objective assessment (Menon, 1974). According to Sen (1976) people not only differ in their total personality make up but also in the possession of different personality traits by degrees. Success in a particular profession depends on right kind of combination of different traits among other things, such as skills, certain kinds of knowledge and work experience. In other words, a successful group of people in a particular kind of profession may be identified by the presence of a similar type of personality traits in them. People again differ in the way they spend their leisure as they do in selecting their career. As a matter of fact that the choice of off-the-job activities may become more important than choice of profession in determining the individuals ability to obtain fulfillment of his personal aspirations.
2.4. **Concept of Organisational Climate** :-

The concept of organizational climate has taken by different researchers in two ways: - organisational climate and organizational culture.

2.4.1. **Concept of Organisational Climate** :-

Organizational climate has been defined as a molar concept reflecting the content and strength of the prevalent values, norms, attitudes, behaviors, and feelings of the members of a social system which can be operationally measured through the perception of system members or observational and objective means (Payne, 1971). Campbell (1970) has defined organizational climate as a set of attributes specific to a particular organization that may be induced from the way that organization deals with its members and its environment.

The definition of organizational climate represent an adoption of conceptions set forth by Beer (1971); Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970); Dachler (1973); and Schneider (1973). Organizational climate further refers to a set of attributes which can be perceived about a particular organization and/or its subsystems, and the same may again be induced from the way that organization and/or its subsystems deal with their member and environment.
According to James and Jones (1974) organizational climate refers to attributes of an organization, a situational description, measured via perceptual means. Psychological climate, on the other hand, refers to attributes of an individual, a personalistic evaluation of events and the perception of those events. The unit of analysis in "organizational climate" is the organization, while the unit of analysis in "psychological climate" is the individual. Schneider (1975) has commented that in many instruments purportedly designed to measure, "organizational climate", the unit of analysis is actually the individual and not the organization. Guion (1973), and Johnneson (1973) have criticized the concept of psychological climate, claiming that conceptualization of organizational climate as an individual attribute amounted to a "rediscovery of the wheel".

The concept of organizational climate in the work environment is a contemporary topic of interest. One value of the climate concept is that multiple dimensions of behaviour within organizations can be studied and considered under a global concept (Schneider, 1972).

According to Ali (1986) the concept of organizational climate is generally viewed as an
important variable for understanding the behaviour of the organizations and their members. Payne and Mansfield (1973) have stressed the importance of the concept of climate in terms of its capacity to link the individual level to the organizational level of analysis.

The variable subsumed under different objective measures of organizational climate seem to be substantially more diverse than the perceptual ones. In part, this may be a consequence of the ability and propensity of some researchers using objective measures to pursue a micro-level strategy, whereas the perceptual climate researchers tend to pursue a macro-level strategy. Research focusing on objective measures of organizational climate has been undertaken by Lirtzman, House and Rizzo (1973), and Whisler (1970). One source of concern with perceptual measure of climate, in contrast to objective climate assessments, is that "there are potentially as many climates as there are people in the organization" (Johanneson, 1971).

According to Jones and James (1977) organizational climate consists of five components which are directly under the control of management, that is, it has the ability to effect changes in the climate through any of the component. The five components are:-
i) The goals and objectives of the organization and the manner in which management pursues their attainment.

ii) The formal relationships, delineating authority and functional responsibility.

iii) Leadership styles and communications.

iv) Physical environment like noise, safety etc.

v) The formal value system of the organization, kinds of behaviour encouraged and rewarded etc.

In India, the concept of organizational climate has been operationalized rather recently in the area of industrial research. Although researchers in the past were very much cognizant about the influence exerted by varying organizational climates on the productivity of employees, they concentrated on isolated studies of a few selected variables (usually one or two such as incentives, communication, job security, motivation etc.) for which consistent relationships with productivity were rarely demonstrated. The emergence of the concept of organizational climate and studies on
The term organizational climate as refered to a set of organisational characteristics which can be induced from the way an organization deals with its members. How an organisation deals with its members is a function of the various personnel policies and practices as perceived by the members of the organization. Organisational climate affects not only the behaviour of individuals, but also how organisations themselves interact (Suba and Anantharaman, 1980, 1981).

Organizational climate is defined as a global impression of what the organization is or as a manifestation of the attitudes of organizational members (all employees) towards the organization itself. These attitude are based upon such things as management policies supervisory techniques, the "fairness" of management and everything that effects the work environment (Chandha and Kaur, 1989). Organizational climate which implies work environment created by man-
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management of the organization is one of the important components of organizational effectiveness (Mukherjee, 1990).

The crucial elements of organizational climate are the individual perceptions of the relevant stimuli, constraints and reinforcement contingencies that govern his job behaviour (Sayeed, 1980). The concept of organization climate has been developed to donate that part of overall work environment, which is described as organization "atmosphere" or "culture", and it is generally defined as the perceived quality of the organizational environment (Kandan, 1985). Maheswari (1980) measured organizational climate on the basis of four factors: environment, technology, Organisation process structure and people, and their competence and motivation.

More recently Pareek (1975) has developed a scale to measure organisational climate, which is best suited to Indian conditions. It is known as motivational analysis of organisations (climate) questionnaire MAO (C) and patterned after Litwin and Stringer's (1968) Climate questionnaire. However, it differs from Litwin and Stringer's (1968) questionnaire in same that (i) it is comparatively more exhaustive and (ii) it use ranking
method rather than the rating method sued in Litwin and Stringer's (1968) questionnaire. Climate is assessed in terms of Achievement, Expert Power, Extension, Affiliation, Dependency and control in twelve areas, namely; orientation, interpersonal relationship, supervision, managing problems, managing mistakes, managing conflicts, communication, decision-making, trust, managing rewards, risk taking and innovation and change.

(i) Achievement dominance indicates concern for work excellence and competition with other companies, excellence is rewarded, information is available for those who need it for decision-making; those who achieve are trusted, people prefer to solve problems by themselves, take mode rate risks and are concerned about achieving tasks.

(ii) Expert Power dominance refers to a climate where people with skill and expertise are encouraged. They are influential in decision-making resolving conflicts and problems and command high regard in the organisation.

(iii) Extension dominance is indicative of high concern to develop people and groups. Work and people are
treated as human beings with genuine concern for their welfare rather than being simply treated for their roles. In such a place people help each other, supervisors try to help their subordinates to grow and develop, people try to handle problems and resolve conflicts.

(iy) Affiliation dominance is characterised by people's striving for friendliness, warmth and affectionate relationships, where tasks and methods of achieving talks are based on relationships such as high concern for social relationship and closeness with each other, and where maintaining good relationship is given more importance than the other things.

(v) Dependency dominance is referred by where people do not do things on their own, but look for orders and suggestions from their supervisors and refers matters to them rather than attempting themselves for solutions. Such an organisation is characterised by observing rules and regulations, strictly following orders, and excessive dependence on authority, and a clear line of communication.

(wi) Control dominance indicates that people enjoy status, power and authority for its own sake,
managers like to control their subordinates, communication is selective only to some people and is used as a mechanism of control. Decisions are made by a few, and only-those few powerful dominate most of the decisions.

2.4.2. Concept of Organisational Culture :-

According to Smircich (1983), the concept has been used in a variety of ways depending on the different ways of conceiving "organization" and "culture" themselves, but she discerns two main research approaches among organizational culture studies:— the first where culture has been used as a "Critical Variable" (culture as something which the organisation has) and second where culture has been used as a "root metaphor" (culture as something which the organization is). Schein (1985) defines organizational culture as follows: "organizational culture, is the pattern of basic assumptions which a given group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration which have worked enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems".
Lebas and Weigenstein (1986) has defined that culture offers one way of shortening the action-correction cycle, when objectives, rules and procedures, and rules become internalized (instead of remaining externalized, as in the classical rules approach), and has shifted decisively towards culture along the continuum of approaches to control. Delisi (1990) has suggested that the professionally managed culture, however, represented values and contradicted those of most individual with in organization, they had grown up with entrepreneurial values.

Greetz (1973) has focused on language and symbols, Cultural descriptions, according to Goodenough (1971), require the discovery and writing out of systematic rules or algorithms that members of the culture implicit use to generate acceptable behaviour. Hofstede (1985) studied four dimensions of 50 cultures and found these dimensions adequate to explain cultural orientations; individualism vs. collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity vs femininity.

A major test of the value of any definition of organizational culture is its value in predicting or
explaining other features of an organization—effectiveness, survival, change etc. congruence with accepted conceptions facilitating discourse, but is a luxury if unrelated to empirically testable statements (Reynolds, 1986). A review of contemporary writing on organizational culture found three interrelated concepts in use (Allaire and Firsirotu, 1984) :- (i) a socio structural system composed of the perceived functioning of formal structures, strategies, policies and management processes; (ii) a cultural system that embodies the organization's myths, values and ideology; and (iii) the individual actors with their particular endowments, endowments, experience and personality.

Deal and Kennedy (1982) have proposed four types of organizational culture on the basis of the degree of risk associated with the company's activities and the speed at which employees get feet back. These are tough-guy; macho-culture, work hard/play hard culture, bet your company culture and process culture. Pettigrew (1979) expressed culture in six forms: (i) Symbol (ii) Language, (iii) Ideology; (iv) Belief; (v) Ritual; and (vi) Myth, of which symbol is the most important. Trice and Beyer (1984) identified thirteen distinctive culture forms:- (i) rite; (ii) ceremonial; (iii) ritual; (iv) myth; (v) saga; (vi) legend; (vii) story; (viii) folk-
In India, there are few researchers who studied organizational culture in their studies. In recent years, the term 'culture' has been increasingly in vague in studies of organisational behaviour because of the growing realization among organizational scientists and management consultants that the culture of an organisation has as such influence on corporate effectiveness as the formal structure of jobs, authority, technical and financial procedures. Although the term culture is normally used to refer to the intangible aspects of an organization such as its beliefs, rituals, customs and traditions which its members have built up over the year for coping with the situation, there is still a conceptual ambiguity surrounding the usage of the term culture in organizational studies (Amasa, 1986). Singh et al. (1977) in a study of "organisational culture and its impact on managerial remuneration" concluded that the demand for money was significantly influenced by the quality of organizational culture and that it can substantially be reduced by improving the quality of organizational culture.
Mamutty (1990) defined that corporate culture is like the glue that holds organisation together something invisible that performs a stabilising function. He obtained some factors which help in development of corporate culture: (i) history of organisation, (ii) technology; (iii) industrial customs and practice, (iv) employees type and classes; and (v) organisational structure. Organisation culture may also be defined as a network of shared undertakings, norms and values that are undertaken for granted and that lie beneath the surface of organisational life. Management is the process of achieving results in organised groups (Pareek, 1988). The organisations and their groups function in a societal culture, in fact, they are part of the large culture. Organisations have their own cultures which are shaped to a large extent by the larger societal cultures (Pareek, 1988).