CHAPTER V
RESULTS

5.1 Comparative Study:

Following are the objectives of comparative study:

1. To determine the difference between technocrats using either avoidance or approach as a dominant mode of coping with respect to organizational role stress, negative indicators (AX/EX, AX-out, AX-in, AX-con trait-anxiety and depression) and positive indicators (off-the-job and on-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being.

2. To determine the difference between technocrats having either high or low organizational support with respect to organizational role stress, negative indicators (AX/EX, AX-out, AX-in AX-cont. trait-anxiety, and depression) and positive indicators (off-the-job and on-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being.

5.1.1 Comparison of technocrats using either avoidance or approach mode of coping with respect to organizational role stress.

Table 5.1 provides the comparison of technocrats using either avoidance or approach coping strategies with respect to organizational role stress and its ten components.

It is evident from the table 5.1 that with respect to inter role distance (IRD), the technocrats using avoidance as dominant coping style differed significantly from their counterparts using approach coping style. (df = 221, t = 2.83, p< .01). The technocrats using avoidance mode of coping had higher mean score (M = 3.831) than their counterparts using approach coping style (M = 3.100). This shows that the technocrats using avoidance mode of coping experienced more conflicts between the organizational role
and other roles as compared to their counterparts using approach mode of coping. It is further evident from table 5.1 that with respect to role

**Table 5.1:** Comparison of technocrats using either avoidance or approach as dominant mode of coping with respect to organizational role stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Measures of ORS</th>
<th>Approach Coping (N = 110)</th>
<th>Avoidance Coping (N = 113)</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>IRD M</td>
<td>3.100 M S.D. 1.740</td>
<td>3.831 M S.D. 2.104</td>
<td>2.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>RS M</td>
<td>2.654 M S.D. 1.104</td>
<td>2.327 M S.D. 1.047</td>
<td>2.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>REC M</td>
<td>2.845 M S.D. 1.687</td>
<td>2.575 M S.D. 1.252</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>RI M</td>
<td>4.081 M S.D. 3.771</td>
<td>5.004 M S.D. 3.416</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>PI M</td>
<td>2.481 M S.D. 1.115</td>
<td>2.734 M S.D. 1.00</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>SRD M</td>
<td>2.409 M S.D. 1.089</td>
<td>2.805 M S.D. 0.953</td>
<td>2.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>RA M</td>
<td>2.427 M S.D. 0.962</td>
<td>2.672 M S.D. 0.1411</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>RIn M</td>
<td>2.536 M S.D. 1.020</td>
<td>2.654 M S.D. 1.450</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01,
IRD – Inter-Role Distance  
RS – Role Stagnation  
REC – Role Expectation Conflict  
RE – Role Erosion  
RO – Role Overload  
RI – Role Isolation  
PI – Personal Inadequacy  
SRD – Self Role Distance  
RA – Role Ambiguity  
RIn – Resource Inadequacy  
ORS – Organizational Role Stress
Figure 5.1: Comparison of technocrats using either avoidance or approach as dominant mode of coping with respect to organizational role stress (ORS).
stagnation (RS), the technocrats using avoidance coping style significantly differed from their counterparts using approach coping style ($df = 221$, $t = 2.2$, $p < .05$). The technocrats with approach as dominant coping style had higher mean score ($M = 2.654$) than their counterparts using avoidance coping style ($M = 2.327$). This shows that technocrats using approach coping style as dominant mode experienced a higher gap between demand to outgrow their previous role and to occupy the new role effectively and also experienced the feelings of being stuck in same role as compared to their counterparts using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping.

There was no significant difference between technocrats using approach mode of coping and their counterparts using avoidance mode of coping in terms of role erosion (RE) ($df = 221$, $t = 1.36$, $p > .05$) and role overload (RO), ($df = 221$, $t = 1.26$, $p > 0.5$).

Table 5.1 also indicates that with respect to role isolation (RI), the technocrats using avoidance coping style differed significantly from their counterparts using approach mode of coping ($df = 221$, $t = 2.00$, $p < .05$). The technocrats using avoidance style of coping had higher mean score ($M = 5.044$) than those using approach style of coping ($M = 4.081$). This shows that technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping experienced more stress in term of lack of appropriate linkages of their role and other roles in the organization as compared to their counterpart using approach as a dominant mode of coping.

It is also evident from table 5.1 that with respect to personal inadequacy (PI), the technocrats using avoidance mode to coping did not differ significantly from their counterparts using approach mode of coping ($df = 221$, $t = 1.78$, $p > .05$).

Table 5.1 further demonstrates that with respect to self role distance, the technocrats using avoidance as a mode of coping significantly differed from their counterparts using approach style of coping ($df = 221$, $t = 2.89$, $p < .01$). The technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping
had higher mean score (M = 2.805). Than their counterparts using approach mode of coping (M = 2.409). This indicates that the technocrats using avoidance coping style experienced more conflicts between the self concept and the expectations from the role as compared to their counterparts using approach as a dominant mode of coping.

There was no significant difference between technocrats using avoidance mode of coping and their counterparts technocrats using approach mode of coping in terms of role ambiguity (RA) and resource inadequacy (Rln).

Further, table 5.1 also demonstrates that with respect to total organizational role stress (ORS) the technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping significantly differed from their counterparts technocrats using approach as dominant mode of coping (df = 221, t = 2.66, p< .01).

The technocrats using avoidance as dominant mode of coping had higher mean score (M = 36.053) than their counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping (M = 32.681). This indicates that the technocrats using avoidance mode of coping experienced more stress related to inter role distance, role isolation and self role distance as compared to their counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping.

In brief the results from table 5.1 shows that technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping scored higher on inter role distance (IRD), role isolation (RI), self role distance (SRD), and total organizational role stress (ORS) as compared to their counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping, while on role stagnation (RS) the technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping scored higher as compared to their counterpart technocrats using avoidance as a mode of coping. The hypothesis 1-A stating that the technocrats using avoidance as dominant mode of coping will score higher
on organizational role stress as compared to their counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping is by and large accepted.

Table 5.2: Comparison of technocrats using either avoidance or approach as dominant mode of coping with respect to Negative indicators (AX/EX, AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont., trait-anxiety and depression) and positive indicators (off-the-job and on-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Measures of PWB</th>
<th>Approach Coping (N = 110)</th>
<th>Avoidance Coping (N = 113)</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>AX/EX</td>
<td>M S.D. 34.854 9.983</td>
<td>M S.D. 36.265 10.507</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>AX-out</td>
<td>M S.D. 15.590 6.935</td>
<td>M S.D. 20.743 3.440</td>
<td>7.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Trait Anxiety</td>
<td>M S.D. 45.027 8.944</td>
<td>M S.D. 49.575 6.712</td>
<td>4.29**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01.

AX/EX – Anger – Expression
AX-out – Anger-out
AX-in – Anger - in
AX-cont. – Anger Control
PWB – Psychological well-being
Figure 5.2: Comparison of technocrats using either avoidance or approach as dominant mode of coping with respect to negative indicators (AX/EX, AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont, Trait Anxiety and Depression) and positive indicators (off-the-job and on-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being.
5.1.2 Comparison of technocrats using either avoidance or approach mode of coping with respect to negative indicators (AX/EX, AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont, trait-anxiety and depression) and positive indicators (job satisfaction: on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being.

Table 5.1 provides the comparison of technocrats using either avoidance or approach as a dominant mode of coping with respect to negative indicators (AX/EX, AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont, trait-anxiety and depression and positive indicators (job satisfaction i.e. on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being.

It is evident from table 5.1 that with respect to anger expression (AX/EX), the technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping did not differ significantly from their counterpart technocrats using approach as dominant mode of coping (df = 221, t = 1.03 p > .05). It is also evident from table 5.2 that with respect to anger-out, the technocrats using avoidance style of coping differed significantly from their counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant coping style (df = 221, t = 7.00, p < .01). The technocrats using avoidance coping style had higher mean score (M = 20.743) than their counterparts using approach as a coping style (M = 15.590). This indicates that the technocrats using avoidance as coping style expressed more anger towards other person or the object in the environment as compared to their counterpart technocrats using approach as coping style.

Table 5.2 further demonstrates that with respect to anger-in, the technocrats using avoidance as dominant mode of coping differed significantly from its counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping (df = 221, t = 7.06, p < .01). The technocrats using avoidance mode of coping had higher mean score (M = 19.141) than their counterpart technocrats using approach mode of coping (M = 13.345). This shows that the technocrats using avoidance as a dominant style of coping employed more frequently the anger-in (AX-in) as mode of anger.
expression than their counterparts using approach as a dominant style of coping. Table 5.2 also demonstrates that with respect to anger control, the technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping differed significantly from their counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping (df = 221, t = 2.49, p < .05). The technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping had higher mean score (M = 21.718) than their counterpart technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping (M = 20.238). This indicates that the technocrats using approach as a dominant style of coping more frequently attempted to control the outward expression of angry feelings as compared to their counterpart technocrats using avoidance style of coping.

Table 5.2 further demonstrates that with respect to trait anxiety, the technocrats using avoidance as a dominant style of coping significantly differed from their counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant style of coping (df = 221, t = 4.29, p < .01). The technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping had higher mean score (M = 49.575) than their counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping (M = 45.027). This indicates that technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping reported more trait Anxiety. They tend to perceive external events or internal cues (thoughts, memories) as dangerous or threatening and a corresponding tendency to respond to such threats with elevation in state anxiety as compared to their counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping.

Further table 5.2 also demonstrates that with respect to depression, the technocrats using avoidance style of coping significantly differed from their counterpart technocrats using approach style of coping (df = 221, t = 6.94, p < .01). The technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping had higher mean (M = 51.663) than their counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping (M = 45.072). This shows that the technocrats using avoidance style of coping experienced more
dejection, feelings of worthlessness and guilt as compared to their counterpart technocrats using approach as dominant mode of coping.

Table 5.2 also indicates that with respect to job satisfaction i.e. on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction, the technocrats using avoidance mode of coping did not differ significantly from their counterpart technocrats using approach style of coping.

In brief the results from table 5.2 show that the technocrats using avoidance as a dominant style of coping scored higher on AX-out, AX-in, trait-anxiety, depression as compared to their counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant style of coping. However on AX-cont., the technocrats using approach as a mode coping scored higher as compared to their counterpart technocrats using avoidance as a mode coping.

The hypothesis 1-A “the technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping will score higher on negative indicators (AX/EX, AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont., trait-anxiety and depression) of psychological well-being as compared to their counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant style of coping” is by and large accepted.

5.1.3 Comparison of technocrats having either high or low organizational support with respect to organizational role stress.

Table 5.3 provides the comparison of technocrats having either high or low organizational support with respect to organizational role stress.

It is evident from table 5.3 that with respect to inter-role distance (IRD), the technocrats having high organizational support did not differ significantly from their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support (df = 153, t = 0.06 p > .05). Table 5.3 also indicates that with respect to role stagnation (RS) and role expectation conflict (REC), the technocrats having high organizational support did not significantly differ from their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support.
Table 5.3: Comparison of technocrats having either high or low organizational support with respect to organizational role stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Measures of ORS</th>
<th>High organizational support (N = 72)</th>
<th>Low-organizational support (N = 83)</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>M 3.472 S.D. 2.207</td>
<td>M 3.494 S.D. 2.020</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>M 2.472 S.D. 1.007</td>
<td>M 2.204 S.D. 0.907</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>REC</td>
<td>M 2.847 S.D. 1.709</td>
<td>M 2.698 S.D. 1.112</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>M 6.986 S.D. 5.045</td>
<td>M 5.494 S.D. 2.535</td>
<td>2.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>M 5.861 S.D. 5.149</td>
<td>M 3.975 S.D. 2.594</td>
<td>2.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Rl</td>
<td>M 5.125 S.D. 5.214</td>
<td>M 3.626 S.D. 1.980</td>
<td>2.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>M 2.680 S.D. 1.111</td>
<td>M 2.722 S.D. 1.016</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>M 2.458 S.D. 1.100</td>
<td>M 2.578 S.D. 1.001</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>M 2.569 S.D. 1.298</td>
<td>M 2.662 S.D. 1.328</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>RIn</td>
<td>M 2.361 S.D. 1.01</td>
<td>M 2.307 S.D. 1.44</td>
<td>2.25*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .05, ** p< .01

IRD – Inter-Role Distance  
RS – Role Stagnation  
REC – Role Expectation Conflict  
RE – Role Erosion  
RO – Role Overload  
Rl – Role Isolation  
PI – Personal Inadequacy  
SRD – Self Role Distance  
RA – Role Ambiguity  
RIn – Resource Inadequacy  
ORS – Organizational Role Stress

Table 5.3 further demonstrates that with respect to role erosion (RE), the technocrats having high organizational support differed significantly from their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support (df = 153, t = 2.27, p< .05). The technocrats having high organizational support had higher mean (M = 6.986) than their counterpart technocrats having low
Figure 5.3: Comparison of technocrats having either high or low organizational support with respect to organizational role stress.
organizational support ($M = 5.494$). This indicates that the technocrats having high organizational support experienced more that their role has become less important than it used to be, as compared to their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support.

Table 5.3 also indicates that with respect to role overload (RO), the technocrats having high organizational support significantly differed from their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support ($df = 153$, $t = 2.81$, $p < .01$). The technocrats having high organizational support had higher mean score ($M = 5.861$) as compared to their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support ($M = 3.975$). This indicates that the technocrats having high organizational support experienced more conflicts that too much is expected from the role than what the occupant can cope with as compared to their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support.

Further, Table 5.3 indicates that with respect to role isolation, the technocrats having high organizational support differed significantly from their counterpart having low organizational support ($df = 153$, $t = 2.30$, $p < .05$). The technocrats having high organizational support had higher mean score ($M = 5.125$) as compared to their counterpart having low organizational support ($M = 3.626$). This indicates that the technocrats having high organizational support experienced more stress in terms of lack of appropriate linkages of theirs role and other roles in the organization as compared to their counterpart technocrat having low organizational support.

It is also evident from Table 5.3 that technocrats having either high or low organizational support did not differ significantly on personal inadequacy (PI), role ambiguity (RA) dimension of ORS.

Further, Table 5.3 also demonstrates that with respect to resource inadequacy (RIn), the technocrats having high organizational support, differed significantly from their counterpart technocrats having low
organizational support (df = 153, t = 2.25, p< .05). The technocrats having low organizational support had higher mean score (M = 2.807) as compared to their counterpart technocrats having high organizational support (M = 2.361). This shows that the technocrats having low organizational support experienced more stress due to non-availability of resources needed for effective role performance as compared to their counterpart technocrats having high organizational support.

Table 5.3 also demonstrates that with respect to total organizational role stress (ORS), the technocrats having high organizational support differed significantly from their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support (df = 153, t = 2.65, p< .01). The technocrats having high organizational support had a high mean score (M = 36.833) than their counterparts having low organizational support (M = 32.265). This shows that the technocrats having high organizational support experienced more stress in terms of resource inadequacy i.e. resources required by the role occupant for performing the role effectively as compared to their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support.

In brief the results from table 5.3 shows that the technocrats having high organizational support scored higher on role erosion (RE), role overload (RO), role isolation (RI), and table ORS as compared to those technocrats having low organizational support.

The hypothesis 2-A stating that the technocrats having high organizational support will score lower on organizational role stress (ORS) and its components as compared their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support is partially rejected.
5.1.4 Comparison of technocrats having either high or low organizational support with respect to negative indicators (AX/EX, AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont, trait-anxiety, and depression) and positive indicators (job satisfaction: on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being.

Table 5.4 provides the comparison of technocrats having either high or low organizational support with respect to negative indicators (AX/EX, AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont, trait-anxiety and depression) and positive indicators (job satisfaction: on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being.

It is evident from table 5.4 that with respect to anger expression (AX/EX), the technocrats having high organizational support did not differ significantly from their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support (df = 153, t = 1.76 p > .05). It is also evident from table 5.4 that with respect to Anger-out (AX-out) the technocrats having high organizational support differed significantly from their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support (df = 153, t = 7.68, p < .01). The technocrats having low organizational support had higher mean score (M = 21.216) than their counterpart technocrats having high organizational support (M = 13.819). This indicates that technocrats having low organizational support expressed more angry feelings towards other persons or objects in the environment as compared to their counterpart having high organizational support.

Table 5.4 further demonstrates that with respect to anger-in (AX-in), the technocrats having high organizational support significantly differed from their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support (df = 153, t = 8.64, p < .01). The technocrats having low organizational support had higher mean (M = 19.867) than their counterpart technocrats having high organizational support (M = 11.027). This shows that the technocrats with low organizational support employed more frequently the anger-in as
Table 5.4: Comparison of technocrats having either high or low organizational support with respect to negative indicators (AX/EX, AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont, trait-anxiety and depression) and positive indicators (off-the-job and on-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Measures of PWB</th>
<th>High organizational support (N = 72)</th>
<th>Low organizational support (N = 83)</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>AX-in</td>
<td>M 11.027 S.D. 7.156</td>
<td>M 19.867 S.D. 5.284</td>
<td>8.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Trait Anxiety</td>
<td>M 47.291 S.D. 8.226</td>
<td>M 45.867 S.D. 8.917</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>M 47.722 S.D. 7.567</td>
<td>M 46.289 S.D. 8.479</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Off-the-job satisfaction</td>
<td>M 17.736 S.D. 5.283</td>
<td>M 15.795 S.D. 6.644</td>
<td>2.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>On-the-job satisfaction</td>
<td>M 18.569 S.D. 5.614</td>
<td>M 17.867 S.D. 7.160</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

AX/EX – Anger – Expression
AX-out – Anger-out
AX-in – Anger - in
AX-cont. – Anger Control
PWB – Psychological well-being
Figure 5.4: Comparison of technocrats having either high or low organizational support with respect to negative indicators (AX/EX, AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont, Trait Anxiety and Depression) and positive indicators (off-the-job and on-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being.
mode of anger-expression than their counterparts having high organizational support.

Table 5.4 also further demonstrates that with respect to anger-control (AX-cont.), the technocrats having high organizational support differed significantly from their counterpart having low organizational support (df = 153, t = 5.26, p< .01). The technocrats having high organizational support had higher mean score (23.555) than their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support (M = 19.289). This indicates that the technocrats having high organizational support more frequently attempted to control the outward expression of angry feelings as compared to their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support.

It is also evident from table 5.4 that with respect to trait-anxiety, the technocrats having high organizational support did not significantly differ from their counterparts having low organizational support (df = 153, t = 1.03, p> .05).

Table 5.4 further indicates that with respect to depression, no-significant difference emerged between technocrats having either high or low organizational support (df = 153, t = 1.11, p> .05).

Table 5.4 also demonstrates that with respect to off-the-job satisfaction, the technocrats having high organizational support differed significantly from their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support (df = 153, t = 2.02, p< .05). The technocrats having high organizational support had higher mean (M = 17.736) as compared to technocrats having low organizational support (M = 15.795). This indicates that technocrats having high organizational support reported better relation with family members, higher sociability, lesser emotionality-neuroticism, lesser anxiety about health than their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support.
Table 5.4 demonstrates that with respect to on-the-job satisfaction, the technocrats having high organizational support did not differ significantly from their counterparts having low organizational support.

In brief the results from table 5.4 show that the technocrats having low organizational support scored higher on AX-out and AX-in dimensions of anger as compared to their counterpart technocrats having high organizational support. However in case of AX-cont., technocrats having high organizational support scored higher as compared to their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support.

The hypothesis 2-A stats that technocrats having low organizational support will score higher on Negative indicators (AX/EX, AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont, trait-anxiety and depression) of psychological well-being as compared to their counterpart technocrats having high organizational support is by and large accepted.

Also, the result from table 5.4 show that the technocrats having high organizational support scored higher on off-the-job satisfaction as compared to their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support.

The hypothesis 2-B stating that the technocrats having high organizational support will score higher on positive indicators (on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) as compared to their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support is partially accepted.
5.1.5 Conclusions:
The following conclusions may be drawn on the basis of comparison studies.

i) The technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping scored higher on inter role distance (IRD), role isolation (RI), self role distance (SRD), and total organizational role stress (ORS) as compared to their counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping.

ii) The technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping scored higher on role stagnation (RS) as compared to their counterpart technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping.

iii) The technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping scored higher on anger-out (AX-out), and anger-in (AX-in) dimensions of anger expression as compared to their counterparts technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping.

iv) The technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping scored higher on trait-anxiety as compared to their counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping.

v) The technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping scored higher on depression as compared to their counterpart technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping.

vi) The technocrats using approach as a dominant mode of coping scored higher on anger-control (AX-cont.) dimension of anger expression as compared to their counterpart technocrats using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping.
vii) The technocrats having high organizational support scored higher on role erosion (RE), role overload (RO), role inadequacy (RIn.) and total organizational role stress (ORS) as compared to their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support.

viii) The technocrats having low organizational support scored higher on anger-out, (AX-out) and anger-in (AX-in) dimensions of anger expression as compared to their counterpart technocrats having high organizational support.

ix) The technocrats having high organizational support scored higher on anger-control (AX-cont.) dimension of anger expression and off-the-job satisfaction, dimension of job satisfaction as compared to their counterpart technocrats having low organizational support.

5.2 Correlational Analysis:

The objectives of correlational analysis are as follow:

i) To find out the relationship between coping strategies (avoidance and approach coping) and organizational role stress among technocrats.

ii) To find out the relationship between organizational support and organizational role stress among technocrats.

iii) To find out the relationship between coping strategies (avoidance and approach coping) and negative indicators (trait-anxiety, anger-in, anger-out, anger-control & depression) of psychological well-being among technocrats.

iv) To find out the relationship between organizational support and negative indicators (trait-anxiety, anger-out, anger-in, anger-control and depression) of psychological well-being among technocrats.
v) To find out the relationship between coping strategies (avoidance and approach coping) and positive indicators (off-the-job satisfaction and on-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being among technocrats.

vi) To find out the relationship between organizational social support and positive indicators (off-the-job and on-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being among technocrats.

5.2.1 Relationship of organizational role stress with coping strategies (approach and avoidance coping) and organizational support among technocrats.

Table 5.5 indicates the relationship of organizational role stress with coping strategies (approach and avoidance) and organizational support among technocrats.

It is evident from table 5.5 that in case of technocrats negative and significant relationship emerged between approach coping and (IRD), \( r = -0.1841, p < .05 \). Thus greater the approach coping lower is the inter-role distance or vice-versa. Table 5.5 also indicates that positive and significant relationship of approach coping emerged with role stagnation (RS), \( r = 0.1369, p < .05 \) and role expectation conflicts (REC), \( r = 0.1337, p < .05 \). This means that greater the approach coping higher is the role stagnation or vice-versa. Similarly greater the approach coping higher is the role expectation conflicts or vice-versa.
Table 5.5

Relationship of Organizational Role Stress with Coping Styles (Approach and Avoidance Coping) and Organizational Role Stress Within Technocrats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>IRD</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>REC</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>RI</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>SRD</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>RIN</th>
<th>Total ORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach Coping</td>
<td>-.1841*</td>
<td>.1369*</td>
<td>.337*</td>
<td>-.0691</td>
<td>.0042</td>
<td>-.0919</td>
<td>-.1535*</td>
<td>-.1449*</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.0053</td>
<td>-.0915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance Coping</td>
<td>.0803</td>
<td>-.0550</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>.0312</td>
<td>.0755</td>
<td>.0524</td>
<td>.0207</td>
<td>-.1279*</td>
<td>.0214*</td>
<td>.0391</td>
<td>.0239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>.0193</td>
<td>.0802</td>
<td>.0324</td>
<td>.1479*</td>
<td>.1643*</td>
<td>.1354*</td>
<td>.0330</td>
<td>-.0817</td>
<td>-.0480</td>
<td>-.1156*</td>
<td>.1625*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

IRD = Inter Role Distance
RS = Role Stagnation
REC = Role Expectation
RE = Role Erosion
RO = Role Overload
RI = Role Isolation
PI = Personal Inadequacy
RA = Role Ambiguity
RIN = Resource Inadequacy
ORS = Organizational Role Stress
Table 5.5 indicates that in case of technocrats negative and significant relationship of approach coping was found with personal inadequacy (PI), \( r = -0.1535, p < 0.05 \) and self role distances (SRD), \( r = -0.1449, p < 0.05 \). Thus greater the approach coping lower is the personal inadequacy (PI) or vice versa. Similarly greater the approach coping lower is the self role distance (SRD) or vice versa. The results from table 5.5 also indicates that approach coping did not relate significantly with dimensions; role erosion (RE), role over load (RO), role isolation (RI), role ambiguity (RA), resource inadequacy (RIn.) and total organizational role stress (ORS).

Table 5.5 further demonstrates that in case of technocrats positive and significant relationship emerged between avoidance coping and self role distance (SRD), \( r = 0.1279, p < 0.05 \). Thus greater the avoidance coping higher is the self role distance or vice-versa. The results from table 5.5 also demonstrates that in case of technocrats avoidance coping did not relate significantly with any other dimension of organizational role stress (ORS) i.e. inter role distance (IRD), role stagnation (RS), resource expectation conflicts (REC), role erosion (RE), role overload (RO), role isolation (RI), personal inadequacy (PI), role ambiguity (RA) & resource inadequacy (RIn.), and total organizational role stress (ORS).

It is also evident from table 5.5 that in case of technocrats positive and significant relationship emerged between organizational support and role erosion (RE), \( r = 0.1479, p < 0.05 \) and organizational support and role overload (RO), \( r = 0.1643, p < 0.05 \). Thus greater the organizational support
higher is the role erosion (RE) or vice-versa. Similarly greater the organizational support higher is the role overload (RO) or vice-versa.

This means that with increase in support from friends, colleagues and subordinates/immediate boss increased the feelings that too much is expected from the role than what the occupant can cope with the provided situation. Table 5.5 further indicates that in case of technocrats, positive and significant relationship of organizational support emerged with RI (r=.1354, p < .05) and total ORS (r = .1625, p < .05). Thus greater the organizational support greater is the RI or vice-versa. Similarly greater the organizational support higher is the total ORS or vice-versa. The results from table 5.5 also further demonstrate that negative and significant relationship emerged between organizational support and resource inadequacy (Rln.), (r = -.1156, p < .05). Thus greater the organizational support lower is the Rln or vice-versa.

Table 5.5 also indicates that in case of technocrats, positive and significant relationships of organizational support emerged with role overload (r = .1643, p< .05) and role isolation (r = .1354, p< .05). Thus greater the support from friends and subordinates higher is the role overload or vice versa. Similarly greater is the support from friends, colleagues and subordinates higher is the role isolation or vice-versa.

In brief the results from table 5.5 show that approach mode of coping negatively and significantly related with inter role distance (IRD), personal inadequacy (PI), and self role distance. However, positive and significant relationship of approach coping emerged with role stagnation (RS) and role expectation conflict (REC). Thus the hypothesis 3-B "approach mode of coping will be negatively related with organizational role stress" is partially accepted. Table 5.5 also shows that positive and significant relationship emerged between avoidance coping and organization role stress. Thus the hypothesis 3-A "avoidance mode of coping will be positively related with organizational role stress" is by and large accepted.
Also table 5.5 shows that positive and significant relationship of organizational support emerged with role erosion, role overload and role inadequacy, however, a negative and significant relationship emerged between organizational support and resource inadequacy. Thus the hypothesis 4-A “that organizational support will be negatively related with organizational role stress” is partially accepted.

5.2.2 Relationship of negative indicators (ax-out, ax-in, ax-con, trait anxiety and depression) of psychological well being with coping strategies (avoidance and approach) and organizational support among technocrats.

Table 5.6 indicates the relationship of negative indicators (Ax-out, Ax-in, Ax-con, trait-anxiety, and depression) of psychological well being with coping strategies (approach and avoidance) and organizational support among technocrats.

Table 5.6: Relationship of Negative indicators Ax-out, Ax-in, Ax-con, trait-anxiety and depression) with Coping strategies (approach and avoidance) and organizational support among technocrats.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Anger-Out</th>
<th>Anger-In</th>
<th>Anger-Control</th>
<th>Trait Anxiety</th>
<th>Depression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach Coping</td>
<td>-.2864***</td>
<td>-.3114***</td>
<td>.0779</td>
<td>-.2299**</td>
<td>-.3793***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance Coping</td>
<td>.4046***</td>
<td>.3489***</td>
<td>-.2059*</td>
<td>.1838*</td>
<td>.2452**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>-.4082***</td>
<td>-.4236***</td>
<td>-.2887***</td>
<td>.0584</td>
<td>.0776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

It is evident from table 5.6 that in case of technocrats negative and significant relationship emerged between approach coping and anger-out (r = -.2864 < p .001). Thus greater the approach coping lower is the anger-out or vice-versa. The results from table 5.6 also indicate that negative and significant relationship of approach coping emerged with anger-in (r = -.3114, p < .001) and trait anxiety (r = -.2299, p < .05). Thus greater the
approach coping lower is the anger in or vice-versa. Similarly greater the approach coping lower is the trait anxiety or vice-versa.

Table 5.6 also indicates that in case of technocrats negative and significant relationship emerged between approach coping and depression \((r = -0.3793, P > 0.001)\) and no significant relationship occurred with anger-control thus it can be concluded that greater the approach coping lesser is the feelings of dejection and worthlessness or vice-versa.

In brief the results show that the negative indicators (Ax-out, Ax-in, Trait-anxiety and Depression) of psychological well-being are negatively related with approach coping. Thus the hypothesis 3-B “approach as a dominant mode of coping will be negatively related to negative indicators (AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont., trait anxiety and depression of psychological well-being” is by and large accepted.

Table 5.6 indicates that in case of technocrats positive and significant relationship of avoidance coping occurred with anger-out \((r = 0.4046, p < 0.001)\) and anger-in \((r = 0.3489, p < 0.00)\). Thus greater the avoidance coping higher is the anger-out or vice-versa. Similarly greater the avoidance coping higher is the anger-in or vice-versa. The results from table 5.6 also indicate that negative and significant relationship emerged between avoidance coping and anger-control \((r = -0.2059, p < 0.05)\) among technocrats. This means that greater the avoidance coping lower is the anger-control or vice-versa i.e. greater is the ineffective mode of coping lower is anger-control or vice-versa.

Table 5.6 further demonstrates that in case of technocrats positive and significant relationships of avoidance coping emerged with trait anxiety \((r = 0.1838, p < 0.05)\) and depression \((r = 0.2452, p < 0.01)\). Thus greater the avoidance coping higher is the trait anxiety or vice-versa. Similarly greater the avoidance coping higher is the depression or vice-versa.

In brief the results show that positive and significant relationship emerged between avoidance coping and negative indicators (Ax-out, Ax-in,
trait-anxiety and depression) of psychological well-being among technocrats. However, a negative and significant relationship emerged between avoidance coping and anger-control. Thus the hypothesis 3-A “that avoidance as a dominant mode of coping will be positively related to negative indicators (AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont., trait-anxiety and depression) of psychological well-being among technocrats” is by and large accepted.

Table 5.6 indicates that in case of technocrats negative and significant relationship of organizational support emerged with anger-out (r=-.4082, p < .001) and anger-in (r = -.4236, p < .001). This means that greater the organizational support lower is the anger-out or vice-versa, similarly greater the organizational support lower is the anger-in or vice-versa.

Table 5.6 also further demonstrates that positive and significant relationship emerged between organizational support and anger-control (r= .2887, p < .001) and no significant relationship emerged with trait-anxiety and depression.

Thus it can be concluded that greater the organizational support higher is the anger-control or vice-versa.

In brief the results show that negative and significant relationship emerged between organizational support, anger-out and anger-in. However, a negative and significant relationship occurred between organizational support and anger control. Thus the hypothesis 5-A “states that organizational support will be negatively related with the negative indicators (trait-anxiety, anger-out, anger-in, anger-cont and depression) of psychological well-being among technocrats” is by and large accepted.
5.2.3 Relationship of positive indicators (on-the-job satisfaction and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being (PWB) with coping strategies (approach and avoidance) and organizational support among technocrats.

Table 5.7 indicates the relationship of positive indicator (on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being with coping strategies (avoidance and approach) and organizational support within technocrats.

Table 5.7: Relationship of positive indicators (on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) with coping strategies (approach and avoidance) and organizational support among technocrats.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Technocrats (N = 300)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off-the-Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>On-the-Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Coping</td>
<td>.1164*</td>
<td>.0514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance Coping</td>
<td>.0361</td>
<td>-.1205*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>.1193*</td>
<td>.0289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

It is evident from table that in case of technocrats positive and significant relationship emerged between approach coping and off-the-job satisfaction (r = .1164, p < .05). Thus greater the approach coping higher is the off-the-job satisfaction or vice-versa. The results from table 5.7 also indicate that no significant relationship emerged between approach coping and on-the-job satisfaction.

Table 5.7 further demonstrates that negative and significant relationship emerged between avoidance coping and on-the-job satisfaction (r = -.1205; p < .05) and a no-significant relationship was found between avoidance coping and off-the-job satisfaction. This means that greater the avoidance coping lower is the on-the-job satisfaction or vice-versa.

Table 5.7 also further demonstrates that positive and significant relationship occurred between organizational support and off-the-job
satisfaction ($r = .1193 \ p < .05$) and no-significant relationship was found between organizational support and on-the-job satisfaction.

Thus it can be concluded that greater the organizational support higher is off-the-job satisfaction or vice-versa.

In brief the results show that positive and significant relationship emerged between approach coping and off-the-job satisfaction and a negative and significant relationship emerged between avoidance coping and on-the-job satisfaction. Also a positive and significant relationship emerged between organizational social support and off-the-job satisfaction.

5.2.4 Conclusions:

The following conclusions may be drawn on the basis of correlational analyses.

i) A negative and significant relationship emerged between approach and inter-role distance ($r = -.1841, \ p < .05$). Thus greater the approach coping lower is the inter role distance or vice-versa.

ii) Positive and significant relationship of approach coping emerged with role stagnation ($r = .1369, \ p < .05$) and role expectation conflicts ($r = .1337, \ p < .05$). This means that higher the approach coping greater is the role stagnation and the role expectation conflict or vice-versa.

iii) Negative and significant relationship of approach coping emerged with personal inadequacy ($r = -.1535, \ p < .05$) and self role distance ($r = -.1449, \ p < .05$). Thus greater the approach coping lower is the personal inadequacy and the self role distance.

iv) A positive and significant relationship emerged between avoidance coping and self role distance ($r = .1279, \ p < .05$). Thus greater the avoidance coping higher is the self role distance or vice-versa.
v) Positive and significant relationship of organizational support emerged with role erosion ($r = .1479$, $p < .05$) and role overload ($r = .1643$, $p < .05$). This means that greater the organizational support higher is the role erosion the role overload or vice-versa.

vi) Positive and significant relationship of organizational support emerged with role isolation ($r = .1354$, $p < .05$) and total organizational role stress ($r = .1625$, $p < .05$). Thus greater the organizational support higher is the role isolation or vice-versa. Similarly greater the organizational support higher is total organizational role stress or vice-versa.

vii) A negative and significant relationship emerged between organizational support and resource inadequacy ($r = -.1156$, $p < .05$). This means that greater the organizational support lower is the resource inadequacy or vice-versa.

viii) Negative and significant relationship of approach coping emerged with anger-out ($r = -.2864$, $p < .001$) and anger-in ($r = -.3114$, $p < .001$). Thus greater the approach coping lower is the anger-out and the anger-in or vice-versa.

ix) Negative and significant relationship of approach coping emerged with trait anxiety ($r = -.2299$, $p < .01$) and depression ($r = -.3793$, $p < .001$). Thus greater the approach coping lower is the trait anxiety and the depression or vice-versa.

x) Positive and significant relationship of avoidance coping emerged with anger-out ($r = .4046$, $p < .001$) and anger-in ($r = .3489$, $p < .001$). Thus greater the avoidance coping higher is the anger-out and the anger-in or vice-versa.

xi) A negative and significant relationship occurred between avoidance coping and anger-control ($r = -.2059$, $p < .05$). Thus greater the avoidance coping lower is the anger control or vice-versa.
xii) Positive and significant relationship of avoidance coping emerged with trait anxiety ($r = .1838, p < .05$) and depression ($r = .2452, p < .01$). This means that greater the avoidance coping higher is the trait anxiety and the depression or vice-versa.

xiii) Negative and significant relationship of organizational support emerged with anger-out ($r = -.4082, p < .001$) and anger-in ($r = -.4236, r = .001$). Thus greater the organizational support lower is the anger-out and the anger-in or vice-versa.

xiv) Positive and significant relationship emerged between organizational support and anger-control ($r = .2887, p < .001$). This means that greater the organizational support higher is the anger-control or vice-versa.

xv) Positive and significant relationship emerged between approach coping and off-the-job satisfaction ($r = .1164, p < .05$). Thus greater the approach coping higher is the off-the-job satisfaction or vice-versa.

xvi) Negative and significant relationship occurred between avoidance coping and on-the-job satisfaction ($r = -.1205, p < .05$). Thus greater the avoidance coping lower is the on-the-job satisfaction or vice-versa.

xvii) Positive and significant relationship emerged between organizational support and off-the-job satisfaction ($r = .1193, p < .05$). Thus greater the organizational support higher is the off-the-job satisfaction or vice-versa.

5.3 Regression Analysis:

The objectives of the regression analysis are to find out:

1) Whether coping styles (avoidance & approach) and organizational support contribute significantly to the variance in organizational role stress.
II) Whether coping styles (avoidance & approach) and organizational support contribute significantly to the variance in negative indicators (AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont., trait anxiety and depression) and the positive indicators (off-the-job and on-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being.

III) The variance explained by coping styles (avoidance & approach) and organizational support in each dependent variable (ORS, negative and positive indicators of psychological well-being).

Stepwise multivariate regression analysis begins with the selection of the variable that by itself has the highest correlation with the dependent variable. The procedure then selects, by computational steps, the variable that would make the largest gain in prediction. At this point the multiple R for the combination of the best prediction, and F-test to determine whether the new R is significantly greater than the correlation without the last addition. The addition of the variable would cease when the probability associated with the obtained F score above an adopted Alpha level (Guilford & Fruchter, 1982). At each step, the optimum variable is selected given the other variables in the equation. This procedure does not always yield the true optimum, but it usually does fairly well (Mitchell, 1970).

The t-test of regression coefficient, if significant, indicates the regression weight differs significantly from zero, which means that the variable with which it is associated contributes significantly to the regression, the other independent variable being taken into account. The co-efficient of multiple determination ($R^2$) associated with each predictor variable gives the variance accounted for by that variable in the predicted variable under consideration. Change in from one predictor to second or third $R^2$ represents how variance came with the addition of new variable. The F-ratios show the significance of $R^2$ change in the stepwise multiple regression analysis.
5.3.1 Multiple Regression Analysis for the indicators of organizational Role stress as predicted by coping strategies (avoidance & approach) and organizational support.

The results of multiple regression analyses with each of the indicator of organizational role stress and total organizational role stress being predicted by coping strategies i.e. avoidance and approach, and organizational support among technocrats are reported in table 5.8.

It is evident from table 5.8 that approach mode of coping was considered for the prediction of inter role distance (IRD), on account of it having the highest correlation out of the three independent variables i.e. approach coping, avoidance coping and organizational support, with IRD ($r = -.1841$). Avoidance mode of coping and organizational support were not added to prediction of inter role distance (IRD) dimension of organizational role stress (ORS).

The t-test for the test of significance of regression coefficient shows that only approach mode of coping ($t = 3.234$, $p < .001$) has significant regression weight. This means that only approach coping contributes to the regression explaining 3.39 percent variation ($R^2 = .0339$, $F = 10.45$, $p < .001$).

Results in table 5.8 further show that in case of role stagnation (RS) dimension of ORS, again approach mode of coping was considered for the prediction. This is on account of its having the highest correlation out of the three independent variables i.e. avoidance, approach and organizational support, with role stagnation ($r = .1369$). Avoidance coping and organizational support were not added in the prediction of role stagnation (RS). The $t$ – test for the test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that only approach mode of coping ($t = 2.386$, $p < .01$) has significant regression weight. This means that only approach mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression explaining 1.82 percent variation ($R^2 = .0182$, $F = 5.69$, $p < .01$) in RS dimension of ORS.
Table 5.8: Multiple Regression Analyses for indicators of organizational role stress as predicted by coping styles (avoidance & approach) and organizational support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Independent variables (β-value)</th>
<th>Approach coping</th>
<th>Avoidance coping</th>
<th>Organis. Support</th>
<th>Mult. R</th>
<th>R² change</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>IRD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.84152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>.0339</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.324)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.36939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>.0182</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.386)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>REC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.33735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>.0178</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.330)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.264781</td>
<td>-.147018</td>
<td></td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>.0218</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.113)</td>
<td>(2.582)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>.0363</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.23122</td>
<td>1.64393</td>
<td></td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>.0270</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.712)</td>
<td>(2.877)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2231</td>
<td>.0497</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43962</td>
<td>1.35462</td>
<td></td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>.0183</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.465)</td>
<td>(2.360)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>.0380</td>
<td>0.0197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.53545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>.0238</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.700)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>SRD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.44920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1449</td>
<td>.0210</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.528)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.140762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1407</td>
<td>.0198</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.023**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.454)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>RIn</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.139520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>.0194</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.92**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.432)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Total ORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.196811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>162580</td>
<td>.0264</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.615)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2597</td>
<td>.0674</td>
<td>0.0410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Note: Figures in Parentheses depicts ‘r’ value of the Regression coefficients, and powers^1 and ^2 denote the ordering of the independent variables entered in the regression equation.

IRD – Inter Role Distance  
RS – Role Stagnation  
REC – Role Expectation Conflict  
RE – Role Erosion  
RO – Role Overload  
RI – Role Isolation  
PI – Personal Inadequacy  
SRD – Self Role Distance  
RA – Role Ambiguity  
RIn – Resource Inadequacy  
ORS – Organizational role Stress
It is further clear from the table 5.8 that approach mode of coping was considered for the prediction of role expectation conflict (REC). This is on account of its having the highest correlation out of three independent variables i.e. avoidance, approach and organizational support, with REC (r = .1337). Avoidance coping and organizational support were not added to the prediction of REC. The t – test for the test of significance of regression coefficient shows that only approach coping (t = 2.330, p< .01) has significant regression weight, which shows that only approach coping contributes significantly to regression. Avoidance coping explains 1.78 percent variance (R^2 = .01789, F = 5.43, p< .01) in REC dimension of ORS.

Results in table 5.8 further show that in case of Role Erosion (RE), approach mode of coping and organizational support were considered for the prediction. This is on account of they having the highest correlations with RE (r = -.0691 and r = .1479). Avoidance mode of coping was not added to the prediction of Role Erosion.

The t – test for the test of significance of regression coefficients shows that approach coping (t = 2.113, p< .05) and organizational support (t = 2.582, p< .05) had significant regression weights. It is further clear from table 5.8 that when organizational support entered into the first step in the regression equation as important determinant of role erosion (RE), accounting for 2.180 percent of variance (R^2 = .02188, F = 6.66, p< .01), when the approach mode of coping got added, its percent of variance came out to be 1.44 percent attributable to RE (R^2 = .03637, F = 5.60, p< .05). Thus in this step wise multiple regression, the total variance in RE as explained by approach coping and organizational support turned out to be 3.63 percent.

Result in table 5.8 also indicates that avoidance mode of coping and organizational support were considered for the prediction of role overload (RO), on account of being higher and significant correlations with role
overload \((r = .0755, r = .1643)\). Approach coping was not added to prediction of role overload dimension of organizational role stress (ORS).

The t-test for the test of significance of the regression coefficients shows that avoidance coping \((t = 3.712, p< .01)\) and organizational support \((t = 2.877, p< .01)\) have significant regression weights. Results also show that when organizational support entered into the first step in the regression equation as important determinant of role overload, it accounted for 2.70 percent of variance \((R^2 = .02703, F = 8.27, p< .01)\), and the entry the second independent variable namely avoidance coping percent of variance change on account of avoidance coping came out to be 2.27 percent attributable to role overload \((R^2 = .04978, F = 7.78, p< .01)\). Thus in this step wise multiple regression, the total variance in role overload as explained by avoidance coping and organizational support turned out to be 4.97 percent.

Table 5.8 further indicates that approach coping and organizational support were considered for the prediction of role isolation (RE). This was on account of having the highest correlations with RI \((r = -.0919, r = .1354)\). Approach coping was not considered to prediction of RI.

The t-test for test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that approach coping \((t = 2.465, p< .001)\) and organizational support \((t = 2.360, p< .01)\) have significant regression weights. Table 5.8 further shows that when organizational support entered into the first step in the regression equation as important determinant of RI, scores on the organizational support accounted for 1.83 percent of variation \((R^2 = .01830, F = 5.57, p< .001)\). When the second independent variable namely approach coping was added, the percent of variation change came out to be 1.97 percent attributable to RI \((R^2 = .0380, F = 5.87 p< .01)\). Thus in this step wise multiple regression, the total variance in RI as explained by organizational support and approach coping turned out to be 3.80 percent.
Table 5.8 also indicates that approach coping was considered for the prediction of personal inadequacy (PI), on account of its highest correlation out of the three independent variables i.e. avoidance coping, approach coping and organizational support, with PI (r = -.1535). Avoidance coping and organizational support were not considered to the prediction of PI dimension of ORS. The t-test for the test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that only approach coping (t = 2.700, p< .01) has significant regression weight. This means that only approach coping contributed significantly explaining 2.38 percent variance (R² = .0238, F = 7.29, p< .01) in PI dimension of ORS.

Table 5.8 further demonstrates that only approach mode of coping was considered for the prediction of self role distance (SRD) on account of its having the highest correlation out of all the three independent variables i.e. avoidance coping, approach coping and organizational support, with self role distance (SRD) (r = -.1449). Avoidance coping and organizational support were not considered to predict SRD dimension of ORS. The t-test for the test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that only approach coping (t = 2.528, p< .01) has significant regression weight, which shows that only approach coping contributed significantly explain 2.10 percent variance (R² = .02100, F = 6.33, p< .01) in SRD dimension of ORS.

Results in the table 5.8 further shows that in case of role ambiguity (RA) only avoidance coping was considered for the prediction, on account its highest correlation with RA (r = .1741). Approach coping and organizational support were not considered to the prediction of RA. The t-test of the significance of the regression coefficient shows that only avoidance coping (t = 2.454, p< .01) has significant regression weight. This means that only avoidance mode of coping contributed significantly to the regression explaining 1.98 percent variance (R² = .01981, F = 6.023, p< .01) in RA dimension of ORS.
Table 5.8 also demonstrates that in case of resource inadequacy (RIn), only avoidance mode of coping was considered for the prediction of resource inadequacy, on account of its highest correlation out of all the three independent variables i.e. organizational support, avoidance coping and avoidance coping, with RIn \( (r = .1320) \). Organizational support and approach coping were not added to prediction of RIn. The t-test for the test of significance of regression coefficient shows that only avoidance coping \( (t = 2.432, p< .01) \) has significant regression weight. This means that only avoidance mode of coping contributed significantly to explain 1.95 percent variance \( (R^2 = .01947, F = 5.92, p< .01) \) in RIn dimension of ORS.

Further the table 5.8 indicates that in case of total ORS, avoidance coping and organizational support were considered for the prediction of total organizational role stress (ORS), on the account of their highest correlations with total organizational role stress (ORS) \( (r = .0915, r = .1625) \). Approach mode of coping was not considered to prediction of total organizational role stress.

The t-test for the test of significance of the regression coefficients shows that avoidance coping \( (t = 3.615, p< .001) \) and organizational support \( (t = 2.844, p< .01) \) have significant regression weights. Also it is clear from the table 5.8 that when organizational support entered into the first step in the regression equation as important determinant of total ORS, it accounted for 2.64 percent variance \( (R^2 = .02645, F = 8.09, p< .05) \). When the second independent variable i.e. avoidance coping was added, the percent of variance change came out to be 4.10 percent attributable to total ORS \( (R^2 = .06747, F = 10.74, p< .001) \). Thus in this step wise multiple regression, the total variance in ORS as explained by organizational support and avoidance mode of coping turned out to be 6.74 percent.
The results of predication of negative (AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont., trait anxiety and depression) and positive indicators (on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being are explained as under.

5.3.2(i) Negative indicators (AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont., trait anxiety and depression) of psychological well-being as predicted by coping strategies (avoidance an approach) and organizational support.

Results in table 5.9 show that avoidance coping and organizational support were considered for the prediction of Anger-out, on account of their highest correlations with anger out (r = .4046 and r = -.4082). Approach mode of coping was not added to prediction of anger-out dimension of trait-anger.

The t-test for the test of significance of regression coefficients shows that avoidance coping (t = 5.284, p< .001) and organizational support (t = 7.719, p< .001) have significant regression weights, which shows that when organizational support was entered into the first step in the regression equation as important determinant of anger-out, scores on organizational support accounted for 16.63 percent of variance (R^2 = .1663, F = 59.05, p< .001). When the second independent variable i.e. avoidance coping was added, the percent of variance change came out to be 7.16 percent attributable to anger-out (R^2 = .2382, F = 46.44, p< .001). Thus in this stepwise multiple regression the total variance in AX-out as explained by organizational support and avoidance coping turned out to be 23.82 percent.

Table 5.9 indicates that approach coping, avoidance coping and organizational support were considered for the prediction of anger-in dimension of trait-anger.

The t-test for the test of significance of the regression coefficients shows that all the three independent variables i.e. approach coping (t = 2.417, p< .01), avoidance coping (t = 6.108, p< .001) and organizational
Table 5.9: Multiple Regression Analyses for negative indicators (AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont., trait anxiety and depression) and positive indicators (on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well being as predicted by coping styles (approach and avoidance) and organizational support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Independent variables (β-value)</th>
<th>Mult. R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² change</th>
<th>F value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approach coping</td>
<td>Avoidance coping</td>
<td>Organi. Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>AX-out</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>290196²</td>
<td>-408202¹</td>
<td>4084</td>
<td>.1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5.284)</td>
<td>(7.719)</td>
<td>4881</td>
<td>.2388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>AX-in</td>
<td>-139809³</td>
<td>-339455²</td>
<td>423620¹</td>
<td>.4236</td>
<td>.1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.417)</td>
<td>(5.106)</td>
<td>(8.073)</td>
<td>.4687</td>
<td>.2195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4845</td>
<td>.2347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>AX-cont.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>288727</td>
<td></td>
<td>2887</td>
<td>.0833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5.206)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Trait Anxiety</td>
<td>229929¹</td>
<td>157205³</td>
<td>142398²</td>
<td>.2299</td>
<td>.0528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.047)</td>
<td>(2.471)</td>
<td>(2.424)</td>
<td>.2669</td>
<td>.0712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2965</td>
<td>.0891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>-378346¹</td>
<td>171933³</td>
<td>214193³</td>
<td>.3793</td>
<td>.1439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.078)</td>
<td>(2.826)</td>
<td>(3.893)</td>
<td>.4306</td>
<td>.1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4548</td>
<td>.2068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Off-the-job satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>119325</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>.0142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.075)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>On-the-job satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120573</td>
<td></td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>.0145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p< .001

Figures in Parentheses depict 't' values of the regression coefficients and powers¹,² and³ represent the order of entered independent variable in the regression equation.

AX-out – Anger-out
AX-in – Anger-in
AX-cont – Anger-control
support (t = 8.073, p< .001) have significant regression weights. Table 5.9 further indicates that when organizational support entered into the first step in the regression equation as important determinant of anger-in, scores on organizational support accounted for 17.94 percent of variance (R^2 = .17949, F = 65.17, p< .001). When the second independent variable i.e. avoidance coping was added the percent change in variance, came out to be 4.00 percent (R^2 = .02195, F = 41.52, p< .001) and with the entry of the third independent variable i.e. approach coping the percent change in variance came out to be 1.52 percent attributable to anger-in (R^2 = .23171, F = 30.27, p< .001). Thus in this stepwise multiple regression, the total variance in anger-in as explained by approach coping, avoidance coping and organizational support turned out to be 23.47 percent.

It is further clear from the table 5.9 that organizational support was considered for the predication of anger-control, on account of it having the highest correlation out of all the three independent variables i.e. organizational support, approach coping and avoidance coping, with anger-control (r = -.2887). Approach coping and avoidance coping were not added to prediction of anger-control.

The t-test for the test of significance of regression coefficient shows that only organizational support (t = 5.206, p< .001) has significant regression weight. This means that only organizational support contributed significantly to explain 8.33 percent variation (R^2 = .0833, F = 27.10, p< .001) in anger-control.

Table 5.9 also indicates that all the three independent variables i.e. avoidance coping, approach coping and organizational support, were considered for the prediction of trait-anxiety.

The t-test for the test of significance of the regression coefficients shows that all the three independent variables i.e. approach coping (t = 4.478, p< .001), avoidance coping (t = 2.471, p< .01) and organizational support (t = 2.424, p< .001) have significant regression weights. This
means that when approach coping entered into the first step in the regression equation as important determinant of trait-anxiety, scores on approach coping accounted for 5.28 percent of variation ($R^2 = .05287$, $F = 16.63$, $p< .001$). When the second independent variable i.e. organizational support was entered, the percent of variance change came out to be 1.83 percent ($R^2 = .0183$, $F = 11.35$, $p< .001$) and when the third independent variable i.e. avoidance coping was entered, the percent of variance change came out to be 1.79 percent ($R^2 = .0179$, $F = 9.65$, $p< .001$). Thus in this stepwise multiple regression, the total variance in trait-anxiety as explained by organizational support, approach coping and avoidance coping turned out to be 8.91 percent.

It is also evident from table 5.9 that all the three independent variables i.e. approach coping, avoidance coping and organizational support were considered for the prediction of depression.

The t-test for the test of significance of the regression coefficients shows that all the three independent variables i.e. approach coping, (t = 7.078, $p< .001$), avoidance coping (t = 2.826, $p< .001$) and organizational support (t = 3.893, $p< .001$) have significant regression weights. This means that when approach coping entered into the first step in the regression equation as important determinant of depression, it accounted for 14.39 percent of variance ($R^2 = .1439$, $F = 50.09$, $p< .001$). When the second independent variable i.e. avoidance coping was added, the percent of variance change came out to be 4.15 percent ($R^2 = .1854$, $F = 33.87$, $p< .001$) and when the third independent variable i.e. organizational support was entered, the percent of variance change came out to be 2.14 percent ($R^2 = .2068$, $F = 25.73$, $p< .001$). Thus in this stepwise multiple regression, the total variance in depression as explained by approach coping, avoidance coping and organizational support turned out to be 20.73 percent.
5.3.2(ii) Positive indicators (on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being as predicted by coping strategies (avoidance and approach) and organizational support.

Table 5.9 indicates that only organizational support was considered for the prediction of off-the-job satisfaction, on account of it having the highest correlation with off-the-job satisfaction ($r = .1193$). Approach coping and avoidance coping were not added to the prediction of off-the-job satisfaction.

The t-test for the test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that organizational support ($t = 2.075$, $p < .05$) has significant regression weight. This means that only organizational support contributed significantly to explain 1.42 percent variance ($R^2 = .0142$, $F = 4.30$, $p < .05$) in off-the-job satisfaction dimension of job satisfaction.

Table 5.9 further demonstrates that only avoidance coping was considered for the prediction of on-the-job satisfaction, on account of its having the highest correlation with on-the-job satisfaction ($r = -.1205$). Approach coping and organizational support were not considered to prediction of on-the-job satisfaction.

The t-test for the test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that avoidance coping ($t = 2.09$, $p < .05$) has significant regression weight. This means that only avoidance coping contributed significantly to explain 1.45 percent variance ($R^2 = .01454$, $F = 4.40$, $p < .05$) in on-the-job satisfaction dimension of job satisfaction.

In brief the results of multiple regression analysis reveals that coping styles (approach and avoidance coping) and organizational support were the important variables predicting organizational role stress, negative indicators (AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont, trait-anxiety and depression) and positive indicators (on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being. In varied manner: (i) inter role distance (IRD), role stagnation (RS), role expectation conflicts (REC), role erosion (RE), rôle isolation (RI),
personal inadequacy (PI), self role distances (SRD), anger-control (AX-cont.) and off-the-job did not depend upon avoidance coping, (ii) role ambiguity (RA), resource inadequacy (RIn), total organizational role stress (ORS), anger-out (AX-out), anger-control (AX-cont), and off-the-job satisfaction did not depend upon approach coping, (iii) inter role distance (IRD), role stagnation (RS), role expectation conflicts (REC), personal inadequacy (PI), self role distance (SRD), role ambiguity (RA), resource inadequacy (Rln.) and on-the-job satisfaction did not depend upon organizational support. In other words total ORS and its dimensions along with positive indicators and negative indicators of psychological well-being among technocrats were predicted by approach coping, avoidance coping and organizational support (either individually, or in different combinations of two/three predictors).

Since inter role distance (IRD), role stagnation (RS), role expectation conflicts (REC), personal inadequacy (PI), and self role distance (SRD) indicators of organizational role stress (ORS) were predicted solely by approach coping; role ambiguity (RA) and resource inadequacy (RIn.) solely by avoidance coping; role erosion (RE) and role isolation (RI) were predicted jointly by approach coping and organizational support; and role over load (RO) dimension of organizational role stress (ORS) as well as total organizational role stress (ORS) were predicted jointly by avoiding coping and organizational support.

The hypothesis 5-A “coping strategies (avoidance and approach) in an interaction with perceived organizational support will account for greater variance in organizational role stress among technocrats” is by and large accepted.

In case of prediction of negative and positive indicators of psychological well-being, anger in (AX-in) trait-anxiety, depression were predicted jointly by approach coping, avoidance coping and organizational support; anger-out (AX-out) was predicted jointly by avoidance coping and
organizational support; anger-control (AX-cont.) and off-the-job satisfaction were predicted solely by organizational support; and on-the-job satisfaction indicator of job satisfaction was predicted solely by avoidance coping.

The hypothesis 5-B "coping strategies (avoidance and approach) in an interaction with perceived organizational support will account for greater variance in negative indicators (AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont, trait-anxiety & depression) and positive indicators (job satisfaction, on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being among technocrats" is by and large accepted.

5.3.3 Conclusions:
The following conclusions may be drawn on the basis of regression Analysis.

5.3.3(i) Organizational role stress (ORS) as predicted by coping strategies (approach and avoidance) and organizational support.

I. Only one significant predictor, namely, approach mode of coping explained 3.39 percent variance in inter-role dance (IRD), 1.82 percent variance in role stagnation (RS), 1.78 percent variance in role expectation conflicts (REC), 2.38 percent variance in personal inadequacy (PI) and 2.10 percent variance in self role distance (SRD), indicators of organizational rolé stress (ORS).

II. Only one significant predictor, namely, avoidance mode of coping explained 1.98 percent variance in role ambiguity (RA), and 1.94 percent variance in resource inadequacy (RIn.) indicators of organizational role stress (ORS).

III. Approach mode of coping in combination with organizational support explained 3.63 percent of variance in role erosion (RE); the individual contribution of organizational support (OS)
and approach coping being 2.18 percent and 1.44 percent respectively.

IV. Approach mode of coping in combination with organizational support explained 3.80 percent of variance in role isolation (RI); the individual contribution of approach coping and organizational support being 1.97 percent and 1.83 percent respectively.

V. Avoidance mode of coping in combination with organizational support explained 4.97 percent variance in role overload (RO); the individual contribution of avoidance coping and organizational support being 2.27 percent and 2.70 percent respectively.

VI. Avoidance mode of coping in combination with organizational support explained 6.74 percent variance in total organizational role stress (ORS); the individual contribution of avoidance and organizational support being 4.10 percent and 2.64 percent respectively.

5.3.3(ii) Negative indicators (AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont., trait-anxiety and depression) and positive indicators (job satisfaction: on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being as predicted by coping strategies (avoidance and approach) and organizational support.

I. Only one significant predictor namely avoidance mode of coping explained 1.45 percent variance in on-the-job satisfaction indicator of job satisfaction.

II. Only one significant predictor namely organizational support explained 8.33 percent variance in anger-control and 1.42 percent variance in off-the-job satisfaction.

III. Avoidance mode of coping in combination with organizational support explained 23.88 percent of variance in anger-out (AX-
out); the individual contribution of avoidance coping and organizational support being 7.16 percent and 16.66 percent respectively.

IV. Approach mode of coping in combinations with avoidance mode of coping and organizational support explained 23.47 percent variance in anger-in (AX-in); the individual contribution of approach coping, avoidance coping and organizational support being 1.52 percent, 4.00 percent and 17.94 percent respectively.

V. Approach mode of coping in combinations with avoidance mode of coping and organizational support explained 8.91 percent of variance in trait-anxiety; the individual contribution of approach coping, avoidance coping and organizational support being 5.28 percent, 1.79 percent and 1.83 percent respectively.

VI. Approach mode of coping in combinations with avoidance mode of coping and organizational support explained 20.68 percent of variance in depression; the individual contribution of approach coping, avoidance coping and organizational support being 14.39 percent, 4.15 percent and 2.14 percent respectively.