Background:

Stress is clearly a part of human condition. Because of its universal occurrence, stress is not looked at in terms of its presence or absence but, rather according to its intensity and the effect it has on the individuals. Many of us seem to cope well with the pressures of work and family life that we encounter daily. But when and why is stress harmful to us? Consider what happens to human body when it is subjected to a strain or pressure of some kind (Cartwright and Cooper, 1997). A larger number of studies on stress have dealt with relationship of occupational/organizational stress with various indicators of well-being. In addition to other findings these studies show (i) the nature and magnitude of the relationship between occupational/organizational stress and well-being are occupation specific, vary with type of stresses studied, the nature of well-being indicators and personal/social measures of coping; and (ii) Magnitude of such an associations reported is at best modest in the coping literature, it is on the important distinction between emotion-focused and problem-focused coping, (Lazarus and Folkman 1984).

Recent conceptualizations of the coping process have emphasized flexibility in a person's manner of coping with different stressors as indication of effective adaptation (e.g., Cohen 1984; Leonova, 1996). In India, researches using measures of role PICS (Preek 1983) reported avoidance coping strategies are associated with high stress and lower well-being and avoidance coping to be associated with low stress and better well-being (Indian study Sharmà and Acharaya 1989; 1991; Gupta, 1989; Kaur and Murthy, 1980; Sahu and Mishra, 1995). These studies reported that relationship between measures of stress and physical and/or psychological well-being though consistent, are low (for reviews see...
Pestonjee, 1992; Sharma, 1988, 1999). This implies that stress per se may be less important to well-being than how an individual appraises and cope with it (Caplan et al. 1984; Sharma, 1999). Since large amount of variance remains to be accounted for, the primary research focus in recent years has shifted from main effect models to more complex moderator models, which assume that stressful experiences have a deleterious impact on well-being/health under specific individual difference genetic, acquired and dispositional. Moderating variables largely include various personality variables such as coping strategies/style and social/organizational support (Sharma, 1999; Pestonjee, 1992). Coping strategies have been considered to be a core concept in stress literature. Researchers have observed that coping competence in itself is a critical process to alleviate stress. Accumulated evidence suggests that coping strategies play a major role in an individual's physical and psychological well-being when an individual is confronted with life/occupational stress (Sarason et al. 1996; and Kalimo et al. 1987). Several research studies provide evidence of the importance of coping strategies/styles to play a mediating role between stress (life/occupational) and its manifestation e.g., anxiety, anger and depression (Sharma and Acharya, 1989, 1991; Sharma et al. 1996; Pestonjee, 1992; Sharma, 1999; Diong and Bishop (1999). If there is consensus negative emotion of anger, anxiety and depression together known as emotional vital signs (Spielberger et al. 1995) have been found to be associated with negative well-being (Endler and Parker, 1990; Mitchell, Cronkite and Moos, 1983; Harvey and Buyant, 1998; Gold and Michael, 1995). Accumulated research evidence have reported that anger and/or avoidance mode of coping have been related to lower physical and psychological well-being (e.g., Diamond, 1982; Dimsdale et al., 1986; and Spielberger and Sarason 1996). Very few studies have however attempted to study anger expression, organizational stress and indicators of well-being vis-à-vis personal and social coping strategies among technocrats. There is a
consistent evidence for beneficial direct effect of social support on stress-well-being (Sharma and Kumari 1990; and Greenglass, 1996). Studies reported buffering effects of social support in work related stress. However, in other studies no buffering effect of social support was evident (Himle et al. 1989; Greenglass, 1996; Shinn et al. 1984; Sharma, 1998). The present study examined the coping strategies and organizational support as predictors of organizational role stress and negative and positive indicators of psychological well-being.

Objectives:

1) To determine the difference between the coping strategies (avoidance and approach) with respect to organizational role stress, 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 among the technocrats.

2) To determine the difference between high/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 (job satisfaction: on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being among technocrats.

3) To determine the nature and magnitude of the relationship of coping strategies (avoidance and approach) with organizational role stress, 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 among technocrats.
4) To determine the nature and magnitude of the relationship of organizational support with organizational role stress, 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 among technocrats.

5) To study how do coping strategies (avoidance & approach) and organizational support interact together to determine the levels of organizational role stress among technocrats.

6) To study how do coping strategies (avoidance & approach) and organizational support interact together to determine the levels of 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 among technocrats.

Hypotheses:

1-A) The technocrats in the avoidance coping group will score higher on organizational role stress and negative indicators (AX/EX, AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont., trait-anxiety and depression) of psychological well-being as compared to their approach coping counterparts.

1-B) The technocrats in the avoidance coping group will score lower on positive indicators (job satisfaction: on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being as compared to their approach coping counterparts.
2-A) The technocrats in the high organizational support group will score lower on organizational role stress and negative indicators (AX/EX, AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont., trait-anxiety and depression) of psychological well-being as compared to their low organization support group counterparts.

2-B) The technocrats in the high organizational support group will score higher on positive indicators (job satisfaction: on-the-job and off-the-job)) of psychological well-being as compared to their low organizational support group counterparts.

3-A) Avoidance as a dominant mode of coping will be positively related to organizational role stress and negative indicators (AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont., trait-anxiety and depression) of psychological well-being among technocrats.

3-B) Approach as a dominant mode of coping will be negatively related to organizational role stress and negative indicators (AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont., trait-anxiety and depression) of psychological well-being among technocrats.

4-A) Avoidance as a dominant mode of coping will be negatively related to positive indicators (job satisfaction: on-the-job, and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being among technocrats.

4-B) Approach as a dominant mode of coping will be positively related to positive indicators (job satisfaction: one-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being among technocrats.
5-A) Organizational support will be negatively related to organizational role stress and negative indicators (AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont. trait-anxiety, and depression) of psychological well-being among technocrats.

5-B) Organizational support will be positively related to positive indicators (job satisfaction: on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being among technocrats.

6-A Coping strategies (avoidance and approach) in an interaction with organizational support will account for greater variance in organizational role stress among technocrats.

6-B Coping strategies (avoidance and approach) in an interaction with 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.

Sample:

This study was conducted on a sample of 300 technocrats. Subjects were randomly selected from the offices of Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board (H.P.S.E.B.). The minimum qualification level of the technocrats was diploma in engineering. The technocrats from various departments of this organization; such as circles, divisions, sub-divisions, and sections participated in this study on volunteer basis. All the subjects were male, married and having an urban middle class background.
Tools Used:

(i) Organizational Role Stress Scale (Pareek, 1981, 1983)

(ii) Organizational Role PICS(0) (Pareek, 1983)

(iii) State-Trait Anxiety Inventory ~STAI (Spielberger, Sharma and Singh, 1973)

(iv) Anger Expression (AX/EX) Scale (Spielberger et. al., 1985; Krishna, 1988)

(v) Zung self Rating Depression Scale (Zung, 1965)

(vi) S.D. Employees Inventory (SDEI: Pestonjee, 1981)

(vii) Functional Social Support (Singh and Srivastava, 1997)

Procedure:

All measuring instruments were administered individually to all respondents under standard instructions. The order of the presentation of the measures was as follow: ORS Scale, Anger expression (AX/EX) scale, Trait-Anxiety scale of STAI, Zung's depression scale, SD employees inventory, organizational support scale, and Role PICS (0). The scoring of each measure was carried out with the help of standard scoring key as provided in respective manuals.

Statistical Techniques Used:

(i) Pearson's Product moment co-efficient of correlations were computed to find out the relationship of organizational support and coping strategies (avoidance and approach) with organizational role stress, 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 among technocrats.

(ii) t-test was used to find out the difference in terms of coping strategies (avoidance and approach) and 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 (job satisfaction: on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) of psychological well-being among technocrats.

(iii) Step wise multiple regression analyses were performed to find out the relative contributions of coping strategies (avoidance and approach) and organizational support in explaining the variances in organizational role stress, negative indicators (AX-out, AX-in, AX-cont., trait-anxiety and depression) and positive indicators (job satisfaction: on-the-job and off-the-job) of psychological well-being among technocrats.

Findings:

1) The major findings on the basis of comparison studies are as under:

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.

2) The major findings on the basis of correlation are as under:

The results of correlational analysis revealed that significant relationship of coping strategies and organizational support with organizational role stress (overall) and component wise was of low magnitude rather weak. However, a moderate and significant relationship of coping strategies and organizational support emerged with negative indicators of psychological well-being, whereas with positive indicators of psychological well-being, the coping strategies had a weak relationship with on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction and organizational support was found to have positive and significant relationship with off-the-job satisfaction.

3) The major findings on the basis of step wise multiple regression are as under:

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 role 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.

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 combination 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 combination 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 combination 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.