

## **Relationship between Organizational Role Stress and Stress Consequences—A Study among Postal Employees in West Bengal**

**Palas R. Sen Gupta and Ajoy Adhikari**

### *Abstract*

*An increased interest in the use of role theory has been seen recently to describe and explain the stresses associated with the membership of the organization. This paper aims at identifying the relationship between ORS variables and Stress Consequences among postal employees in West Bengal as postal employees are over burdened with. They deal with customers in massive number every day with very limited physical resources at their disposal. This study covers 614 responses from a sample of postal employees (both departmental and extra-departmental) from various Post offices located in difference areas in West Bengal.*

**Keywords:** Organizational Role Stress, Psychological Consequences, Behavioural Consequences, Burnout Symptoms.

**JEL Classification :** D23 ,M12, M49

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Stress at work resulting from increasing complexities of work and its divergent demand has become a prominent and pervading factor of modern organizations. Recent years have seen an increased interest in the use of role theory to describe and explain the stresses associated with the membership of the organization. Researchers [Caplan, Cobb and French(1975), Cooper and Marshal(1979), Kahn & his associates (1964), Pareek (1993) Srivastav (1999), Pestonjee (1999)] have applied role theory to understand stress problems at work and to examine how and to what extent role pressures contribute to occupational stress.

There are two role systems: Role Space and Role Set. Both have a built –in potential for conflict. Such conflict is called Role stress. Important Role Stress Variables (ORS Variables) as identified by different authors are: Self-role distance, Role stagnation, Inter-role distance, Role ambiguity, Role Expectation conflict,

Role over-load, Role erosion, Role Inadequacy and Role Isolation. Such Role stress variables have their consequences of job stress in three different sections like Physical consequences, Psychological consequences and Behavioral consequences.

## **II. THE PRESENT STUDY**

This paper aims at identifying the relationship between ORS variables and Stress Consequences among postal employees in West Bengal as postal employees are over loaded with work and are engaged with the responsibilities of money related transaction without having minimum security arrangement. They deal with customers in massive number every day with very restricted physical resources at their disposal. Moreover, they are poorly paid and provided with very limited other facilities.

In this paper the scores of consequences like Physiological, Psychological and Behavioral are taken together and linked with ten different variables of ORS to get coefficient of correlation of each ORS variables with composite result of consequences.

The purpose of such analysis is to find out the extent of interdependence of stress consequences with the role variables. This measure will help the management to recognize the possible cause factor responsible for the stress consequences and as a follow up action, intervention measures can be taken up so as to control the severe consequences faced by the victim employee.

## **III METHODOLOGY**

This study covers 614 responses from a sample of postal employees from various post offices located in difference areas in West Bengal. Of these, 294 responses were collected from the departmental staff and that of the number of the extra-departmental staff were as much as 320. The proportion of female response altogether was 16.93%. The proportion of the same for the departmental staff was 19.72% and that of the ED staff was 14.37%. Respondents were asked 26 questions to mention whether they experienced the following Physiological, Psychological and Behavioral symptoms (Stress Consequences) 'Never', 'Sometimes' or 'Often' and scores were calculated on the basis of such responses:

Relationship between Organizational Role Stress and Stress Consequences

<u>Psychological Consequences</u>	<u>Behavioural Consequences</u>	<u>Behavioural Consequences</u>
<i>Tension and Headache</i>	<i>Not satisfied with the job</i>	<i>Feel like doing strikes</i>
<i>Weakness</i>	<i>Getting bored</i>	<i>Feel like early retirement</i>
<i>High Blood Pressure</i>	<i>Anxiety</i>	<i>Feel burnout</i>
<i>Heart Pounding</i>	<i>Depression</i>	<i>Excessive smoking</i>
<i>Indigestion</i>	<i>Irritation</i>	<i>Alcoholism</i>
<i>Constipation</i>	<i>Low Self respect</i>	<i>Adjustment with colleagues</i>
<i>Muscle Aches</i>	<i>No attachment with Orgn.</i>	<i>Accidents or Error</i>
<i>Sexual frustration</i>	<i>Fatigue</i>	
	<i>Employee' side</i>	

Out of the 26 responses, 14 responses were subsequently picked up to measure the burnout symptoms of the respondents for further analysis. Organizational Role Stress Scores were obtained using Pareek's (1983 5 point) scale containing 10 dimensions of role stress (see note), covering 50 statements.

#### IV. RESULT AND ANALYSIS

##### A. ORS SCORES AND STRESS CONSEQUENCES

###### i) ORS Scores and Physiological Consequences

Table I shows ten correlation coefficients between ten ORS factors with the combined result of the physiological problems. Inter Role Distance (0.355), Role Expectation Conflict (0.278) and Role overload (0.268) are the highest scorers positively related with the Physiological consequences of the job stress affected employees. All these are significant at 0.01 levels. It obviously makes a strong case for immediate managerial intervention to minimize stress. Role Stagnation, Role Erosion, Personal Inadequacy, Self Role Distance, and Resource Inadequacy, Self Role Distance, and Resource Inadequacy show inverse correlation with the physiological consequences.

**TABLE I**  
**Correlation coefficient between ORS Scores and Physiological Consequences**

ORS	Departmental			Extra Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Inter Roll	0.403**	0.673**	0.462**	0.276**	0.234	0.303**	0.320**	0.382**	0.355**

Relationship between Organizational Role Stress and Stress Consequences

Distance									
RS	0.053	0.308*	0.114*	-0.52**	0.445**	-0.194**	-	0.337**	-0.085*
REC	0.294**	0.628**	0.257**	0.310**	0.450**	0.310**	0.308**	0.490**	0.278**
RE	-2.49**	0.032	-	0.091	0.266	0.117*	-0.095*	0.112	-0.071
RO	0.438**	0.097	0.365**	0.179**	0.279	0.166**	0.310**	0.199*	0.268**
RI	0.087	0.245	0.086	-0.006	0.414**	0.035	0.011	0.204*	0.020
PI	-0.330*	0.115	-0.250**	-0.028	0.401**	0.037	-	0.214	-
SDR	0.118	-0.091	0.058	0.001	-0.158	-0.009	-0.008	0.212*	-0.152
RA	0.033	0.368**	0.114	0.160**	0.626**	0.252**	0.078	0.428**	0.160**
RIN	0.210**	0.500	0.194**	-0.121*	-0.075	-	0.018	0.195*	0.008

Notes : \*\* denotes significance at 1% level and \* at 5% level

## ii) ORS Scores and Psychological Consequences

Table II shows the relationship between ten ORS variables and the combined result of psychological problems of the employees. The basic purpose of such analysis is to identify such ORS variables, which are responsible for creating excessive psychological problems of the employees. From analysis of the results from Table 2, it can be seen that all the ORS variables are positively correlated with psychological problems of the job occupants. The most effective ORS variables responsible for psychological problems are Role Stagnation (0.283), Role Isolation (0.273), Role Overload (0.272), Resource Inadequacy (0.239) and last but not the least Role Ambiguity (0.213). It is worth mentioning here that all these positively related coefficient or correlations are significant at 0.01 levels. Female workers of both the categories show positive correlation (departmental 0.423 and for ED 0.527) with the Role Expectation Conflict whereas; the overall score of REC though positive but shows moderate effect (0.153).

Relationship between Organizational Role Stress and Stress Consequences

**Table II**  
Correlation coefficient between ORS Scores and Psychological Consequences

ORS	Departmental			Extra-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
IRD	0.071-	0.067-	0.071-	0.044	**0.430	*0.116	0.003	**0.293	0.049
RS	**0.304	0.125	**0.273	*0.154	*0.338	*0.135	**0.310	0.161	**0.283
REC	*0.154	**0.423	**0.180	**0.166	**0.527	**0.181	**0.121	**0.448	**0.153
RE	**0.223	**0.372	**0.175	0.086-	0.063	0.066-	0.074	0.015	0.065
RO	-0.432	0.187	**0.405	**0.202	*0.345	**0.194	**0.301	0.121	0.272
RI	-0.262	0.254	-0.261	**0.179	0.166	**0.173	**0.264	**0.378	**0.273
PI	0.061	0.000	0.055	0.079	0.005	0.078	0.083	0.082	0.084*
SRD	0.249*	-0.110	0.200**	-0.071	-0.090	-0.062	0.187**	0.260**	0.196**
RA	0.313**	0.010	0.307**	0.313	0.010	0.307**	0.240**	-0.012	0.213**
RIN	0.259**	0.406**	0.267**	-0.093	0.482**	0.167**	0.235**	0.377**	0.239**

Notes : \*\* denotes significance at 1% level and \* at 5% level

**iii) ORS Scores and Behavioral Consequences**

Table III shows the relationship of ORS variables with behavioral consequences through correlation coefficient. Except IRD and PI other ORS variables are showing positive coefficient of correlation. Role Stagnation (0.408), Role Expectation Conflict (0.240) Role Overload, (0.228) Self Role Distance (0.203) show positive correlation (at 0.01 level of significance)

**TABLE III**

**Correlation Coefficient between ORS Scores and Behavioral Consequences**

ORS	Departmental			Extra-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
IRD	-0.058	0.342**	-0.055	-0.271 **	0.413**	-0.216**	-0.174**	0.409**	-0.130**
RS	0.259**	0.519**	0.257**	0.542**	-0.096	0.489**	0.430**	0.238*	0.408**
REC	0.199**	0.502**	0.299**	0.222**	0.152	0.216**	0.196**	0.369**	0.240**
RE	-0.001	0.089	0.024	0.208**	0.537**	0.232**	0.104*	0.318**	0.130**
RO	0.534**	0.377**	0.496**	-0.055	-0.104	-0.057	0.246**	0.044	0.228**
RI	0.123	0.043	0.131 *	0.123**	0.046	0.118*	0.145**	0.265**	0.165**
PI	-0.318**	-0.411**	-0.311**	0.036	-0.182	0.020	-0.177**	-0.136	-0.120**
SRD	0.286**	0.235	0.282**	-0.022	0.013	-0.019	0.167**	0.416**	0.203**
RA	0.056	-0.011	0.005	0.355**	0.290	0.340**	0.194**	0.138	0.154**
RIN	0.280**	0.107	0.302**	-0.243**	-0.179	-0.223**	0.136**	0.308**	0.198**

Notes : \*\* denotes significance at 1% level and \* at 5% level

**B. ORS SCORES AND BURNOUT SYMPTOMS:**

Burnout is a relatively newly defined concept in the field of psychological stress that has recently gained extensive attention as a separate strain (Farber, 1983). Chronic daily stresses (Roskies & Lazarus, 1980) rather than unique life events (Dohrenwend & Dohrenwend, 1980; Singh 1987; Pestonjee, D.M. 1987b) are regarded as central factors in producing burnout. Burnout has some bearing on the field of job satisfaction in organizational theory (Locke, 1976) and is linked to the extensive literature of occupational stress ( MacNeill, 1981); however, the concept of burnout goes beyond specific stresses in the work place to emphasize total life and environmental pressures that affect the individual's well being. At severe levels, burnout might also overlap with symptoms of reactive-depression (Seligman, 1978). Since Freudenberger (1974) and Maslach (1976) defined the

concept as a separate entity, the burnout syndrome has become the subject of rapidly growing interdisciplinary literature.

The construct validity of burnout was assessed by relating it to several other concepts. Several researches were conducted with burnout measure documented correlation between burnout and diminishing satisfaction from work, life, and one self, poor physical health, sleep problems, hopelessness, and loss of idealism about the work. Various stress-producing variables have been found to be significantly related to burnout. Work overload, social over extension; bureaucratic pressures; lack of feedback, autonomy and appreciation. Burnout was found to be significantly correlated with a wide range of outcome variables as well, including turnover rates, tardiness, and inclination to leave the job. A significant correlation was found between burnout as assessed by the subjects and the degree of burnout attributed to them by colleagues (Sharma, 2002).

Burnout though identified as a psychological symptoms, it seems to pervade almost all aspect of life. Burnout may be exposed in the form of alienation, powerlessness and extreme low self-esteem, poor supervisor's relationship and absenteeism.

According to Maslach (1976) following three variables can be selected to measure the burnout symptoms and in this study a comprehensive correlation analysis have been taken along with 10 different ORS variables:

- i. **Depersonalization:** This is a sense of detachment of the incumbent from other and his/her own self.
- ii. **Lack of personal Accomplishment:** This is the variable measure where low level of personal involvement and similarly lower achievements are taken care with, which are the indicative of emotional burnout
- iii. **Emotional Exhaustion:** It reflects the chronic physiological and psychological problems sad powerlessness experienced by an incumbent due to crossing of his/her stress tolerance limits.

In this study out of responses to the 26 questions 4 responses were taken as the measures of Depersonalization, 5 Responses were taken as the measures of Lack of Personal Accomplishment and 5 responses were taken as measures of Emotional Exhaustion.

**i) ORS and Depersonalization.**

Table IV shows the coefficient of correlation of measures of depersonalization with different ORS variables. Out of ten variables 8 of them have positive correlation with burnout depersonalization measures in overall aspect. However, for both the cases i.e., departmental and extra departmental employees separate sets of correlation coefficients have been calculated. On overall basis all eight variables, which are positively related with burnout symptoms all are significant at 1% level of significance. On overall basis Role Stagnation show highest positive correlation (0.362), whereas, Self Role Distance (0.271), Role Ambiguity (0.211) Resource Inadequacy (0.173) etc. coming next. Sharma. (2002) in her study of Executive burnout found Role Expectation, Role Overload Personal Inadequacy and Self Role Distance having positive correlation at 0.01 level of significance.

**TABLE IV**  
**Correlation coefficient between ORS Scores and Depersonalization**

ORS	Departmental			Extra-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
IRD	-0.015	0.369**	0.050	0.238**	0.626**	-0.112*	0.139**	0.514**	-0.034
RS	0.291**	0.691**	0.364**	0.365**	-0.114	0.277**	0.374**	0.384**	0.362**
REC	0.152*	0.677**	0.201**	0.171**	0.334*	0.165**	0.141**	0.546**	0.168**
RE	0.067	-0.068	0.048	0.340**	0.443**	0.343**	0.205**	0.224*	0.202**
RO	0.394**	0.486**	0.403**	-0.060	-0.109	-0.084	0.163**	0.146	0.152**
RI	0.116	0.316*	0.132*	0.145*	0.069	0.134*	0.162**	0.347**	0.173**
PI	-0.293**	0.087	-0.277**	-0.009	0.048	0.004	-0.120**	-0.015	-0.104**
SRD	0.345**	0.291*	0.327**	0.054	0.390**	0.094	0.244**	0.478**	0.271**
RA	0.079	0.056	0.086	0.318**	0.446**	0.353**	0.194**	0.217*	0.211**

Relationship between Organizational Role Stress and Stress Consequences

RIN	0.348**	0.251	0.294**	-0.353**	-0.573**	-0.403**	0.150**	0.235*	0.129**
-----	---------	-------	---------	----------	----------	----------	---------	--------	---------

Notes : \*\* denotes significance at 1% level and \* at 5% level

**ii) ORS and Lack of Personal Accomplishment**

To study the relationship between Personal accomplishment and role related variables Pearson's coefficient s of correlation have been calculated with each variable. The result obtained is show in the Table V. Out of ten variables except Role Erosion all nine other variables show positive correlation. Role Overload (0.299), Resource Inadequacy (0.291) and Role Stagnation (0.266) are some of the highest scoring variables are significant at 0.01 levels. Maslach (1976) reported almost same type of findings. Sharma (2002) although did not consider personal accomplishment as a significant contributor towards the burnout symptoms.

**TABLE V**  
**Correlation coefficient between ORS Scores and Lack of Personal Accomplishment**

ORS	Departmental			Extra- Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
IRD	*0.162-	*0.268-	**0.188-	0.063	0.244	0.099	0.014-	0.155	0.004
RS	**0.204	0.007-	**0.159	*0.132	**0.483	**0.150	**0.233	0.174	**0.226
REC	0.120	0.117	*0.149	*0.139	**0.596	**0.177	*0.104	**0.387	**0.146
RE	0.126	**626.-	0.063	0.110-	0.091	0.084-	0.004	0.057-	0.003-
RO	**0.436	0.085	**0.393	**0.259	**0.389	**0.263	**0.324	0.143	**0.299
RI	**0.222	0.070-	**0.199	**0.284	**0.459	**0.296	**0.284	**0.342	**0.291
PI	0.071	0.122-	0.047	0.093	0.057-	0.079	*0.093	0.001	*0.080
SRD	**0.204	-0.407**	0.121*	-0.144	0.276-	-0.127*	0.109*	0.040	0.099 *
RA	*0.155	**0.478	0.062	**0.305	0.110	**0.295	-0.228	0.089-	**0.179

Relationship between Organizational Role Stress and Stress Consequences

RIN	0.124	0.098-	0.112	0.105-	*0.371-	**0.158-	**0.125	0.121	**0.127
-----	-------	--------	-------	--------	---------	----------	---------	-------	---------

Notes : \*\* denotes significance at 1% level and \* at 5% level

**iii) ORS and Emotional Exhaustion**

Relationship of emotional Exhaustion and ORS are studied with the help of coefficient of correlation between measures of Emotional Exhaustion and ten ORS variables. The results obtained are shown in Table 6. The overall result shows that Inter Role Distance (0.294), Resource Inadequacy (0.282), Role Ambiguity (0.262) Role Overload (0.235), Role Expectation Conflict 90.221) and Role Isolation. (0.210) are among the highest score of the ORS variables and related positively with the Emotional Exhaustion at 0.01 level of significance.

All three dimensions of burnout symptoms are found to be significant with different ORS variables with different combinations. This makes a clear sense that the employees under consideration are working under moderate level of burnout symptom. These results are significant at 0.01 level of significance). It is this imperative that supportive measures from the management are must to protect the postal employees in general from most of the adverse effects of burnout symptoms.

**TABLE VI**  
**Correlation coefficient between ORS Scores and Emotional Exhaustion**

ORS	Departmental			Extra-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
IRD	**0.258	**0.338	**0.280	**0.236	**0.481	**0.304	**0.244	**0.444	**0.294
RS	**0.380	**0.337	**0.372	0.030-	0.009-	0.072-	**0.195	*0.210	**0.182
REC	**0.277	**0.483	**0.273	**0.207	*0.339	**0.193	**0.222	**0.449	**0.221
RE	**0.242	0.069	**0.210	**0.242-	0.148-	**0.218-	0.005	0.019	0.002
RO	**0.310	0.183	**0.285	**0.217	*0.308	**0.192	**0.626	0.178	**0.235
RI	**0.288	**0.478	**0.302	0.078	0.161-	0.058	**0.208	**0.335	**0.210
PI	0.045-	*0.290	0.009	0.044-	0.059	0.020-	0.038-	*0.211	0.002

Relationship between Organizational Role Stress and Stress Consequences

SRD	**0.293	0.222	**0.270	0.025	0.045	0.040	**0.184	**0.303	**0.196
IRA	~0.223	**0.343	**0.251	**0.626	0.061	**0.275	**0.242	**0.255	**0.262
RIN	**0.433	**0.517	**0.411	0.066	0.121-	0.027-	-0.310	-0.446	**0.282

Notes : \*\* denotes significance at 1% level and \* at 5% level

#### IV. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

1) Inter-role distance, Role expectation conflict and Role overload are few ORS factors highly responsible for physiological consequences. The Most effective ORS variables responsible for psychological problems are; Role Stagnation (0.283), Role Isolation (0.273), Role Overload (0.272), Resource Inadequacy (0.239) and Role Ambiguity (0.213). Role Stagnation (0.408), Role Expectation Conflict (0.240) Role Overload, (0.228) and Self Role Distance (0.203) are some of the import ORS variables influencing Behavioral consequences of the sampled employees.

2) Burnout symptoms have been shown in three different stages; Depersonalization, Personal accomplishment and Emotional exhaustion. On overall basis Role Stagnation has highest positive correlation (0.236), whereas, Self Role Distance (0.271) Role Ambiguity (0.211) Resource Inadequacy (0.173)., having positive relationships with Depersonalization factors. Out of the ten ORS variables expect Role Erosion all nine other variables have positive correlation. Role Overload (0.299), Resource Inadequacy (0.291) and Role Stagnation (0.266) are some of the highest scoring variables identified in this section of Personal accomplishment. And the overall result shows that Inter Role Distance (0.294), Resource Inadequacy (0.282) Role Ambiguity (0.262) Role Overload (0.235), Role Expectation Conflict (0.221) and Role Isolation (0.210) are among the highest scorer of the ORS variables and related positively with Emotional Exhaustion.

In nutshell, this study indicates that postal employees are experiencing moderate to high level of role stress. The consequence of such role stress-physiological, and behavioral are strongly felt by the employees. Organizational efforts to tackle this problem is immensely required.

#### References

Agarwal, R. (2001). *Stress in life and at work*. Response Books. New Delhi.

Relationship between Organizational Role Stress and Stress Consequences

Caplan, R.D., S., French, J.R.P., Jr., Van Harrison, R., and Pinneau, S.R. (1975). *Job Demands and Worker Health: main Effects and Occupational Differences*. U.S. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing office.

Freudenberger, H.J. (1974). Staff Burnout. *Journal of social Issues*, 30,159-165.

Justice, C.Talwar. (1997). *Report on Postal Extra-Departmental staff*, Postal Crusader, NFPE, New Delhi.

Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Qunin, R.P., Snock, Jr. D., and Rosenthal, RA (1964). *Organisational Sress: studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.

Katz, J.L.& Kahn, R.L. (1996). *The Social Ppsychology of the Organization*. Wiley, New York.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology,1297-1349*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

MacNeill, D. (1981). The relationship of occupational stress to burnout. In J. W. Jones (Eds.), *The Burnout Syndrome*, 68-88. Park Ridge, IL: London House Management Press

Marshal, J. & Cooper, C.L. (1979). *Executive Under Pressure*, Paper presented at the International Seminar on Stress in Health and Diseases,. Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi.

Maslach, C. (1976). Burned-out. *Human Behavior*,5,16-22.

Pareek, U. (1983). *Role Stress Scale: ORS scale booklet, answer sheet, and manual*, Ahmedabad: Navin Publication.

Pareek. U. (1993). *Making organizational roles effective*. New Delhi: Tata Mc. Graw- Hi11.86,

Pestonjee, D.M. (1999). *Stress and Coping: the Indian experience*, Sage Publication, N. Delhi.

Seligman, M. E. P. (1978). Comment and Integration, *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, ,165-179.

Sharma, Radha, R. (2002). Executive Burnout: Contribution of role related factors, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relation*, 38 (1)

Srivastava, A.K. (1999). *Management of Occupational Stress*, Gyan Publishing House, New Delhi,15.

*Explanation of Abbreviations for ORS variables:-*

**Inter-Role Distance (IRD):** Covers conflict arising due to organizational and non-organizational roles.

**Role Stagnation (RS) :** Arising due to the difference between the extreme involvement with an existing role and the new role that one incumbent has to accept for the change in the organization.

**Self-Role Distance (SRD):** This types of stress may occur when an incumbent perpetually feels that his likings do not match with the requirement of the role occupied by him (e.g. Engagement in stereotype work for a long time).

**Role Expectation Conflict (REC):** This is kind of stress when a role occupant remains in dilemma as to whom to please.

**Role Erosion (RE):** Arises when a role occupant feels that his/her job is being performed by others due to indulgence of the authority.

**Role Overload (RO):** Occurs when an occupant feels that he/she is over loaded with work, beyond his capacity to accomplish.

**Role Isolation (RI):** Feelings of the role occupant that due to very nature of the job he/she remains isolated from other role occupant as well as from others' role.

**Personal Inadequacy (PI):** A feeling of not capable of performing the task meant for the occupant - either due to lack of training and knowledge or any organizational change.

**Role Ambiguity (RA):** When the role occupant remains confused about the priority of his functioning.

**Resource Inadequacy (RIN):** A feeling of not provided with appropriate resources to combat the challenges of the requirements of the role occupied by the occupant.

## Relationship between Organizational Role Stress and Stress Consequences

<sup>1</sup> This gradual process of encroachment, however, may cause tension. Prof. Kausik Basu studied one such tension between 'global policy and local freedoms'. Basu K. (2003)

<sup>1</sup> Nayyar, of-course, argued that macroeconomic objectives and policies should not be identical for all countries.

<sup>1</sup> Other than kakwani et al, there is another measure proposed by Ravallion and Chen (2003) to estimate pro-poor growth. However, kakwani et al (2006) claimed that Ravallion-Chen estimate violates Axiom-1

<sup>1</sup> Equation GQ Lorenz curve:  $L(1-L) = a(p^2 - L) + bL(p-1) + c(p-L)$

<sup>1</sup> Beta Lorenz curve:  $L(p) = p - \theta p^\gamma (1-p)^\delta$

<sup>1</sup> [ $\mu L'(0.001; \pi)$ ,  $\pi L'(0.999; \pi)$ ]

<sup>1</sup> See appendix in Chen & Ravallion (Background Paper) for country wise details of survey year and welfare indicators.

<sup>1</sup> However, many republics were reluctant to come out from soviet system, particularly of Asian region. While the Baltic States led the fight for independence, Central Asian states were afraid of it. Michael McFaul wrote in '*Russia's Unfinished Revolution*' that "the centrifugal forces pulling the Union apart were weakest in Central Asia. Well after the August 1991 coup attempt, all Central Asian countries believed that the Union might somehow be preserved".

<sup>1</sup> Martin Ravallion is associated with poverty research and monitoring programme of the World Bank.

<sup>1</sup> Except Albania. The case of Albania is unexplainable. It indicates increasing poverty but declining inequality with positive growth. I hope more scrutiny on data is required to analyze Albanian condition.

<sup>1</sup> Nepal's result is somewhat perplexing. Inequality increases with a very high rate i.e., 10 percent but severity of poverty along with poverty reduces substantially.

<sup>1</sup> For \$1 per day poverty line, there is no basic change in the situation. We find only one change. Bangladesh shows 'immiserizing' growth instead of 'trickle down' growth.

## Relationship between Organizational Role Stress and Stress Consequences