

Chapter – IV

Causes of Job Stress and Organizational Role Stress (ORS)

Contents:

- 4.1 Introduction.*
 - 4.2 Analysis of Response*
 - 4.3 Organizational Role Stress*
 - 4.4. Different ORS Variables*
 - 4.5 Measures of ORS*
 - 4.6. Summing Up*
-

Key Terms:

- 1) ***I/O Psychology***: *The study of a branch of psychology where issues related to industries and organization are dealt with including human resources of the concerned organization*
- 2) ***GAS***: *'General Adoption Syndrome' – a physical mechanism to develop self-control over stress. Hans Selyes first introduced the term in 1956.*
- 3) ***ORS***: *'Organizational Role Stress' – it includes ten different variables and measures the extent of stressfulness through role elements of the job.*

4.1. Introduction

Job stress is a psychophysical condition of the employees under work in a certain working environment usually arises from constituent factors of the related job. All these factors are not necessarily the inherent stressors. In fact, personal characteristics of the employee, his cognitive appraisal of the job elements within his capacity and resources and his personal coping strategy determine the extent of stress he/she would experience from a job factor or from a particular combination of job factors. It is perhaps a difficult task to categorize a particular job, job condition or a work setting as universal stressors instead we can only predict some of the potential factors or conditions, which may cause job stress. However, all the employees do not response equally under same stressful condition. The pressure caused by a particular job factor, in fact, is negotiated by the very personal characteristics of the employee concerned. On the other side of the coin, it would not be a true assessment if only job condition is made responsible for job stress keeping aside the psychological and behavioral specialties of the employees, which are also considered to be consistent sources of job stress. It is therefore, essential to categorize the potential sources of job stress primarily in two different sections i.e., personality characteristics and job/work setting variables.

Hans Selyes (1956) ¹ in his General Adoption Syndrome (GAS) has described a comprehensive model through which it can be understood that how a stress free personality ultimately becomes a stressful one. The model suggests a three (3)-stages continuous development process that can also be called as physiological response mechanism. The first stage is called 'alarm action' which is an initial shock phase and reduces the resistance mechanism of the job occupant. The second phase is named as 'stage of resistance' that helps the incumbent to maximize the level of adoption and in consequence the alarm reaction disappears. Finally, the 'stage of exhaustion' comes into force in which the adoption energy gets exhausted, the alarm reaction reappear. The organism

then collapses and thus the incumbent start developing very first sense of stress and strain.

Various scholars in the field of Industrial and Organizational (I/O) psychology have identified several causes of job stress among the working employees. It has been the general observations of the researchers in this field that there are two main reasons of job stress viz. Personal characteristics and organization related causes. The first reason is self-dispositional in nature and could not be controlled by easy method of organizational intervention, whereas, the later one is controllable and immense scope of organizational intervention is possible in this area. Hence, in this research work almost all efforts are concentrated in finding out organizational reasons of job stress among the Indian Postal employees through the measures of Organizational Role Stress (ORS) variables. Before going for in depth analysis of ORS variables few other responses from the sample employees are taken for analysis as premise of ORS analysis.

4.2. Analysis of Responses:

Few questions are set in the questionnaire in such a fashion so that some potential causes other than role variables can be identified for the perceived stress of the Indian postal employees. In this section eight such questions and reported reply of the sample respondents are analysed with utmost care. The survey of literature done so far has not shown any sign of dealing such sort of questions in investigating employees' stress problem. But here the endeavor is taken to create a comprehensive premise for role variables analysis. Employees' Marital status, Age, Transfer, perception about the management they working under, are some of the areas analysed in this section. The analysis of this section will be followed by the discussion of organizational and its segmental analysis.

Table 4.1
Employees' Marital Status

Marital Status	Departmental			Ex-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	M	F	T	T	M	F	T
Married	192	43	211	45	256	235	403	88	491
Unmarried	44	15	59	63	1	64	107	16	123
Total	236	58	294	274	46	330	510	104	614

Married/ Unmarried. The marital status of the respondents was enquired about in this question. The table depicts that out of total 614 employees of both categories 491 were married and 123 were unmarried. Though no empirical link was established between marital status and stress perspective of the employees in the study still there remains a possibility of a strong link between perceived stress and marital status. It may both ways influence the perceived stress of the human being depending on the very personal characteristics of the focused person.

Table 4.2
Average Age of the Employees

	Departmental			Ex-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Mean	41.75	38.34	41.08	40.84	39.35	40.62	41.26	38.79	40.84
SD	9.50	10.23	9.73	9.16	7.20	8.91	9.32	8.99	9.30

Present Age. This table depicts the average age of the employees. This is perhaps one of the most important indicators of the health of the organization. It is true that more the average age of the working people in the organization less the productivity of the same. The study show that average age of both categories of employees is 40.84 with SD 9.30. The same of the departmental male employees is 41.75 with SD 10.23 and that of the ED employees is 40.84 with SD 8.91. The result of average age is not at all encouraging. The affect of closing

of new appointment in the department is clearly seen from the average age of the departmental and ED staff. It may be stated that employees of higher age with excessive workload cannot be free from stress situation.

Table 4.3
No of transfer (branch to branch)

No of transfer	Departmental			Ex-Departmental		
	M	F	T	M	F	T
0	12	8	20	83	3	9
1	8	7	15	9	0	30
2	8	1	9	21	9	22
3	31	22	53	17	5	64
4	33	8	41	40	24	45
5	36	3	39	44	1	
Often	108	9	117	60	4	64
Total	236	58	294	274	46	320

Total No. of transfer from (Branch to Branch). This table shows the total number of the employees transferred from one branch to another. While collecting this particular information it came to the knowledge that most of the departmental employees do face multiple transfer from branch to branch. Sometimes it was even difficult for the employee concern to recall the exact number. Hence, while coding this particular figure transfer from branch to branch for 5(five) times or more were considered as transfer took place often or frequently. In case for ED employees the problem was not acute except for urban ED Staff. The rural based ED staff are mostly working as ED Branch Post Master or ED Sub Post Master hardly have any transfer in their whole life time. Out of 294 total departmental employees 117 received transfer frequently from one office to another. 64 out of 320 ED employees have got same treatment. This frequent transfer must have a bearing on the employees stress level. On the other hand 86 ED employees, of which most of them are EDBPMs have not faced a single transfer in their lifetime. This may again be not a very hygienic situation for the psychological health of the concerned staff.

Table 4.4
No of transfer (job to job)

No of transfer	Departmental			Ex-Departmental		
	M	F	T	M	F	T
0	60	0	60	67	1	68
1	7	4	11	3	1	4
2	11	4	15	17	0	17
3	15	5	20	17	10	27
4	5	2	7	21	3	24
5	21	11	32	26	13	39
Frequently	117	32	149	123	18	143
Total	236	58	294	274	46	320

Total no. of transfer from (job to job). This table shows the number of transfer of the postal employees from one job to another. Once again the departmental staff are the most affected group. Out of total 294 staff 149 got transfers often or frequently. From personal interview it is known that most of the head offices, departmental employees do not know today that where they will sit tomorrow or what sort of work they will be assigned with. The level of uncertainty in the office environment may certainly have a bearing on perceived stress of the employees. The score for the ED employees is not far behind. It is a fact that the urban-based ED employees, who are working in same offices with their departmental staff, do also face frequent transfer from one job to another.

Table 4.5
No of Job of related training

No of training	Departmental			Ex-Departmental		
	M	F	T	M	F	T
0	9	0	9	207	35	242
1	27	10	37	67	11	78
2	39	23	62	0	0	0
3	65	3	68	0	0	0
4	61	9	70	0	0	0
5	34	13	47	0	0	0
6	3	0	3	0	0	0
Total	236	58	294	274	46	320

No. of Job Related Training. This table shows the number of job related training, the employees received during their job life. The result shows a very amazing picture. The departmental staff shows that the training they receive from the authority is not insufficient. Out of total 294 departmental employees except only 9 (nine) others somehow have access to the training process. On the other hand the result of ED staff shows just an opposite picture. Out of 320 total employees 242 reported that they never have a formal training from the department. Remaining 78 have one formal training in their lifetime. The result is not at all encouraging for the department. And this must cost the productivity of the department in a large extent. Overall psychological effect may also not be negligible.

**Table 4.6
Treatment of management with the employee.**

	Departmental				Ex-Departmental				Total			
	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%
Very good	16	7	23	7.82	0	0	0	0.00	16	7.00	23	3.75
Good	157	48	205	69.73	92	7	99	30.94	249	55.00	304	49.51
Not good	63	3	66	22.45	182	39	221	69.06	245	42.00	287	46.74
Total	236	58	294	100.	274	46	320	100.	510	104	614	100

Treatment of management with the employee.

This table shows the self-assessment of the sample employees on the treatment of management with them. The answer was asked in three scales; very good, good and not good. The result, if analyzed show mixed result for both categories of staff. For departmental staff only 7.82% report 'very good', 69.73% 'good' and 22.45% 'not good'. In contrast the report of the ED staff is as follows; 3.75% report 'very good' 49.51% 'good' and 46.74% 'not good'.

A major share of the employee opined that they are not treated well by the management and thus it must affect them badly in developing job stress among them.

Table: 4.7
Employees' Opinion in Improving the Position of the Department

	Departmental				Ex-Departmental				Total			
	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%
Employing more men	146	20	166	56.46	25	6	31	9.69	171	26	197	32.08
Rational work load	49	38	87	29.59	0	0	0	0	49	38	87	14.17
Increasing salary	41	0	41	13.95	249	40	289	90.31	290	40	330	53.75
Total	236	58	294	100	274	46	320	100	510	104	614	100

How present position can be improved? For this particular question three different options of the answer were provided with, these are; 'Employing more men', 'Making workload rational' and 'Increasing salary'. The optional answers were designed after making long discussions with concerned employees and few leaders of the recognized postal Union. If the result is analyzed following information is available. Responses of departmental employee; 'Employing more men' 56.46%, 'Making workload rational'-29.59% and 'Increasing salary'-13.95%. On the other hand the same of the ED staff are 'Employing more men'-23.08%, 'Making workload rational'-14.17% and 'Increasing salary'-53.75%. It is a fact that when employees are left with the question of the improvement of the organization they are attached with, their answer was not only to highlight their salary but other two answers also got due importance. This makes a sense that despite of a lot of problems in and out side the department, the employees maintain a positive attitude for the development of their organization same and they obviously deserve a note of respect for this overall attitude.

Table: 4.8
Method of performance appraisal

	Departmental				Ex-Departmental				Total			
	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%
Observation	77	13	90	32.61	69	11	80	25.08	146	24	170	27.69
Providing targets	141	38	179	64.86	141	24	164	51.41	282	62	344	56.03
No judgment	18	7	7	2.54	64	11	75	23.51	82	18	100	16.29
Total	236	58	276	100	274	46	319	100	510	104	614	100

Method of performance appraisal.

This particular question was set to learn the employees' perception about the method of their evaluation by the management. Three options of answers were provided with the question. These options were; 'By observation', 'By providing targets' and 'No judgment'. The analysis of the result of the sample employees reveals following results; for departmental staff 'By observation' 23.61%, 'By providing targets' 64.86% and 'No judgment' 2.54%; and for the ED staff 'By observation' 27.69%, 'By providing targets' 56.03% and 'No judgment' 16.29%. It seems that as per the perception of the departmental staff, they are engaged with more target-oriented task hence they are more stress prone. On the other hand 16.29% of the ED employees are kept free without any assessment obligation from the part of their superior.

4.3 Organizational Role Stress (ORS)

In case of jobs are poorly defined, people have different expectations of an employee's activities. In consequence, an employee may not have the idea of what to do, eventually fail to meet these expectations. Role conflict, Role ambiguity and other role-related variables do affect the employee's performance to a great extent. Work and job environment also have bearing on the performance of the concerned employee too. Individualities matching with job related factors produce stressors for an employee. It is not necessary that same job environment will create same type of stressors on different employees. On the other hand same stressors will not have equal impact on every stressful employee. This research will however, stress its endeavor to identify various type of stressors whether job related or individuality related and will seriously attempt to recognize the effect of the same on the employees as well as on the organization.

Some jobs provide more stress than others. Those, who are involved in rotating, shift work, machine paced tasks, and routine and repetitive work, or

hazardous environments, associated with greater risk of stress. Evidence also indicates that the sources of stress differ by hierarchical level of organization. Executive stress may arise from the pressure for short-term financial results or the fear of hostile take over attempt, corporate cutbacks etc. Supervisory stressors include the pressure for quality, customer service, numerous meetings, and responsibility for the work for others. Workers at bottom, on the other hand are more likely to experience the stressors due to of low social status, lack of perceived control, resource shortages, and the demand for a large volume of error free time bound work.

Stress at work resulting from increasing complexities of work and its divergent demand, has become a prominent and pervading factor of modern organizations. The researchers in the area of I/O psychology and management have used the term to denote employees' mental state aroused by a job situation or a combination of job situations perceived as presenting excessive and divergent demands. Some researchers have emphasized the role of job situation in the definition of job or occupational stress. *Caplan, Cobb and French (1975)*² have accordingly defined occupational stress as "any characteristics of job environment which poses a threat to the individual". *Cooper & Marshal (1979)*³ have expressed that "by occupational stress is meant negative environmental factors or stressors associated with a particular job".

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. The concept of 'role' is the key concept in understanding the integration of the individual in a system. The first requirement in linking individual and organization is to locate the individual in the total set of ongoing relationship and behaviors comprised by the organization. Researchers have applied role-theory to understand stress problems at work and to examine how and to what extent role pressures contribute to occupational stress. *Kahn and his associated (1964)*⁴ have extensively investigated the stresses arising from two major

characteristics of organizational roles, i.e., role ambiguity and role conflict. *Ivancevich and Matteson (1980)*⁵ have noted that the role pressure occurs when an employee's expectations or demands conflict with expectation and demands of the organization.

*Srivastav. (1999)*⁶ has stated that "role over-load as well as role-under-load have also been noted as competent stressors". In defining the concept of role in an organization and on its employees *Pestonjee. (1999)*⁷ stated, "The extent of stress is however, a matter of degree. Some organizations manage to generate a more harmonious work atmosphere whereas others have greater friction and tension. Human behavior in an organization is influenced or directed by several physical, social and psychological factors. One key concept to understand the integration of the individual with an organization is the role assigned to him within the overall structure of the organization. It is through this role that the individual interacts and get integrated with the system. An organization can be defined as a system of roles. However, role itself is a system".

Therefore, any organization can be perceived as a system of role or combination of roles. These measures of roles are different from position or rather various portfolios of the offices. As per *Katz and Kahn (1996)*⁸, office is a relational or power related concept, while role is a concept of obligation. Office is associated with the hierarchical position and privileges, but role refers to the obligations and responsibilities attached to that office. Human being as such associated with various roles concurrently. He/she plays relation roles like son, daughter, father, mother, husband, wife, employer, employee etc., sex role i.e., role of men or women; age roles like role of infant, role of adults, etc. It is a matter of fact that an individual simultaneously performs several roles and this performance is done not in a single period of time but at the same span of time. According to *Agarwal, (2001)*⁹, under this perceived situation with the engagement of several roles, an incumbent often face the question about his

command over his roles, the question of his intrudes over another, the question of expectation from him, the question of his understanding of the concerned job etc., these and many other questions may be constantly plaguing you. And if these were there, one would certainly experience role stress.

Two major factors as identified by many researchers for role stress are role ambiguity and role conflict. Role overload and role under-load have also been noted as competent factors of occupational stressors. The features of job role set which cause occupational stress have been given due importance in evaluating stress at work for the individual. Except role ambiguity, role conflict and role over-load other potential variables of job roles were not in use before a theoretical speculation of Organizational Role Stress was first made popular by *Pareek (1983c)* ¹⁰. Once again *Pareek (1993)* ¹¹ has defined role as a set of functions, which an individual performs in response to the expectation about the role. For a role occupant there are two role systems in a specified role: role space and role set.

The definition of role indicates that there are inherent problems in the performance of a role and, therefore, stress is inevitable for the role occupant. The concept of role and related concept of 'role space' and 'role set' have a built in potential for conflict and stress.

Role space includes all the roles occupied simultaneously by the person in focus. The person finds his/her place in the center of this space. Thus it can be defined as the dynamic interrelationship both between the self and various roles that an individual occupies. It has three main variables: self, the role under question and other roles an individual occupies. Conflicts amongst these are referred to as role space conflicts or stress. These stress factors and their names as suggested by *Pareek (1983c,)* ¹², and *Pestonjee (1999)* ¹³, can be explained as follows:

1. **Inter- Role Distance (IRD):** Every working individual plays more than one roles at a time. His role in work place may come into a conflict with family or social roles he/she is otherwise preoccupied with. The conflict arises due to organizational and non-organizational role generates such element of stress.
2. **Role stagnation(RS):** This sort of conflict is the generated 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. This peculiar phenomenon occurs especially when an individual enters new role/job after occupying a fixed role for a long period of time. It may also occur when the incumbent feels that there is no opportunity for the progress of his/her career.
3. **Self-Role Distance (SRD):** This type of stress may occur when an incumbent perpetually feels that his likings do not match with the requirement of the role he occupied with. Prolonged engagement with any stereotype work may be the source of such stress.

Role set conflicts arise due to the incompatibility between the expectations of the 'important' others. Pareek (1983c) ¹⁴ has identified seven (7) such type of stresses usually generated amongst the employees. These stresses/conflicts are;

1. **Role Expectation Conflict (REC):** This is a kind of stress when a role occupant remains in dilemma about whom to please. There may be two or more than two persons interested in the outcomes of one's performance in the role and surprisingly, their expectation may differ from each other.
2. **Role Erosion (RE):** This is a feeling of stress when a role occupant feels that his/her job is being performed by others due to indulgence of the

authority. It may also surface when credit of performance is otherwise shifted from the actual doer to other one.

3. **Role Overload (RO):** When an occupant feels that he/she is loaded with work, which is beyond his capacity to accomplish, this particular stress may occur. This overloading may be of three types; too much physical load, time constraints, and intellectual incapability to combat the very element of work.
4. **Role Isolation (RI):** This is a situational distress of role occupant where he/she feels that due to very nature of the job he/she remains isolated from other role occupant as well as from other's role. If the place of job is not conducive for interaction this sort of stress may occur among the employees where they may even feel that they and their performances are purposefully ignored in the organization.
5. **Personal Inadequacy (PI):** this type of stress is very common among the newly appointed employees where due to lack of training and knowledge they feel that they are not capable of performing the task meant for him/her. It may even occur due to the change in the technology of function when existing working force may feel such stress, as they are not acquainted with the changed technology. Occupant of such stress may feel alienated.
6. **Role Ambiguity (RA):** This is a type of stress where the role occupant remains confused about the priority of his functioning. If authority fails to categorize the function of a role occupant with specific priority, this type of stress becomes obvious.
7. **Resource Inadequacy (RIN):** This is the type of stress when the role occupant feels that he/she is not provided with appropriate resources to combat the challenges of the requirements of the role he/she occupied at present. It may even occur due to late as well as casual direction from the end of supervisor.

4.4 Different ORS Variables

According to *Pareek, (1983c)* ¹⁵ the ORS scale, which constitutes ten variables all together, can be used to investigate the nature and dynamics of role stress in various organizations. This can also be used to develop interventions for the use of individuals, groups and organization. "ORS is certainly one of the best instruments available today for measuring a wide variety of role stress"- *D M Pestonjee, (1999)* ¹⁶. It is a five-point Likert ¹⁷ scale ranging from the views of "strongly disapprove" to "strongly approve". The ORS scale has been widely used by scholars in measuring the quantity of stress. All ten variables of ORS include all possible role related factors responsible for developing stress among the employees.

In this study a questionnaire [Appendix-A] has been developed in the line suggested by *Pareek (1993)*. It consists of 50 (fifty) questions for all 10 (ten) ORS variables. Each ORS variable has 5 (five) questions each in the questionnaire ranging in a gap of 10 (ten) questions, e.g., the questions of Role Over-load are set in question number (5), (15), (25), (35), and in (45). All other questions are set in similar pattern. All together 614 respondents replied the questionnaire of which 294 are departmental employees and 320 are of extra-departmental in their nature of job. All ten variables are discussed below with the responses received from the respondents. In each case the responses are presented separately for Departmental and Extra-departmental staff with further classification of responses from male and female staff. The results on overall basis are also recorded to depict the total effect of the data received.

Table: 4.9
Inter-Role-Distance (IRD)

	Departmental			Ex-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Mean	12.37	13.48	12.59	12.53	14.93	12.87	12.45	14.12	12.74
SD	3.51	2.99	3.44	4.18	3.73	4.20	3.89	3.40	3.86
CV	28.38	22.18	27.32	33.36	24.98	32.63	31.24	24.08	30.30

4.4.1 Inter-Role-Distance (IRD)

As can be seen in Table 4.9 the Mean score of Inter-Role –Distance of the departmental staff as a whole is 12.59 with Standard Deviation 3.44 and coefficient of Variation 27.32 and that of extra-departmental staff are 12.87, 4.20 and 32.63. Score level of IRD produces almost same result for both categories of staff but with comparatively lower value of SD and CV, the results of departmental staff seem to be more consistent and homogeneous.

However, the Mean value of IRD of all the staff together gives the result 12.74 is significant enough as it represents more than 60% of the highest possible score i.e., 20. (5 questions with serial numbers 1,11,21,31 and 41, each having highest possible score 4) The overall score of female respondents as well as the score of the female employees of extra-departmental category are significantly more than that of the male score. It is therefore, predicted from this difference that this may occur due to more family involvement of the female staff than their male counterpart. Therefore, it can be stated that IRD is found to be one of the major contributing factors of the stress outcome of the postal employees.

Table: 4.10
Role Stagnation (RS)

	Departmental			Ex-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Mean	11.08	11.50	11.16	13.32	11.65	13.08	12.28	11.57	12.16
SD	3.56	4.09	3.66	3.45	2.88	3.42	3.67	3.59	3.67
CV	32.13	35.57	32.80	25.90	24.72	26.15	29.89	31.03	30.18

4.4.2 Role Stagnation (RS)

Table 4.10 depicts total result of Role Stagnation variable in connection with the stress experienced by the employees. The result shows that the overall mean (12.6) is more than 60% of the total possible highest score, therefore, contributing sufficiently to the total stress of the employees concerned. It emerges from the table that the score of departmental staff (11.66) is comparatively lower than that of extra-departmental staff (13.08). The SD (3.42) and CV (26.15) of the score of ED staff are lower than that of departmental staff i.e., SD (3.66) and CV (32.80). From the above comparison it seems that stress feelings due to stagnation are more for the ED staff. It happens so due to the fact that most of the ED staff are working in the same office for a prolonged period of time and their work schedule is monotonous in actual sense. The response of the female ED staff and female employees in overall scenario are surprisingly low may be due to their less representation of them in the ED branch post master and ED sub-post master categories.

Table: 4.11
Role Expectation Conflict (REC)

	Departmental			Ex-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Mean	13.60	11.41	13.17	13.07	12.37	12.97	13.32	11.84	13.07
SD	3.04	2.89	3.13	3.58	2.81	3.48	3.35	2.88	3.32
CV	22.35	25.33	23.77	27.39	22.72	26.83	25.15	24.32	25.40

4.4.3 Role Expectation Conflict (REC)

Table 4.11 shows the whole distribution of the variable Role Expectation Conflict where the Mean score of departmental staff (13.17) is slightly more than that of ED staff (12.97). Moreover, SD and CV of departmental staff which score 3.13 and 23.77 are seem to more consistent than that of the ED staff which score 3.48 and 26.83. Therefore, it is evident from the emerged result that the departmental staff are facing more pressure for role expectation conflict due to massive cross expectation from different corners of the administration. ED staff however, face little less of this particular stress variable because of administrative isolation they inherited due to the system itself. The total Mean score however, in this case is more than 65% of the highest possible score, therefore, contributing significantly towards developing total stress among the employees under consideration. Female employees once again scoring significantly lower than their male counterpart may be due to the fact that they hardly care expectation of others.

Table:4.12
Role Erosion (RE)

	Departmental			Ex-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Mean	11.38	10.86	11.28	11.57	11.67	11.58	11.48	11.22	11.44
SD	3.90	2.34	3.65	3.31	3.32	3.31	3.59	2.83	3.48
CV	34.27	21.55	32.36	28.61	28.45	28.58	31.27	25.22	30.42

4.4.4 Role Erosion (RE)

Table 4.12 shows the score distribution of Role erosion, which measures the stress generating out of the feeling of the role occupant that some of the functions are taken away from him/her and the same are given to others and consequently he/she become less important in the office. The ED staff score

higher in the Mean score than that of the departmental staff. And the SD and CV of ED staff are also lower than that of the departmental staff. Hence, the score of ED staff seems to be more homogeneous and consistent. However, the total Mean score (11.44) seems to be moderate (below 60%) with SD 3.48 and CV 30.42 depicts moderate level of fluctuation of the Mean value. Female employee's score in all the categories except ED staff are less than that of their male counterpart but the differences are not significant to draw any conclusion in this regard.

Table: 4.13.
Role Over-load (RO)

	Departmental			Ex-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Mean	14.08	13.90	14.04	14.16	13.30	14.04	14.12	13.63	14.04
SD	3.42	2.71	3.29	2.89	3.05	2.92	3.14	2.86	3.10
CV	24.29	19.50	23.43	20.41	22.93	20.80	22.24	20.98	22.08

4.4.5 Role Over-load (RO)

The table 4.13 shows the Mean average score of role over-load along with SD and CV for both the categories and the result as a whole. The Mean score of departmental and ED staff are same i.e., 14.04 but the SD and CV for departmental and that of ED staff are 3.29, 23.43 and 2.92, 20.80 respectively. Hence, due to lower SD and CV the score of ED staff seems to be more consistent and therefore, they are to be more stress full for workload variable. The total score for both the categories as well as the overall score is above 14 i.e., more than 70% of the highest possible score (i.e., 20) implies that role over-load variables contribute huge in workers' stress feeling. The score of female categories are also not fairly lower than that of the score of their male counterpart.

**Table: 4.14
Role Isolation (RI)**

	Departmental			Ex-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Mean	10.44	9.71	10.30	11.92	11.78	11.90	11.24	10.62	11.14
SD	4.71	3.10	4.44	3.81	2.62	3.66	4.31	3.06	4.13
CV	45.11	31.93	43.11	31.96	22.24	30.76	38.35	28.81	37.07

4.4.6 Role Isolation (RI)

This is a type of stress arises from the psychological distance of the role occupant between the roles of other in the same role set. The possibility of the ED staff of developing such stress is too much who are working along with the departmental staff in the same office under the same role set. The table 4.14 shows the findings of the study where the Mean value of the variable is 10.30 for departmental staff and 11.90 for the ED staff. This helps to make a clear idea that the ED staff gets more stress due to role isolation. The higher Mean value of ED staff becomes more consistent and homogeneous due to comparatively lower SD (2.92) as well as lower CV (20.80). The total Mean value however is 11.4 which is 55% of the highest possible score indicates that in this study this particular variable is moderately contributing towards the total stress experienced by the employees.

**Table 4.15
Personal Inadequacy (PI)**

	Departmental			Ex-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Mean	10.69	10.74	10.70	11.06	11.52	11.13	10.89	11.09	10.92
SD	3.90	3.09	3.75	4.15	3.69	4.08	4.04	3.37	3.93
CV	36.48	28.77	35.05	37.52	32.03	36.66	37.10	30.39	35.99

4.4.7 Personal Inadequacy (PI)

It is a kind of stress where the role occupant feels that he/she is not enough skillful to face the challenges of the job. This may happen due to poor or no training of the staff and eventually the employees lost their confidence in coping the challenges required by the job. Table 4.15 depicts that once again the ED staff are scoring more than that of the departmental staff. The Mean scores of ED and departmental staff are 10.70 and 11.13 respectively. Whereas, the SD and CV of departmental staff and ED staff are 3.75, 35.05 and 4.08, 36.66 respectively. It seems that due to higher SD and CV of the ED staff the difference of the Mean value is not going to be so significant. On the other hand the scores of the female employees in both the categories are more than that of their male colleagues. The overall score of this particular stress variable comes to 10.92 a little over than 50% of the highest possible value and thus perhaps contribute moderately in the total stress feelings.

Table: 4.16
Self-Role Distance (SRD)

	Departmental			Ex-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Mean	10.52	10.00	10.42	12.59	13.02	12.66	11.64	11.34	11.58
SD	2.97	3.00	2.98	2.95	2.74	2.92	3.13	3.25	3.15
CV	28.23	30	28.60	23.43	21.04	23.06	26.89	28.66	27.20

4.4.8. Self Role Distance (SRD)

This is the type of stress occurs when the focal person feels that his present role goes against his self-concept about the same role. It is a conflict of mismatch between the person and the role he is assigned to play. The table 4.16 shows the result of this particular ORS variable where the difference of Mean score between departmental and extra-departmental staff is significant enough. The Mean score of departmental staff is 10.42 whereas that of the ED staff came out as 12.66. The SD (2.92) and CV (23.06) scored by ED staff also proved that

the Mean score has very little dispersion and the result is steady enough to be significant. This again proves that most of the ED staff have been suffering from the concept of mismatch of job and their self-concept. The Mean score of female ED staff is even more than that of their male counterpart. The overall score of the Mean comes to 11.58, which is almost equal to 60% of the highest possible score, is obviously contributing towards the total stress feelings of the employee.

Table:4.17
Role Ambiguity (RA)

	Departmental			Ex-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Mean	10.18	11.95	10.53	10.58	12.72	10.89	10.40	12.29	10.72
SD	5.58	4.37	5.40	4.16	3.58	4.14	4.87	4.04	4.79
CV	54.81	36.57	51.28	39.32	28.14	38.02	46.83	32.87	44.68

4.4.9. Role Ambiguity (RA)

This is a type of stress generating due to lack of clarity about the expectation of the role he/she occupies. From the table 4.17 it can be seen that the overall Mean score of this variable is 10.72, which is just above 50% of the highest possible score and therefore predicted that it is moderately contributing towards the total stress experience. The mean scores for departmental and extra-departmental staff are almost same but comparatively higher score of SD (5.40) and CV (39.32) of the departmental staff suggests that the Mean score is less homogeneous than that of the score of ED staff. The female employees in both the categories are scoring higher than their male counterpart. This happen may be due to the fact that the job performed by the female employees are not well clarified or may be the female workers are not so concerned about the clarification of the job they are engaged with.

Table:4.18
Resource Inadequacy (RIN)

	Departmental			Ex-Departmental			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Mean	14.54	12.26	14.09	16.68	15.41	16.49	15.69	13.65	15.34
SD	3.56	4.13	3.82	1.79	2.03	1.88	2.95	3.82	3.20
CV	24.48	35.15	27.11	10.73	13.17	11.40	18.80	27.99	20.86

4.4.10. Resource Inadequacy (RIN)

In this section respondents are asked five questions (vide: question no. 10,20,30,40 and 50 of questionnaire attached in appendix-A) in relation to the resource inadequacy experienced by the postal employees. The result can be seen in the table no. 4.18. The Mean score of the ED staff figures 16.49 with lowest ever SD 1.88 and CV 11.40. It seems that so far this is the strongest reaction of the ED staff. Physical resources, human resources, financial resources available in the hands of ED employees are really insufficient. On the other hand the Mean score of that of the departmental staff figures 14.09 with a SD of 3.82 and CV of 27.11. The result comes out from the departmental category is also high enough to be stressful because the Mean score is above 70% of the highest possible score. But in case of ED staff the Mean value (16.49) is extremely high and the steadiness of the distribution is again supported by the lowest ever SD. Thus, it is predicted that the ED employees are not at all provided with even minimum resources to combat with the challenges they face in their day-to-day job life. Female employees of both the categories score high but much less than their male counterpart. From our general understanding we realized that the resource requirement of any employee depends on the responsibility he/she possesses. Male employees hold most of the ED Branch Post Master and ED Sub Post Master posts and thus they feel more in resource inadequacy than the other female employees.

4.5. Measures of ORS

In this section the overall score of ORS will be discussed to measure the stressfulness of the employees of the Indian postal department. For this purpose the following scales have been followed as suggested by *Srivastav (1999)*¹⁸;

- i) Respondents scoring less than 50% of the total Score ($4 \times 50=200$) i.e., 99 or below are assumed to have low stress or no stress.
- ii) Respondents scoring more than 50% of the total Score ($4 \times 50=200$) i.e., 100 or more but below 140 (70%) are assumed to be moderately stress full.
- iii) Respondents scoring 70% or more of the total Score ($4 \times 50=200$) i.e., 140 (70%) and above are considered to be highly stressful.

614 employees of postal department respond to the questionnaire (Appendix-A). The numbers of ORS questions are 50 in total. In addition to that there are 55 other questions in relation to respondents' profile, their physical problems, psychological problems etc.

The ORS measurements of all these staff are found out with various variables attached to the same. A general picture can be drawn from these measures that how extensively the employees are stressful and what other factors are responsible for such stressfulness. Other factors here considered are pay scale, qualification, age, and sex etc. For each and every other factor separate table has been prepared so that an unambiguous picture of the ORS measures can be had and these factors responsible for stressfulness can be identified for a better management of all these factors. Management part of course will be discussed in the chapter mentioned for the same.

Table: 4.19
Distribution of ORS score of the total sample population

ORS Score	Departmental Staff		Extra-Departmental Staff		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-99	42	14.28	24	7.50	66	10.75
100-139	194	65.99	241	75.31	435	70.85
140 and above	58	19.73	55	17.18	113	18.40
Total	294	100.00	320	100.00	614	100.00

4.5.1 ORS Measure of Total Sample

Table 4.19 shows that out of total population 10.75% are not stressful and remaining 89.25% are either moderately or highly stressful. Whereas among the ED staff out of 320 respondents 296 persons are stressful i.e., 92.49% of them are reported moderately or highly stressful. On the other hand 85.72% of the departmental staff are reported stressful. Over all percentage of stressful people among the postal employees is therefore high enough.

Table: 4.20
Sex and Departmental Status-Wise distribution ORS score.

ORS Score	Departmental		Ex-Departmental		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
	No %	No %	No %	No %	No %	No %
0-99	27 (5.29)	15 (14.42)	21 (4.11)	3 (2.88)	48 (9.41)	18 (17.30)
100-139	159 (31.17)	35 (33.65)	205 (40.19)	36 (34.61)	364 (71.37)	71 (68.28)
140 and above	50 (9.80)	8 (7.69)	48 (9.41)	7 (6.73)	98 (19.22)	15 (14.42)
Total	236 (46.27)	58 (55.77)	274 (53.73)	46 (44.23)	510 (100)	104 (100)

4.5.2. ORS Measures: Sex and Departmental Status-Wise

Table 4.20 shows that out of total 614 respondents 510 are male and 104 are female have responded through the questionnaire. Irrespective of

departmental and ED staff 92.49% of the male and 82.70% of female employees reported either moderately or highly stressful. In case of departmental staff the percentage of male (40.97 %) and female (41.34 %) being stressful are almost same. But in case of ED staff 49.60 % male and 41.34 % female are found stressful.

Table:4.21
Basic Pay-wise distribution of ORS Score of Departmental staff.

ORS Score	Rs.7500	Rs.6500-4500	Rs.4000	Rs.3200-3050	Rs.2550	Total
	No. (%)					
0-99	2 (0.68)	13 (4.42)	23 (7.82)	4 (1.36)	0 (0.0)	42 (14.28)
100-139	31 (10.54)	38 (12.92)	44 (14.96)	41 (13.94)	40 (13.60)	194 (65.98)
140-above	1 (0.34)	15 (5.10)	10 (3.40)	16 (5.44)	16 (5.44)	58 (19.73)
Total	34 (11.56)	66 (22.45)	77 (26.19)	61 (20.74)	56 (19.04)	294 (100)

4.5.3. ORS Measures: Basic Pay-Wise for Departmental Staff

Table 4.21 shows that out of 34 employees belonging to the basic pay of Rs.7500/, 32 are in the group of moderately or highly stressful area. Out of 66 employees in the basic pay of Rs.6500/, 53 are falling in this high stressful zone. 54 employees out of 77 in the basic pay of Rs.4000/ are in the high stressful zone, 57 out of 61 employees in the basic pay of Rs.3200-3050 are in high stressful area and 56 out of 56 employees in the basic pay of Rs.2550/ are in the high stress full zone. From the figures of the table it seems that the employees falling in the highest category as well as in the lowest category of pay scale are more stressful than the employees falling in between categories.

Table: 4.22
Basic Pay-wise distribution of ORS Score of Extra- Departmental staff.

ORS Score	Rs.2125	Rs.1740	Rs.1600	Rs.1545	Rs.1260	Total	
	No. (%)	No.	(%)				
0-99	6 (1.87)	6 (1.87)	6 (1.87)	4 (1.25)	2 (0.63)	24	(7.5)
100-139	55 (17.91)	56 (17.5)	44 (13.75)	34 (10.62)	52 (16.25)	241	(75.31)
140-above	8 (2.5)	8 (2.5)	9 (2.81)	24 (7.50)	6 (1.87)	55	(17.19)
Total	69 (21.56)	70 (21.87)	59 (18.44)	62 (19.37)	60 (18.75)	320	(100)

4.5.4. ORS Measures: Basic Pay-Wise for Extra-Departmental Staff

Table 4.22 shows that employees belonging in almost all the categories of the basic pay and the people under stressfulness are almost equal. Only employees in the category of Rs.1260/-, the proportion is extreme. Once again the employees belonging to the lowest basic pay category shows that these people of this category are worst hit by stress and strain. People of this category mostly belong to the ED Branch postmaster working in the rural post offices with working hours less than 3 hours and 45 minutes.

Table: 4.23
Experience-wise distribution of ORS score of Departmental Staff.

Yr. of experience	ORS 0-99		ORS 100-139		ORS 140 above		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-4	14	(4.76)	20	(6.80)	00	(00)	34	(11.56)
5-9	02	(0.68)	24	(8.16)	06	(2.04)	32	(10.88)
10-14	00	(00)	24	(8.16)	23	(7.80)	47	(15.99)
15-19	19	(6.46)	41	(13.94)	17	(5.78)	77	(26.19)
20-24	00	(00)	39	(13.26)	09	(3.06)	48	(16.33)
25-29	05	(1.70)	20	(6.80)	03	(1.02)	28	(9.52)
30-34	02	(0.68)	25	(8.50)	00	(00)	27	(9.18)
35 and above	00	(00)	01	(0.34)	00	(00)	01	(0.34)
Total	42	(14.28)	194	(65.98)	58	(19.73)	294	(100)

4.5.5. ORS Measures: Experience-wise for Departmental Staff

Table 4.23 depicts that the employees working for only 4 years or less seem to be not much stressful. Out of total 34 employees 14 belong to no stress group and remaining 20 belong to the zone of moderate stress. Not a single employee in this experience group comes under the heavy stress zone. For the employees coming under the experience group of 5 to 9 years, 24 come under moderate zone, 2 come under the no stress zone and only 6 belong to heavy stress zone. Employees in the group 10 to 14 years take the highest toll, 23 out of 47 come under the high stress zone. Next is the group of 15 to 19 years 17 out of 77 come under the heavy stress zone. The table clearly shows that employees at initial stage do not develop stress in them but with the time progress especially between 10 to 24 years working experience they develop huge stress with little organizational intervention. Surprisingly employees in the end of the career did not report much stress may be due to the indifference nature they develop with the process of time.

Table: 4.24
Experience-wise distribution of ORS score of Extra Departmental Staff.

Yrs. of experience	ORS		ORS		ORS		Total	
	0-99	%	100-139	%	140 and above	%	No	%
0-4	3	(0.94)	11	(3.43)	4	(1.25)	18	(5.62)
5-9	8	(2.50)	67	(20.93)	9	(2.81)	84	(26.25)
10-14	6	(1.87)	52	(16.25)	24	(7.5)	82	(25.63)
15-19	1	(0.31)	58	(18.12)	12	(3.75)	71	(22.19)
20-24	6	(1.87)	35	(10.94)	3	(0.94)	44	(13.75)
24-29	00	(00)	10	(3.12)	00	(00)	10	(3.12)
30-34	00	(00)	07	(2.19)	00	(00)	07	(2.19)
35 and above	00	(00)	01	(0.31)	00	(00)	01	(0.31)
Total	24	(7.5)	241	(75.31)	55	(17.19)	320	(100)

4.5.6. ORS Measures: Experience-wise for Extra-Departmental Staff

Table 4.24 shows the experience wise ORS score distribution of the ED staff. Once again it can be seen that the employees with less experience do not

suffer from acute stress nor even the employees in higher experience category but the people belonging to the middle experience group suffer a lot. People with experience within the range 10 to 24 years reported highest level of stressfulness. It is evident from table 5.15 and from table 5.16 that people of middle age group are showing higher stress. It is seen from the visit to different post offices in the rural as well as in urban areas that employees belonging to this particular category share maximum work load in the offices as well as in their family. When they grow with more experience they become passive in their work place and thus avoid excess stress on them.

Table: 4.25
Educational qualification-wise distribution of ORS score of Departmental Staff.

Qualification	ORS		ORS		ORS-		Total	
	0-99	%	100-139	%	140and above	%	No	%
Below- 10 th	0	(00)	15	(5.10)	7	(2.38)	22	(7.48)
10 th Std	0	(00)	34	(11.56)	14	(4.76)	48	(16.32)
12 th Std.	7	(2.38)	50	(17.00)	18	(6.12)	75	(25.51)
Graduate	19	(6.46)	66	(22.45)	18	(6.12)	103	(35.03)
Post Graduate	16	(5.44)	29	(9.86)	01	(0.34)	46	(15.64)
Total	42	(14.28)	194	(65.98)	58	(19.73)	294	(100)

4.5.7.ORS Measures: Educational Qualification-wise For Departmental Staff

The table 4.25 shows that departmental employees having qualification of below 10th standard are numbering 22 in all and out of them all 22 are in the stressful zone. Employees in the category of having qualification up to 10th standard all 48 are in the stressful zone. Next category having qualifications up to 12th standard are little less affected. Out of total 75 employees 68 are in the high and moderate stress zone and 7 in no stress zone. Graduate employees numbering 103 constitutes highest proportion of the sample seem to in a safe position. Out of 103 of them 19 reported no stress. 66 feel stress at moderate level and 18 of them in high stress full zone. There are 46 employees having post

graduate qualification, 16 of them feel no stress, 29 feel moderate stress and only one feels high stress. The result clearly shows that the level of stress some how effected by the qualification of the incumbent. More the academic qualification less the level of stress what can be seen at least from the following table for the departmental employees.

Table: 4.26
Educational qualification-wise distribution of ORS score of Extra Departmental Staff

Qualification	ORS		ORS		ORS-140 and above		Total	
	0-99	%	100-139	%	%		No	%
Below- 10 th	1	(0.31)	46	(14.38)	18	(5.62)	65	(20.31)
10 th Std	9	(2.81)	73	(22.81)	24	(7.50)	106	(33.12)
12 th Std.	5	(1.56)	51	(15.93)	7	(2.18)	63	(19.69)
Graduate	2	(0.62)	55	(17.18)	6	(1.87)	62	(19.37)
Post Graduate	7	(2.18)	16	(5.00)	0	(00)	23	(7.18)
Total	24	(7.50)	241	(75.31)	55	(17.18)	320	(100)

4.5.8 ORS Measures: Educational Qualification-wise for Ex- Departmental Staff

The table 4.26 shows distribution of ORS score of ED staff on the basis of their qualification. The table shows almost the same trend as it is in the case of departmental staff. Employees having lower academic qualification experiencing more stress and even a substantial portion of them fall in the excessive stress zone. 18 out of 65 of below 10th standard, 24 out of 106 of 10th standard fall in the excessive stress zone, whereas, 6 out of 62 of graduates and none out of 23 of the postgraduates fall in this zone. It makes a clear impression that academic qualification has a clear impact on whether some one feels stressful or not.

4.6. Summing Up

- 1) In this chapter causes of job stress have been dealt with immense care. The major 'Role Variables' are used to detect the role related causes of the sample employees.

- 2) Ten established ORS variables used by different scholars to measure different components of job stress have been used here as major tools.
- 3) All ten ORS factors have been analyzed from the responses of the sample employees and framed into ten different tables to exhibit the Arithmetic Mean, Standard Deviation and Coefficient of Variation of the same. The extent of importance of the 'Role Variables' in developing job stress among the sample employees have been analyzed through these results.
- 4) Table 4.11 shows that as many as 70.85% of the total sample employees reported that they are moderately stressful. 18.40% of the total employees are reported to have extremely stressful scoring more than 70% of the total score of ORS Variables. The reported overall stressfulness of the ED staff is however, more than that of the departmental staff.
- 5) Sex wise dichotomized data analysis (Table 4.12) show that the sample male workers are comparatively more stressful than their female colleagues.
- 6) When the ORS variables are compared with the basic pays of the sample employees it was found that the employees belonging to lower and higher categories of the basic pay are comparatively more stressful.
- 7) Experience wise table shows that the employees belonging to the middle age of services are more stressful than the employee in the initial stage or at the end of their service lives.
- 8) Educational qualifications of the sample employees and the level of stressfulness have been also compared and it was found that employees having more academic qualification suffer less stressor in their work life.

Notes, References and Reports:

1. Selye, H. Confusion and Controversy in stress field. *Journal of Human Stress*, 1975, 1, pp 37-44.
2. Caplan, R.D., Cobb, S., French, J.R.P., Jr., Van Harrison, R., and Pinneau, S.R. *Job Demands and Worker Health: Main Effects and Occupational Differences*. Washington, D.C. : U.S. Government printing office, 1975
3. Marshal, J. & Cooper, C.L., *Executive under pressure: Paper presented at the International Seminar on Stress in Health and Diseases*,. Benaras Hindu University, Varanasi. 1979
4. Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Qunin, R.P., Snock, Jr. D., and Rosenthal, R.A. *Organisational stress: studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley. 1964
5. Ivancevich, J.M. and Matteson, M.T. *Stress and work: A Managerial Perspective*. Gleinview, J.L. Foreman Company, 1980.
6. Srivastava, A.K. *Management of Occupational Stress*, Gyan Publishing House, New Delhi, pp 15. 1999
7. Pestonjee, D.M., *Stress and Coping: the Indian experience*, Sage Publication, N. Delhi; 1999,
8. Katz, J.L.& Kahn, R.L. *The social psychology of the organization*. Wiley, New York, 1996.
9. Agarwal, R. *Stress in life and at work*. Response Books. New Delhi, 2001.
10. Pareek, U. *Role Stress Scale: ORS scale booklet, answer sheet, and manual*, Ahmedabad: Navin Publication 1983c.

11. Ibid.
12. Pareek. U., Making organizational roles effective. New Delhi: Tata Mc. Graw- Hill. 1993 p.86,
13. Pestonjee, D.M., Stress and Coping: the Indian experience, Sage Publication, N. Delhi; 1999, p. 21.
14. Pareek, U. Op. cit. p79
15. Ibid.
16. Pestonjee, D.M: Op. cit. p.32
17. Likert, Rensis. New patterns of management, McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc., London. 1991.
18. Srivastava, A.K. Management of Occupational Stress, 1999, Gyan Publishing House, New Delhi, pp 193.