

Exploring Role Stress and Role Efficacy in an Organization

¹ Dr. Anitha Thomas, ² Mr. B.K Basu

¹ Astit. Professor, School of Business and Law, Navrachana University, Vadodara

² V.P and Head, Corporate Centre and Tech., L&T Power, Vadodara

Abstract : Stress is often described as the result of demands exceeding resources. This is particularly evident in professional careers where managers balance work, family, and significant travel in addition to firefighting their routine commitment. Executives today have to deal with various types of Role Stress which in turn has a negative impact on their Role Efficacy. This paper is focused on the study of role stress while performing an organization role. A study of 62 employees in the Level 3 and Level 4 of a Engineering & Construction organization has been surveyed and analyzed by using one of the instrument for measuring organization role stress developed by Dr. Udai Pareek (1993)

This scale evaluates respondent's quantum of stress in terms of total Organization Role Stress (ORS) scores. Another measure of how these set of employees tend to address people and situations in their respective roles is the Organisational Role Efficacy (ORE) Score also developed by Dr. Pareek. The study explores that Role Stress among employees emerging out of not getting any opportunity to grow, no guidance, no Challenges. Now-a-days executives seem to be inundated with Role Stress which in turn has a negative impact on their Role Efficacy. The Study emphasis that more the executives become aware of means to enhance the various facets of Role Efficacy, more they will be able to cope with Role Stress.

Introduction

Stress is an outcome of expectation. Stress is both psychological and physiological, individuals differ in their aptitudes, abilities & innate potential and accordingly they perceive stress in their resultant interaction with the environment. Stress is essentially an individual phenomenon & must be understood with reference to the characteristics of both the individual & his environment. As organization grows and become complex, the potential for stress increases. The dynamics of stress changes with the environment, situation and personal characteristics. In any organization, stress emerges with the complexities of work setting and one such stress that emerges is Role Stress. it is the stress experienced by the person because of their role (job) in the organization. The main reason for this kind of stress is expectation associated with the role of the position. A study by Karve and Nair (2010) highlighted role stress having emerged due to role conflict and role ambiguity.

Organizational Role Stress Framework

Any role cannot be performed without interaction with connected roles in the organization. These interactions give rise to mutual expectation from each other which becomes the potential source of stress and is referred as role stress. Organization Role Stress covers a wide range of stresses arising out of one's existence in a work organization. Several frameworks have been developed and the concept was introduced by Kahn (1964). Lately, in 1993, Udai Pareek significantly contributed to it by expanding the instrument and items by profound research and made ORS Scale. His research lies in identifying ten different types of organization role stressors as given below:-

Inter-Role Distance Stress arises due to organizational & non-Organizational role conflicts.

Role Stagnation Stress is the reaction of being stuck in the same role.

Role expectation stress arises out of conflicting demands originating from colleagues

Role Erosion stress arises when a role has become less important than it used to be or when somebody else gets the credit for what needs to b done in one's own role.

Role Overload Stress is the feeling that one is required to do too much

Role Isolation Stress is described by the feeling that others can't be reached out easily, indicative of the absence of strong linkages of one's role with other roles.

Personal Inadequacy Stress arises due to the absence of adequate skills, competence & training to meet the demand of one's role.

Self-Role Distance Stress arises out of gaps felt between one's concept of self & the demands of the role.

Role Ambiguity Stress is experienced when there is a lack of clarity about the demands of the role.

Role Inadequacy Stress arises when the human or material resources allocated are inadequate to meet the demands.

Link between Role Stress and Role Efficacy

The performance of a person working in an organization depends on effectively he integrate himself with the role how the he perform in his role, It is the integration of the two (the person and the role) that ensure a person's effectiveness. Hence Role efficacy is the psychological factor underlying role effectiveness. Dr. Pareek's research on role efficacy was developed study the impact role efficacy does on role stress. For Dr. Pareek the concept of role is much larger and wider than a job and this gives a dimension that

is more holistic and comprehensive.

Role Efficacy has three facets: The first is Role Making which has the following dimensions Self-Role Integration, Pro-activity, Creativity, and Confrontation. The second is Role Centering and Centrality; that includes -Influence and Personal Growth. The third is Role Linking and its following dimensions are Inter-role Linkage, Helping Relationship and Super-ordination. Research on Role Efficacy indicates that persons with high role efficacy experience less role stress (Sen, 1982; Surti, 1983); less anxiety (Deo, 1993) less work related tension (Sayeed, 1985). They effectively cope up with problems (Sen 1982, Surti, 1983), use more purposeful behavior, (Das, 1984). A high role efficacy seems to develop some degree of resilience in individual to cope up with various types of stresses (Das, 1984),

Rationale and Methodology for the study

Every employee or role occupant encounters a specific kind of problem through a Role Stressor during the course of his/her role performance. Identification of the prominent role stressor(s) at the organizational level is useful for enhancing organizational performance and effectiveness. It could be helpful for designing the most effective strategies for enhancing organizational performance and effectiveness in different parts of the organization.

This study is limited to a homogeneous group of a sample of 45 Graduate Engineers of Level 3 and 17 Managers of Level 4, of the organizations who carries out detail engineering, fabrication, inspection, project coordination and site construction, but have an important role to play in terms of timely and effective delivery of drawings, materials equipment, etc. The population of this group is 150 and 50 respectively, thus justifying the sample size of

The respondents in this survey participated in giving their responses to two questionnaires -one ORS and the other ORE. It is proposed to use the analysis of this study with the following objectives:-

- a) Ascertain the dominant stress among each level.
- b) Determining the dominant Role Efficacy
- c) Determine the link between ORS and ORE
- d) To explore the strength of role efficacy on role Stress.

Analysis and Discussion

Organization Role Stress Scores

The Table no I exhibits mean score of Role Stress among the all respondents. As per the analysis in both the levels Organization Role Stress is emerging out to be Role Erosion and Role Stagnation The highest dysfunctional stressor being the Role erosion is due to lack of role visibility in the organization while Role Stagnation is occurring due to absence of challenges in the job. They are finding themselves stuck in the routine work.

However the respondents are not having Role Ambiguity, the low mean score indicate that they have clarity of what is expected from them with respect to activities, responsibilities, priorities. This means table suggest if more challenges, job variety and appreciations are given to the employees then the Role Stress can be reduced to a great extent.

Table 1:- Mean Score of Role Stress

	Overall	Level 3	Level 4
IRD	5.56	4.41	5.89
RS	5.86	5.00	6.36
REC	3.89	4.47	3.64
RE	8.24	8.29	8.42
RO	4.00	2.53	4.53
RI	4.91	5.06	5.00
PI	4.68	2.76	5.51
SRD	4.20	4.00	4.27
RA	2.98	2.35	3.31
Rln	4.55	4.47	4.51

Organization Role Efficacy Scores

The Table 2 exhibits analysis respondents ORE scores. Findings indicate that employees perceive that everyone confront their problem and challenge themselves rather than blaming others. When people face interpersonal problems they resolve themselves. Second area on Role efficacy is Helping Relationship, the employee feel that they get help from others whenever it is needed hence, they find no hostility. However low score on Superordination indicates that employees do not feel that the role they are playing has a value to larger group with whom it is linked. This leads to Role Erosion. Low visibility and Less Challenge are the main reasons

for low efficacy score.

Table 2- Mean Score of Role Efficacy Scores

Role Efficacy	Overall	Level 3	Level 4
Centrality	2.47	2.59	2.38
Integration	3.02	3.06	2.91
Proactivity	2.73	3.00	2.58
Creativity	2.79	3.53	2.51
Inter - role linkage	3.00	3.41	2.84
Helping Relationship	3.29	3.24	3.33
Super Ordination	1.83	1.82	1.82
Influence	2.53	3.18	2.24
Growth	2.64	3.12	2.40
Confrontation	3.55	3.65	3.47

Correlation between Role Stress and Role Efficacy.

Table 3 Correlation analysis between Role Stress and Role Efficacy.

	Inter Role Distance	Role stagnation	Role Expectation Conflict	Role Erosion	Role Overload	Role Isolation	Personal Inadequacy	Self Role Distance	Role Ambiguity	Result Inadequacy
Centrality		-0.38				-0.32			-0.39	
Integration		-0.32						-0.46		
Proactivity								-0.31		
Creativity								-0.36		
Linked			-0.30			-0.42			-0.47	
Helping			-0.36			-0.39		-0.38		
Super ordination										
Influence										
Growth		-0.49		-0.31						
Confronting								-0.58	-0.33	

The Analysis highlights only the significant negative correlation. The study indicate that –

- Self-Role Distance is Adversely affecting Integration, Proactivity, Creativity, Helping and Confronting. It means people are distancing, reacting, doing routine work and avoiding finding solutions

- Role Stagnation - relates to the desire to have more functions in one's own role which is adversely affecting Centrality, Integration and Growth. This exhibits that employee perceives that their role not giving enough opportunity to grow and only require to do routine task and they are not finding job to exciting hence employee perceives his talents are not utilized at all in his role.

- Role Isolation – the isolation one feels when Role Inadequacy one relates to authority given to them. Role isolation is adversely affecting Centrality, Linked and Helping. This is due to no proper guidance hence neither modification nor enrichment in the job. These are leading to sense of no contribution or being felt valued.

Along with this it is necessary to mention Inter Role Distance, Role Overload, Personal Inadequacy and Result Inadequacy have a little role to play in Role stress. This indicates that employees are not having problem in balancing job roles, they are not overloaded, and they can link with what is expected. Superordination and Influence is

not contributing to Role Efficacy.

Table 4 Multiple Regression Analysis of Role Efficacy with Role Stress

Dependent Variable	Intercept	Beta	R2	sig	T value
Centrality	Role Stagnation	-.215	.476	.001	1.65
	Role Isolation	-.116	.476	.001	0.87
	Role Ambiguity	-.275	.476	.001	2.23
Integration	Role Stagnation	-.134	.480	.000	1.10
	Self Role Distance	-.403	.480	.000	3.21
Proactivity	Self Role Distance	.315	.315	.010	2.65
Creativity	Self Role Distance	.346	.346	.004	2.94
Linked	Role Expectation Conflict	-.089	.555	.000	0.72
	Role Isolation	-.246	.555	.000	1.91
	Role Ambiguity	-.370	.555	.000	3.26
Helping	Role Expectation Conflict	.207	.459	.002	0.12
Growth	Role Stagnation	-.445	.500	.000	3.55
	Role Erosion	-.098	.500	.000	0.78
Confronting	Self Role Distance	-.235	.211	.214	1.65
	Role Ambiguity	.064	.211	.240	0.45

Table 4 indicating the relation of 10 role efficacy with 10 role stressors. Dependent variable in each case was items of Role Efficacy. The analyses were as follows:

- 1) For Centrality- it can be inferred that among all ten variables only Role Stagnation, Role Isolation and Role Ambiguity ($\beta = -0.25, -0.116$ and -0.275 $p < 0.01$) has negative beta weight and affect Centrality significantly, which means the more the executives are stagnate, isolate and ambiguous about the role the less they will feel central in the organization and feel peripheral to the organization.
- 2) For Integration- out of 10 Role stress variables Role Stagnation and Self Role Distance ($\beta = -0.134$ and -0.403 $p < 0.00$) has negative beta weight which means if an executive has been given a job which does not match her 'self' concept, then he will not be able to use his talents in the role expected out of his, thus poor integration of one's strength and skills.
- 3) While taking Proactive as DV, the only role stressor variable emerged was self Role Distance which had positive beta weight ($\beta = 0.315$ $p < 0.10$). This means the more the executive are clear on their self role, the more they will be proactive and will be initiator. Same is positive beta value highlighted in Creativity and Self Role.
- 4) MRA is administered, taking Inter Role Linkage as DV and the variables of Role stress indicated negative beta weight on Role expectation Conflict, Role Isolation and Role Ambiguity ($\beta = -0.089, -0.246, -0.370$ $p < 0.00$). These negative values means the more the executive feel stressed out due to the conflict between their self concept, ambiguity and the expectations from the role the less they will not be able to find out Linkages between their roles and other roles in their organization and the more there will be feeling of isolation.
- 5) Interestingly when MRA was administered keeping Helping as DV, one value of Role stress came as positive- Role Expectation Conflict ($\beta = 0.207$ $p < 0.002$) indicating that more the executives feel good about others and less conflicting expectations between various significant others the more they will be able to have helping relationship between their roles and other roles in their organization.
- 6) In MRA the Role Efficacy of Super-ordination and Influence neither had positive nor negative significant relation with role stressor. Linking with Correlation analysis the study highlights that employee respect each other and power influence is not part of organization culture.
- 7) MRA on Growth indicated negative beta weight on Role Stagnation and Role Erosion ($\beta = -0.445, -0.098$ $p < 0.00$) suggest that employee feels that some of the important functions belong to their role are performed by some others, hence the prospectus of growth is been hindered.
- 8) The last MRA on the Confrontation indicated beta weight negative value ($\beta = -0.235$) at Self Role Distance and positive beta weight on Role Ambiguity.

Conclusion

On investigative the relationship between Role Stress and Role Efficacy among the employees, it was found that Self Role Distance, Role Stagnation, Role Isolation and Role Ambiguity are the major reason for Role Stress. These Role Stressors adversely affecting Role Efficacy dimensions of Centrality, Linked and Helping. If correlating the findings the study explores that if employees are given better opportunity, guidance, support and clarity of what is expected can enhance the Role. This subject assumes critical importance in light of the difficult business scenario the sector is experiencing in the last few years and significant recovery is still not at sight. Engineering & Construction organizations are encountering huge challenges resulting in stunted growth. Organizational Role Stresses are consequences to this industry situation to a great extent hence affecting all the spectrum of employment relations.

Reference

1. Das, G. S .1984.Purposeful Role-behavior and its Determinants, Bombay: National Institute of Bank Management.
2. Deo, T. P. (1993), A Study of Psychological Correlates of Role Efficacy in Organization from Information Technology, (Unpublished PhD theses, submitted to Bombay University), Mumbai.
3. Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. D., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). Organizational Stress Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. New York: John Wiley
4. Karve, S., & Nair, S. K. (2010). A study of role stress and role efficacy among Indian women executives. International Journal of Arts and Sciences, 3(13), 542- 573.
5. Pareek, U. 1987.Motivating Organizational Roles: Role Efficacy Approach, Jaipur: Rawat Publications.
6. Pareek, U. (1997) Training Instruments For Human Resource Development Tata McGraw-Hill, New Delhi
7. Sen, P.C. (1982), "A study of Personal and Organizational Correlates of Role Stress and Coping Strategies in Some Public Sector Banks", Doctoral dwassertation in Management, Gujarat Unversity.
8. Surti, K. (1983), "Role Stress and coping Styles of Working Women", Doctoral dissertation in Psychology, Gujarat University.
9. Sayeed, O. B (1985), Job Stress and Role Making Behaviour: Relationship between Job Stressors and Role Efficacy Dimensions, Managerial Psychology, 6(1&2), 35-52.

