

Role Stress, Job Anxiety, Job Involvement, and Job Satisfaction Among Three Groups of Organizational Employees: A Factor Analytic Study

**Sanjay Srivastava
Arun K. Sen**

University of Delhi, India

This study is an attempt to compare organizational role stress, job involvement, job anxiety, and job satisfaction among three groups of employees in a private sector organization. The sample consisted of 50 top managers, 50 middle managers, and 50 workers. The Organizational Role Stress developed by Pareek (1983), the Job Involvement scale by Lodhal and Kejner (1965), the Job Anxiety scale by Srivastava and Sinha (1977), and the Job Descriptive Index developed by Smith, Yulin, and Kendall (1969) were administered to all three groups of employees. The results were analyzed both by the factor analytic technique and by discriminant function analysis. The factor analysis yielded three important factors that are discussed. The discriminant function analysis separated the three groups on 10 out of the 23 variables considered in the study. The findings are discussed in the light of other relevant studies.

stress work satisfaction

1. INTRODUCTION

Stress results from a combination of various individual characteristics (such as age, achievement need, type of personality) and organizational stressors (role conflict, role ambiguity). Stress can also be defined in terms of the product of a dynamic mismatch between an individual and his or her physical, social, and psychological environment (McMichael, 1978). It is a nonspecific response of the body to any demand made on it (Selye, 1956). According to Margolis and Kores (1974), stress—as a condition at work interacting with worker characteristics—disrupts psychological and physiological homeostasis. Stress may result from a variety of organizational, supervisory, individual, and work factors. Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964) identified two primary factors of organizational stress, namely role ambiguity and role conflict. Bharti, Nagarathamma, and Reddy (1991) explored whether occupational stress had any relationship with job satisfaction among 90 clerical employees of three different organizations in India. They found that occupational stress was significantly related to job satisfaction: Greater stress accompanied lower satisfaction. Ahmad

Paper presented at the 4th annual convention of the National Academy of Psychology on December 29-31, 1993, hosted by the Department of Psychology, University of Delhi, India.

The first author is a Doctoral Research Scholar in the Department of Psychology, University of Delhi, the second—a Professor in the same Department, under whose guidance this work has been carried out.

Correspondence and requests for reprints should be sent to Arun K. Sen, University of Delhi, Department of Psychology, Delhi 110007, India.

and Khanna (1992) studied job stress in relation to job satisfaction and job involvement among 50 middle-level hotel managers (aged 23–36). There was a significant—but negative—relationship between job stress and job satisfaction, irrespective of the subject's genders, marital status, education, and experience. However, occupational stress was negatively correlated with job involvement and the high job involvement group was more satisfied with their job than the low job involvement group. Rodgers, Hunts, and Rogers (1993) went on to say that the literature of many different types of management programs says that effective program installations depend on the level of top management commitment: The stronger the commitment, the greater the potential for program success. A meta-analysis of 18 studies that evaluated the impact of the objectives on the management was presented to test this hypothesis. Results showed that the gain in job satisfaction was approximately one third of one standard deviation when top management had high commitment to program implementation. Little improvement was found in studies that had moderate or low commitment from top management.

Job anxiety is another psychological component in an organization. Despite the increasing number of available facilities, people often show unnecessary apprehension and emotional tension. Their actions are marked by fear and insecurity. Such behavioral manifestations have psychological bases, in which a reference to the prevailing situational context of the person can hardly be overlooked. More often than not, their behavior demonstrates some kind of uncalled for fear and emotional tension, arising out of the person's imaginary involvement in his or her situational contexts. In psychological parlance, their behavioral patterns are referred to as *job anxiety*.

Job involvement and job satisfaction are key concepts in the progress of an organization. Job involvement is a cognitive state of psychological identification with work, to the extent that work is perceived as instrumental in satisfying one's salient needs and expectations (Kanungo, 1981).

Job satisfaction is the general attitude that results from many attitudes in three areas, namely specific job factors, an individual's characteristics, and group relations outside the job (Blum & Naylor, 1968). Nateson and Radhai (1990) administered a job satisfaction scale and a checklist of factors of job satisfaction to 50 executives and 50 supervisors in India. The supervisors indicated greater job satisfaction than the executives. The majority of executives had a low level of job satisfaction, whereas the majority of supervisors had a moderate level of job satisfaction. Salary, opportunity for advancements, job security, and working conditions were regarded by most of the executives as important factors of job satisfaction. Job security, working conditions, and coworkers' behavior were important factors of job satisfaction according to most of the supervisors. Singh and Pestonjee (1990) administered the employee inventory, the job involvement scale, and the psychological participation index to 250 officers and 250 clerks of a Nationalized Bank in India in order to compare job satisfaction with job status in the banking industry. Clerks indicated more job satisfaction than bank officers. The officers showed higher job involvement and more participation in decision making than clerks.

Since the dawn of civilization, the human being has been continuously striving for a meaningful survival. The tremendous societal and technological changes in the past century have seen the human being going through a total metamorphosis. However, change is not always pleasant; change means a lot of pain, struggle, and loss, as well as joy and victory. In the present times, people manifest their survival efforts mostly by working in fields, factories, or different organizations. All these spheres undergo the process of constant change. This study is an attempt to gauge people's involvement in their work, and to establish how it causes anxiety and stress, as well as a related pleasant experience of job satisfaction. There is no dearth of research evidence and literature relating to these factors individually. However, the main deficiency observed in previous work consisted of a lack of a holistic approach. This study is an attempt to fill that gap. Therefore, this study is an effort to explore the dimensions of role stress, job anxiety, job involvement, and job satisfaction among three groups of employees, namely top managers, middle managers, and workers in a private sector organization.

2. METHODS AND MATERIALS

2.1. Sample

The sample consisted of 150 respondents working in Eicher Limited in Faridabad, India. Fifty top managers, 50 middle managers, and 50 workers were selected for the purpose of comparison.

The top managers had an average monthly income of Rs. 8000/-, with average work experience of 12 years. Top management includes general management, who basically plan and direct the divisional management cadre. However, the functioning, especially the specialized input, although initiated at the departmental level, is controlled by the top managers. They are executives who carry the ultimate authority for the administration of organizational affairs, both internal and external. The role of the executives includes setting the general policy of the organization, establishing proper relations between the industrial plant and important external forces, directing the internal organization, operating the plant, and administering it effectively.

The group of middle managers had an average monthly income of Rs. 6000/-, with average work experience of 5 years. This is a level between the departmental executives and the operating supervisors. Middle managers coordinate functional, regional, or product bases, which are basic to the operation of the organization. They have to interpret the orders from the top.

The workers had an average monthly income of Rs. 2300/-, and the average work experience was 10 years. The sphere of operations, although different from that of top and middle management, maintains a link with other spheres. In fact, the workers form the main strength of an organization. They represent the shop-floor level. They work on the machines and are responsible for meeting the productivity targets of the organization. In Eicher, a department is usually headed by a top manager with a few middle managers and, generally, a group of workers who take orders from the middle managers.

2.2. Measurements

The tools used were (a) the Organizational Role Stress (Pareek, 1983), (b) the Job Anxiety scale (Srivastava & Sinha, 1977), (c) the Job Involvement scale (Lodhal & Kejner, 1965), and (d) the Job Descriptive Index (Smith et al., 1969).

The Organizational Role Stress has been developed to measure the various role-based stresses relevant to organizational life. It comprises the following 10 dimensions:

- Inter-Role Distance (IRD)—The amount of conflict an individual faces between his or her organizational role and other roles of society (e.g., "My role tends to interfere with my family life.").
- Role Stagnation (RS)—Stress an individual experiences as a result of the demand of a new role to outgrow the previous role and occupy the new role effectively (e.g., "I am afraid I am not learning enough in my present role to take on bigger responsibilities.").
- Role Expectation Conflict (REC)—The conflict an individual experiences over the various expectations of different people in the organization (e.g., "I am not able to satisfy the conflicting demands of various people.").
- Role Erosion (RE)—The conflict an individual experiences due to the feeling that the same function he or she would like to perform is being performed in some other role (e.g., "The importance of my role has recently decreased.").
- Role Overload (RO)—The stress an individual expresses as a result of the fact that there are too many expectations regarding his or her role (e.g., "My workload is too heavy.").
- Role Isolation (RI)—The stress an individual experiences as a result of the perception of psychological proximity or distance from certain roles (e.g., "I wish there was more consultation between my role and other roles.").

- Personal Inadequacy (PI)—The stress resulting from the perception that an individual is not fully equipped (lacks internal resources) for effective performance of his or her role (e.g., “I do not have adequate knowledge to handle the responsibility in my role.”).
- Self-Role Distance (SRD)—The conflict between self-concept and expectation from the role (e.g., “I am not able to use my training and expertise in my role.”).
- Role Ambiguity (RA)—The conflict a role occupant experiences when he or she is not clear about the various expectations people have of his or her role (e.g., “I do not know what the people I work with expect of me.”).
- Resource Inadequacy (RI)—The conflict resulting from the feeling that an individual does not have resources to perform his or her role effectively (e.g., “I do not get information necessary to carry out the responsibilities assigned to me.”).

This scale comprises 50 items to be rated on a 5-point scale, with a score of 0 to 4 assigned to each item. The total score of the Organizational Role Stress may range from 0 to 200.

The Job Anxiety scale was developed to measure anxiety in seven aspects of job life in order to yield a complete portrayal of an employee’s job anxiety. These aspects are:

- Security (SEC)—Job security, safety (e.g., “I usually fear I may be terminated from my job.”).
- Recognition (REC)—Fair evaluation, approval, participation (e.g., “Our officers consider us to be hard working and competent workers.”).
- Human Relations at Work (HRW)—Interpersonal relationships (intracadre and intercadre), cooperation, communication (e.g., “I often have apprehensions that my colleagues may be promoted earlier than me.”).
- Reward and Punishment (R & P)—Monetary gains, treatment of supervisors, unjust criticisms, blame (e.g., “Sometimes I am afraid of false allegations being leveled against me.”).
- Self-Esteem (SE)—Self-image, an opportunity to show proficiency, social status of the job (e.g., “I get enough opportunity to improve and display my abilities and efficiency here.”).
- Future Prospects (FP)—Opportunity for promotion, advancements, an increase of efficiency (e.g., “The chances of promotions are few in this company.”).
- Capacity to Work (CW)—Shouldering responsibilities, self-confidence, aptitude, interest for job activities (e.g., “I sometimes feel that I can do some other job with more care and efficiency.”).

The scale consists of 80 items, 63 of which are true-keyed and 17 false-keyed. A score of 1 is assigned to each item.

The Job Involvement scale (JI) has been developed to measure involvement (e.g., “I am a real perfectionist about my work.”). The scale consists of 20 items to be ranked on a 4-point scale, with a score of 1 to 4 assigned to each item. The minimum possible score on this scale is 20 and the maximum is 80. The higher the score, the lower the job involvement.

The Job Descriptive Index has been developed to measure various dimensions of job satisfaction. These dimensions are:

- Work on Present Job (WPJ)—For example, “fascinating” or “routine.”
- Opportunities for Promotion (OP)—For example, “dead end job” or “unfair promotion policy.”
- People on Present Job (PPJ)—For example, “stimulating,” “lazy,” “loyal,” or “smart.”
- Present Pay (PP)—For example, “can barely live on income” or “income provides luxuries.”
- Supervision on Present Job (SPJ)—For example, “asks my advice,” “tactful,” “influential,” “annoying.”

The Job Descriptive Index contains 72 adjectives to be rated on a 3-point scale, with a score of 1 to 3 assigned to each adjective. The total score of the Job Descriptive Index may range from 72 to 216.

2.3. Procedure

Before data were collected, formal permission was sought from the personnel department. Top managers, middle managers, and workers were contacted. Assurances were given that responses would be kept confidential and would be used for research purposes only. Instructions regarding the format for answering the questions were typed on the questionnaire. Both groups of managers were allowed to complete questionnaires within a week. The workers, however, were administered the tool by the investigator in the conference room of the organization. Data were analyzed when completed questionnaires were obtained from the 50 top managers, 50 middle managers, and 50 workers of the organization.

3. RESULTS

Table 1 displays means, standard deviations, and significant factor loading of the three groups of subjects on different dimensions of organizational role stress, job anxiety, job involvement, and job satisfaction. The principal component method of factor analysis (Hotelling, 1933) was employed to extract the relevant factors. With the help of the factor matrix with varimax rotation (Kaiser, 1958), nine factors for top managers, and seven factors for middle managers and workers were extracted.

The acceptance level of significant factor loading was taken as .45. The factor loading of .30 is usually accepted as significant if the sample size is larger than 200. Because in this study the sample size was 50 in each group, the acceptance level of significant factor loading was raised to .45 (Guilford, 1959). With further help of a scree test (Cattell, 1966), three factors have emerged as most important for interpretation.

Table 1 shows that the first factor has significant factor loadings on Inter-Role Distance (IRD), Role Stagnation (RS), Role Expectation Conflict (REC), Role Erosion (RE), Role Overload (RO), Role Isolation (RI), Personal Inadequacy (PI), and Self-Role Distance (SRD). Job stress emerged as the most important dimension for top managers. Recognition (REC), Human Relations at Work (HRW), Reward and Punishment (R & P), and Future Prospects (FP) turned out as the significant contributors to the second factor and all the variables belonged to the job anxiety dimension. The third factor for top managers has significant loading on the job involvement dimension, which showed their noninvolvement on the job.

For the group of middle managers, Inter-Role Distance (IRD), Role Stagnation (RS), Role Expectation Conflict (REC), Role Erosion (RE), Role Overload (RO), Role Isolation (RI), Personal Inadequacy (PI), Self-Role Distance (SRD), Resource Inadequacy (RI), and Role Ambiguity (RA) were the important contributors to the first factor. In this factor stress turned out to be an important factor, too. For the second factor, in which most of the variables belonged to job satisfaction, significant factor loading was evident on Work on Present Job (WPJ), Opportunity for Promotion (OP), Present Pay (PP), and Supervision on Present Job (SPJ). Security (SEC) and Future Prospects (FP) turned out to be important contributors to the third factor for the middle managers group.

The group of workers had significant loading on Human Relations at Work (HRW), Reward and Punishment (R & P), Security (SEC), Capacity to Work (CW), Job Involvement (JI), and Present Pay (PP). It follows, therefore, that job anxiety has emerged as the most important dimension. Role Stagnation (RS), Role Conflict (RC), Role Erosion (RE), Role Overload (RO), Resource Inadequacy (RI), Personal Inadequacy (PI), and Role Ambiguity (RA) all belonged to stress and were significant contributors to the second factor. The third factor, to which Recognition (REC), People on Present Job (PPJ), Present Pay (PP), and Supervision on the Present Job (SPJ) were the significant contributors represented the job anxiety and job satisfaction dimensions.

TABLE 1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Loadings of Variables on Different Factors

Variables	Group 1 (Top Managers) (N = 50)						Group 2 (Middle Managers) (N = 50)						Group 3 (Workers) (N = 50)					
	M		SD		Loadings		M		SD		Loadings		M		SD		Loadings	
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
IRD	5.00	3.09	.67*	.08	.08	.10	8.14	4.02	4.02	.56*	.22	.14	7.10	4.72	4.72	.06	.07	.08
RS	3.30	2.37	.78*	.07	.07	.24	7.62	4.12	4.12	.89*	.08	.02	6.46	3.41	3.41	.09	.76*	.09
REC	3.26	2.00	.76*	.01	.15	.15	8.32	4.78	4.78	.84*	.11	.25	6.64	0.24	0.24	.04	.66*	.06
RE	4.14	2.59	.81*	.13	.15	.15	8.42	4.45	4.45	.50*	.03	.34	7.70	3.91	3.91	.11	.74*	.02
RO	4.64	2.89	.72*	.08	.05	.05	6.90	4.07	4.07	.85*	.12	.08	6.80	5.03	5.03	.10	.57*	.06
RI	5.18	2.46	.54*	.08	.09	.09	6.92	4.16	4.16	.82*	.16	.06	6.62	3.99	3.99	.10	.72*	.24
PI	4.58	2.93	.62*	.12	.09	.09	7.64	4.41	4.41	.73*	.09	.01	7.58	3.56	3.56	.12	.76*	.07
SRD	3.74	2.51	.56*	.16	.10	.10	7.40	4.57	4.57	.77*	.15	.09	5.88	3.46	3.46	.10	.24	.12
RA	3.90	2.44	.12	.34	.03	.03	7.66	4.22	4.22	.91*	.15	.04	5.42	4.13	4.13	.01	.52*	.02
RI	4.46	2.34	.16	.11	.01	.01	7.68	3.93	3.93	.89*	.21	.09	7.02	3.49	3.49	.15	.22	.01
SEC	1.96	1.37	.15	.33	.39	.39	4.78	2.00	2.00	.13	.01	.80*	2.94	2.10	2.10	.32	.07	.89*
RC	2.00	1.23	.09	.79*	.16	.16	4.40	2.96	2.96	.02	.02	.11	3.08	2.42	2.42	.39	.19	.13
HRW	5.10	2.20	.01	.79*	.03	.03	8.76	2.92	2.92	.13	.27	.04	6.92	3.15	3.15	.79*	.06	.01
R&P	5.90	2.70	.23	.83*	.05	.05	7.20	3.09	3.09	.24	.06	.25	7.38	3.46	3.46	.86*	.03	.03
SE	2.68	1.65	.02	.22	.07	.07	3.78	1.60	1.60	.01	.20	.10	7.76	1.61	1.61	.89*	.07	.19
FP	2.46	1.72	.09	.62*	.33	.33	4.02	2.10	2.10	.16	.24	.54*	3.38	1.99	1.99	.37	.19	.14
CW	1.50	1.25	.07	.06	.91	.91	4.24	1.92	1.92	.01	.09	.81	3.18	1.99	1.99	.69*	.01	.06
JI	42.94	6.93	.25	.04	.49*	.49*	39.96	8.20	8.20	.09	.09	.16	40.76	5.89	5.89	.94*	.03	.07
WPJ	44.48	4.57	.09	.30	.17	.17	44.78	4.34	4.34	.10	.75*	.01	46.60	3.46	3.46	.03	.43	.08
OP	21.46	2.60	.12	.01	.03	.03	21.76	2.37	2.37	.02	.76*	.10	21.44	2.65	2.65	.04	.04	.76*
PPJ	43.50	4.48	.17	.05	.39	.39	43.74	3.65	3.65	.05	.16	.04	43.18	2.26	2.26	.05	.15	.59*
PP	19.60	2.20	.02	.05	.02	.02	20.78	2.68	2.68	.08	.81*	.05	21.51	0.50	0.50	.58*	.01	.19
SPJ	43.56	4.06	.02	.05	.01	.01	43.88	4.57	4.57	.23	.70*	.13	44.98	3.97	3.97	.06	.12	.61*

*Shows significant factor loadings.

Discriminant function analysis was also applied in the study. It separated the three groups in terms of the 23 variables considered in this study. Table 2 displays the results. It shows that only 10 out of the 23 variables (on the basis of Rao's V, 1952) discriminated the three groups. These variables were Capacity to Work (CW), Role Erosion (RE), Security (SEC), Role Conflict (RC), Job Involvement (JI), Present Pay (PP), Human Relations at Work (HRW), Reward and Punishment (R & P), Work on Present Job (WPJ), and Recognition (REC).

Rao's V criterion was used as the stepwise method for selecting the "best" set of discriminating variables. The use of the stepwise procedure results in an optimal set of variables being selected. The result is only optimal (rather than maximal), because not every possible subset is considered. The assumption is that the stepwise procedure is an efficient way of approximately locating the best set of discriminating variables and, thus, it was employed in this study. The canonical correlation is another way to judge the substantive utility of the discriminating function. This coefficient is a measure of association that summarizes the degree of relatedness between the groups and the discriminant function. High eigenvalue, percentage of variance, canonical correlation, and a lower value of Wilks' lambda assure that discrimination is significant at both levels of confidence. Moreover, both functions explain similar results and are, thus, significantly different on those variables.

4. DISCUSSION

The results showed that the three groups of employees, namely top managers, middle managers, and workers in a private sector organization, differed in terms of their job stress, job anxiety, job

TABLE 2(A) Results Showing Discriminant Function Analysis Among Top Managers, Middle Managers, and Workers

Variables	Wilks' Lambda	Rao's V	Change in Rao's V	Significance on the Basis of Wilks' Lambda
CW	.709	60.204	60.204	.01
RE	.515	137.594	77.389	.01
SEC	.457	165.483	27.889	.01
REC	.420	191.657	26.175	.01
JI	.401	207.319	15.662	.01
PP	.376	219.001	11.632	.01
HRW	.368	225.497	06.496	.01
R&P	.351	238.038	12.541	.01
WPJ	.337	244.986	06.048	.01
RC	.331	250.837	05.851	.05

TABLE 2(B) Result Showing the Eigenvalue and Canonical Discriminant Function

Canonical Discriminant Function	Eigenvalue of Variance	Percentage Correlation	Canonical
1	1.507	83.94	.775
2	0.228	16.06	.473

TABLE 2(C) Result Showing Wilks' Lambda and the Chi-Square Test of Discriminant Analysis

Function Derived	Wilks' Lambda	Chi-Square	df	Significance
0	.309	165.324	26	.01
1	.776	035.725	12	.01

involvement, and job satisfaction. Organizational stress originates from organizational demands, which are experienced by an individual. There are two related reasons for studying organizational stress. First, mismanaged organizational stress can produce individual strain, which is detrimental to the human resources in the organization. This has negative economic implications, such as poor quality of work, low productivity, absenteeism, and so forth. Second, when the organization is able to manage stress, improved performance, work satisfaction, involvement, and productivity can follow. The impact of stress on the human being as well as the economy is substantial, although no precise data are available in the Indian context. Ivancevich and Mateson (1980) estimated the total cost of stress to be approximately 10% of the U.S. gross national product, with stress probably costing the economy substantially more than strikes. These findings clearly state that mismanaged stress can lead to various dysfunctional consequences, both for the individual and for the organization. As shown in Table 1, the first factor, namely job stress, emerged as the most important dimension for top managers and middle managers, whereas job anxiety was the most important dimension for the workers.

Singh, Agarwal, and Malhan (1981)—after studying the nature of the managerial role conflict among 205 supervisors and administrative personnel in India—concluded that personal characteristics (e.g., age, education, tenure) played a much smaller role in perceptions of role conflict than the organizational level of the subject's position and the nature of his/her work.

Srivastava, Hagtvet, and Sen (1994) found that middle managers suffer maximally in organizational role stress and anxiety, followed by workers and top managers. Vansell, Brief, and Schwer (1981) stated that when an individual occupies more than one role, he or she may experience a conflict between the roles, or between conflicting job demands. Stress is caused by the liability or difficulty in meeting the various expectations. Laboratory studies supported the cause of lower productivity, dissatisfaction, tension, and psychological withdrawal from the group. Table 1 also shows that the second factor places maximum emphasis on job anxiety for top managers, job satisfaction for middle managers, and job stress for workers. Top managers felt more anxious about monetary benefits, unjustified criticisms, and the social status of their jobs. Middle managers were satisfied with their present pay and personal growth, contrary to workers who were worried about their personal inadequacy.

Heneman and Schwab (1985) studied the unidimensional perspective of job satisfaction of satisfaction with present pay with the four relatively independent dimensions of pay. The third factor included noninvolvement in the job for top managers, job anxiety for middle managers and job satisfaction and job anxiety as the important dimensions for workers. Top managers were worried about their efficiency due to age. The feeling of insecurity, as revealed from factor loadings among the group of middle managers, was caused by their inadequacy of work proficiency in a private sector organization where the demands are quite high. Workers showed a feeling of fear and insecurity, which may be caused by their inefficiency in the work environment.

Ahmad and Khanna (1992) studied job stress in relation to job satisfaction and job involvement among 50 middle-level hotel managers. There was a significant—but negative—relationship of job stress and job satisfaction, irrespective of the subject's gender, marital status, education, and experience. Occupational stress was negatively correlated with job involvement and the high job involvement group was more satisfied with their job than the low job involvement group.

In this study, out of the 10 variables that discriminated the three groups of employees, two variables belonged to both role stress and job satisfaction, and one to job involvement. The remaining five variables belonged to the job anxiety dimension. In this study, the results indicate that workers were more satisfied with their jobs, followed by middle managers and top managers. Job involvement was optimum for the group of middle managers, followed by workers and top managers.

Singh and Pestonjee (1990) studied job involvement, job satisfaction, and job status of 250 bank officers and 250 clerks of a Nationalized Bank in India. The findings showed that clerks were comparatively more satisfied than officers. However, officers showed higher job involvement and more participation in decision making than clerks.

Discriminant function analysis also showed that there were five variables in the job anxiety dimensions for the three groups of subjects. These variables were Capacity to Work (CW), Secu-

urity (SEC), Recognition (REC), Human Relations at Work (HRW), and Reward and Punishment (R & P). The result is also in agreement with the work of Bajaj (1978), who found that highly anxious employees were more job involved than the less anxious ones. Parasuraman and Alutto (1984) also found that manifest anxiety played a key role in enhancing the perceived magnitude of stressors. They added that job involvement tended to reduce role frustration, and increasing age was associated with greater ability to tolerate stress. The present results may be explained by the fact that nowadays scientific and technological advancements have enhanced prosperity and many other aspects of man and his living. Because the condition exerts considerable influence on the development of anxiety, specific anxiety accrues due to an individual's personal involvement in diverse stressful situations. These significant factors of job anxiety may be caused by the fact that job life offers the most significant challenges in present-day life. The individuals operating in the context of industry, business, or other employment often indicate apprehension and vague fears about various components of their jobs as a result of their interactions between their personality characteristics and the variables operating in the job situation.

Severe stress and anxiety may lead to costly destructive behaviour. This potentially explosive crisis in societies has to date gone unrecognized as it has been thought to be restricted to certain occupations and professions. Compensative law is still inadequate, too. A cognitive evaluation of stressful situations in the organization may play an important role in determining stress. The same stressful event can be perceived quite differently by top managers, middle managers, and even by workers. This perception may depend on what the situation means to individuals at their own level, whether the event is threatening for themselves, their self-esteem, work, or for their survival. An evaluation of the situation by each of them in relation to themselves determines the degree of stress they face. Emergencies in the work situation are particularly stressful as the usual methods of coping do not work. Not to know what to do can be demoralizing because under stress one tends to fall back on well-learned responses. Thus, stress—in terms of adverse effect, its cost to human resources, material, and progress—is tremendous. Management within an organization should function so as to maximize the coordination of human resources and work system and to minimize conflict.

There are two approaches for managing organizational conflict, namely preventive measures and creative measures. With preventive measures, management tries to create an environment in which dysfunctional conflict does not take place. Conflict is not primarily a result of individual neurotic traits; instead it arises under given conditions, even when the people involved are well-adjusted. Because situational variables induce conflict, it is possible to modify situations so as to avoid conflict. However, there may not be any specific standard of situation for conflict in the organization. The development of effective two-way communication with proper emphasis on upward communication, improvement in interpersonal relationships, provision for more facilities, and opportunities to develop informal groups may be some of the areas on which management should place more emphasis. Creative measures include the resolution of conflicts when they take place and become dysfunctional in the organization. Such preventive and creative attempts may be made in the following ways: establishing common goals, changing structural arrangement (i.e., reduction in interdependence, reduction in shared resources, exchange of personnel, creation of special integrators, reference to supervisors' authority), and conflict resolution actions (i.e., problem solving, avoidance, smoothing, compromise, confrontation). These various approaches of conflict management suggest that management can take a variety of actions for the enhancement of production and for the reduction of stress, depending on situations, parties to conflicts, and the organizational resources available. Therefore, in any organizational set-up, attempts should be made to minimize stress as much as possible.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, S., & Khanna, P. (1992). Job stress and job satisfaction of middle level hotel employees. *Journal of Personality and Clinical Studies*, 8, 51–56.
- Bajaj, N. (1978). Job involvement in high and low anxious working women. *Journal of Psychological Research*, 22, 33–36.

- Bharti, J., Nagarathnamma, B., & Reddy, S.V. (1991). Effect of occupational stress on job satisfaction. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 1*, 81-85.
- Blum, M.L., & Naylor, J.G. (1968). *Industrial psychology: Its theoretical social foundation*. New Delhi: CBS Publishers.
- Cattell, R.B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research Journal, 1*, 245-276
- Guilford, J.P. (1959). *Psychometric methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Heneman, H.G., & Schwab, P.B. (1985). Managerial salary rise decision: A policy capturing approach. *Personnel Psychology, 40*, 27-38.
- Hotelling, H. (1933). Analysis of a complex of statistical variables into principle components. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 24*, 417-441.
- Ivancevich, J.M., & Matteson, M.T. (1980). *Stress and work*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foreman.
- Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R.P., Snoek, J.D., & Rosenthal, R.A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.
- Kaiser, H.F. (1958). The varimax criterion of analytic in factor analysis. *Psychometrika, 23*, 187-200.
- Kanungo, R.N. (1981). Work alienation and involvement problems and prospects. *International Review of Applied Psychology, 30*, 10-16.
- Lodhal, T.M., & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 49*, 24-33.
- Margolis, B.L., & Kores, W.H. (1974). Job stress: An unlisted occupational hazard. *Journal of Occupational Medicine, 16*, 654-661.
- McMichael, A.J. (1978). *Personality, behavioral and situational modifiers of work stressors. Stress at work*. New York: Wiley.
- Nateson, H., & Radhai, K. (1990). Extent of job satisfaction among executives and supervisors and the factors promoting job satisfaction. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 16*, 49-52.
- Parasuraman, S., & Alutto, J.A. (1984). Sources and outcome of stress in organizational settings: Towards the development of a structural model. *Academy of Management Journal, 27*, 330-350.
- Pareek, U. (1983). *Role stress scale manual*. Ahmedabad, India: Navin Publications.
- Rao, C.R. (1952). *Advanced statistical methods in biometric research*. New York: Wiley.
- Rodgers, R., Hunts, J.E., & Rogers, D. (1993). Influence of top management commitment on management programme success. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 151-155.
- Selye, H. (1956). *The stress of life*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Singh, P., Agarwal, U.N., & Malhan, N.K. (1981). The nature of managerial role conflict. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 17*, 1-26.
- Singh, S., & Pestonjee, D.M. (1990). Job satisfaction, job involvement and participation amongst different categories of bank employees. *Journal of Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 16*, 37-43.
- Smith, P.C., Yulin, E.A., & Kendall, L.M. (1969). *Cornell studies of job satisfaction IV: The relative validity of JDI and other methods of measurement of job satisfaction*. Unpublished manuscript, Ithaca, NY.
- Srivastava, S., Hagtvet, K.A., & Sen, A.K. (1994). A study of role stress and job anxiety among three groups of employees in a private sector organization. *Social Science International, 10*, 25-30.
- Srivastava, A.K., & Sinha, M.M. (1977). *Job anxiety scale*. Varanasi, India: Rupa Psychological Centre.
- Vansell, M., Brief, A.P., & Schwer, K.S. (1981). Role conflict and role ambiguity: Integration of the literature and direction for future research. *Human Relations, 4*, 43-71.