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ABSTRACT

This study is an attempt towards making Indian organizations more effective and helping managers in actualizing their full potential. As middle managers have to interact with people (subordinate, colleagues, top management, customers) and major portion of their working time is utilized in people work, it can be expected that characteristics of job-burnout-emotional exhaustion, depersonalization or dehumanization and diminished personal accomplishment are found among them.

Hence keeping in view, the above said notion, the present investigation is aimed to measure the influence of organizational role stress, organizational climate and social support on job burnout among middle managers at private and public undertakings.

Burnout is a work-related syndrome that stems from an individual's perception of a significant discrepancy between effort (input) and reward (output). It occurs most often in those who work face-to-face with troubled or needy clients and is typically marked by withdrawal from, cynicism towards, clients, emotional and physical exhaustion and various psychological symptoms such as irritability, anxiety, sadness and lowered self-esteem (Farber, 1991). Burnout is often been studied in various human service professionals such as business organisation, lawyers, police officers, health workers, doctors, nurses, teachers, social workers, etc. Burnout is characterised by physical depletion, by feeling of helplessness and hopelessness, by emotional drain and by the development of negative self-concept and negative attitude towards work, life and people. Maslach
and Jackson (1981, 1986) defined burnout as a triparitile syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and a reduced sense of personal accomplishment that occurs frequently among people whose work involve intense interaction with other people. Emotional Exhaustion - it is caused by excessive psychological and emotional demands made on people in helping various professions. Depersonalization - it refers to treating people like objects and development of negative attitude towards one's self, work and life. Personal Accomplishment - It is the demotivational effects of feeling of inefficiency about their ability related to recipients that may result in a self-imposed verdict of failure. Concept of organizational role stress is based on role theory (Pareek, 1983). Role can be defined as position one occupies in a social system. The very nature of the role has an in-built potential for stress. Organizational climate may be defined as summary of perception which people have of an organisation (Schneider & Synder, 1975). Social Support as a construct, refers to helpful social transactions that make people feel better. It speaks of an individual experience of being cared for, loved, esteemed and a member of network of mutual obligations (Cobb, 1976). Social support has been conceptualized as structural integration into a social network of relationships as well as functional resources provided as part of ongoing interpersonal relationships (Cohen & Syme, 1985).

**Hypotheses**

H(a) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Organizational Role Stress dimension.
H(b) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Organizational Climate dimension.

H(c) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Social Support dimension.

H(d) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Job-Burnout dimension.

H(e) Organizational Role Stress dimension and its ten components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(f) Organizational Role Stress dimension and its ten components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(g) Organizational Climate dimension and its nine components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(h) Organizational Climate dimension and its nine components will act as predictor of Emotional Exhaustion feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(i) Social Support dimension and its three components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.
H(j) Social Support dimension and its three components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of public sector middle managers.

Measures

The following psychometric devices have been employed in the present investigation.

1. Maslach Burnout Inventory:

Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) developed by Maslach and Jackson (1981) has been used to measure Job-Burnout among middle managers. MBI consists of 22 items that are divided into 3 subscales i.e. Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment.

2. Organisational Role Stress Scale:

Pareek's (1983) Organizational Role Stress scale has been used to assess the extent of role stress of middle manager on the ten role dimensions, namely Inter Role Distance, Role Stagnation, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Erosion, Role Overload, Role Isolation, Personal Inadequacy, Self-Role Distance, Role Ambiguity and Resource Inadequacy.

3. Organizational Climate Questionnaire:

The Organizational Climate Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Litwin and Stringer (1968) has been employed in order to measure employees perception towards Organizational Climate of their respective organization. This questionnaire is comprise nine dimension namely Structure, Responsibility, Reward, Risk, Warmth, Support, Standard, Conflict and Identity.
4. Social Support Scale:

Social Support scale has been developed by Kapoor (1995) and Vashistha (1998), which comprises of 18 items and 3 sub-scales namely - Appraisal Support, Belonging Support and Tangible Support.

Sample

In the present study the sample was randomly selected from various organisations parts of Delhi. It consists of (N=300) middle managers, 150 each from private and public undertakings (Lausreb International, Ottoagn, K.K. Kohli and brothers, Orient Craft, Shaff Eye Centre, Sukdan Home, etc. Indian Oil Corporation, Maruti Udyog, Indian Aluminium, Bilai Steel Plant, etc.) Delhi. The methodology of the study was planned systematically keeping in view its lofty objectives.

Analysis and Result

Keeping in view the aims of the study, appropriate statistical techniques namely - descriptive analysis and stepwise multiple regression analysis were being used.

1. Public and private sector middle managers differ significantly with each other on Organizational Role Stress dimension since means and SDs in the case of public sector middle managers has been found 107.08, 8.97 and 82.57, 27.05 respectively in the case of private sector middle managers.

2. Public and private sector middle managers differ significantly with each other on Organizational Climate dimension since means and
SDs in the case of public and private sector middle manager were found to be 107, 9.72 and 129.04, 15.48 respectively.

3. Public and private sector middle managers differ significantly with each other on Social Support dimension since means and SDs in the case of public and private sector middle managers were found to be 8.56, 1.83 and 11.24, 1.45 respectively.

4. Public and private sector middle managers differ significantly with each other on Job-Burnout dimension since means and SDs in the case of public and private sector middle managers were found to be 77.57, 10.55 and 55.76, 21.17 respectively.

5. Organisational Role Stress and its various components are significantly related with Job-Burnout and its various components in the case of private sector middle manager.

6. Organizational Role Stress dimension has been found significantly related with Job-Burnout dimension but not to its various components known as Emotional Exhaustion, feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment in public sector middle managers.

7. Organizational Climate and its various components are significantly related with Job-Burnout and its various components except responsibility component of Organizational Climate dimension viz-a-viz Personal Accomplishment component of Burnout in the case of private sector middle managers.
8. Organizational Climate and its various components have been found only significantly related with Emotional Exhaustion component of Burnout and insignificantly related with Depersonalization and 50% of the Personal Accomplishment component of Burnout in the case of public sector middle managers.

9. Social Support and its various components have been found significantly related with Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization of component of Job-Burnout except Personal Accomplishment in case of private sector middle managers.

10. Social Support and its various components have been found insignificantly related with Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment components of Job-Burnout in the case of public sector middle manager.
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Chapter - I

INTRODUCTION
BURNOUT

BURNOUT - ITS MEANING

There is divergence of opinion among scholars as for as meaning of burnout is concerned. The dictionary meaning of burnout is to fail, wearout, or become exhausted by making excessive demands on energy, strength, or resource. Burnout is a chronic state of emotional exhaustion stemming from an unrelenting series of on-the-job pressure; it is a work-related distress usually experienced by the people in the job with high levels of interpersonal interaction or in jobs that require helping other people. Burnout is a process that begins with excessive and prolonged level of job stress. This stress produces strain in the worker (feeling of tension, irritability, and fatigue). It includes change in attitudes towards ones work and clients as well as the feelings of exhaustion and tension that sometimes occur. It is different from socialization or acculturation. And this process is completed when the worker defensively cope with the job stress by psychologically detaching themselves from the job and becoming apathetic, cynical, or rigid. The term burnout has been defined in various ways by different researchers.

Freudenberger (1974) was the first to coined the term 'burnout'. He has identified burnout as cynicism, negativism, inflexibility, rigidity of thinking, unhappiness, boredom, psychosomatic symptoms, and a condition in which helping professionals wear out in their pursuit of impossible goals. Spaniol and Caputo (1979) see burnout as the inability to cope with the stress of work and personal life.

Schwab and Iwanicki (1982) and Khan et. al. (1964) identify role conflict and role ambiguity as the cause of stress and burnout.

Calamidos (as reported by Cedoline, 1982) identifies burnout as comprising a set of five stages, including physical burnout, intellectual burnout, social burnout, psycho-emotional burnout and spiritual burnout. In turn, each stage also has numerous other lists of symptoms (most of which are indicative of stress), so that burnout becomes equated with sexual impotency, bruxism (excessive teeth grinding), sweating, accident proneness, excessive worry about worry, malicious humor, alcoholism, impaired decision making, dehumanization, paranoia, absenteeism and depression.

Whereas, Shinn (1982), Maslach (1976), Pines, Aronson and Kafry (1981), Jones (1981) and Maslach and Jackson (1979) - have reported that burnout is implicated in behavioural intentions to exist a role and in actual role exits.

Cherniss (1980:5) described burnout as a process in which the professional's attitude and behaviour change in negative ways in response to job strain.
Maslash (1976) defined burnout as the 'loss of concern for the people with whom one is working'. Cherniss, (1980a) defined as psychological withdrawal from work in response to excessive stress or dissatisfaction. Berkeley planning Associates, (1977) have defined burnout as the extent to which a worker has became separated or withdrawn from the original meaning or purpose of his work - the degree to which a worker expresses estrangement from clients, coworkers and agency.


Freudenberger (1980) described burnout as a state of fatigue or frustration, which stems from devotion to a cause, way of life; or relationship that did not provide the expected reward.

Nelson (1980) associated burnout with a mid-life or mid-career crisis, but it can happen at different times to different people. Pareek (1988) have described burnout as an end result of stress experienced, but not properly coped, resulting in symptoms of exhaustion, irritation, ineffectiveness, inaction, discounting self and others, and health problems.

Farber (1991) described burnout as a work-related syndrome that stems from an individual's perception of a significant discrepancy between effort (input) and reward (output) i.e. it occurs most often in those who work face-to-face with troubled or needy clients. Burnout among teaching staff
and other human services professionals has been observed in general as a process, not an event, that begins in perceived stress afflicting the individuals it is explained in a unique fashion by each person (Farber, 1983).

McFadden (1980) explained organisational burnout as a collection of symptoms which are characterised by low morale in the workers, declining in rates of overall production, alienation low level work, absenteeism, inadequate level of communication and increased level of job attribution.

Paine (1982) has observed 'Burnout stress syndrome (BOSS), the consequence of high level of job stress, personal frustration and inadequate coping skills, as a major personal, organisational and social costs.

Burnout stress syndrome is a debilitating psychological condition brought about by unrelieved work stress, resulting in depletion of energy reserves, lowered resistance to illness, increased dissatisfaction and pessimism, and increased absenteeism and inefficiency at work (Veningale and Spradley, 1981).

Maslach (1983) operationally defined burnout as psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with other people in some capacity.

Pines and Aronson (1988) define burnout as a condition of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion that is the result of chronic emotional strain.
Ganstar and Schaubroek (1991) described burnout as a type of stress - a chronic affective response pattern to stressful work conditions that features high levels of interpersonal contact (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). Burnout process is consistent with the stress-strain coping framework (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Where emotional exhaustion can be viewed as a form of strains and depersonalisation as a form of coping (Lee & Ashforth, 1993a). Cordes and Dougherty (1993) viewed burnout as emotional exhaustion, depersonatization and lowered self-accomplishment.

Psychologically, burnout may be defined as a response to an intolerable work situation. The process of burnout begins with a stressful situation that occurs when there is a perceived imbalance between resources and demands. It has also been visualized as a process that is self-reinforcing and does have negative bearing on the qualitative and quantitative performance of the workers.

BURNOUT AS A TRANSACTIONAL PROCESS

Burnout is a process, not an event, and is not identical for every one. As Mathingly (1977) has pointed out, burnout is a subtle pattern of symptoms behaviours and attitudes that are unique for each of us. That is burnout can be conceptualized as a function of stresses endangered by individual work related and social factors. According to him, burnout process includes three different stages as represented in the following figures.
The first stage involves an imbalance between resources and demands (stress). The second stage is the immediate short-term emotional response, characterized by feelings of anxiety, tension, fatigue and exhaustion, (strain). The third stage consists of a number of changes in attitude and behaviour such as a tendency to treat client in terms of their attitude and behavioural fashion. Thus burnout refers to a transactional process, a process consisting of job stress, employee's strain, and their psychological accommodation. Specifically, burnout can be defined as a process in which a previously committed professional disengages him or herself from work in response to stress and strain experienced in the job.

**STAGES OF BURNOUT**

There are five distinct stages of burnout that have been identified by Cherniss (1980b), Veningile and Spradley (1981), such as:

(i) **HONEYMOON STAGE**:

This is first stage of burnout in which there is euphoric feeling of encounter with the new job such as excitement, enthusiasm challenge and pride. Dysfunctional features emerged in two ways: first, the energy
reserves are gradually depleted in coping with the demands of a challenging environment. Second, habits and strategies for coping the stress are formed, this stage which are often not useful in coping with later challenge.

(ii) FUEL SHORTAGE STAGE:

In fuel shortage stage, there is a range feeling of loss, fatigue and confusion arising from the individuals overdraw on reserves of adaptation energy.

(iii) CHRONIC STAGE:

Chronic stage is also known as stages of crisis. In this stage psychological and physiological symptoms persist over a period of time in the individual. During this stage, ones feels oppressed and suffers from the following symptoms, such as heightened pessimism, self doubting tendency, escape mentality, peptic ulcer, headaches, high blood pressure etc.

(iv) CRISIS STAGE:

The physiological symptoms become more pronounced and demand attention and help at this stage. Common symptoms are chronic exhaustion, physical illness, anger and depression. A sense of fatigue and exhaustion overtakes the individual.

(v) HITTING THE WALL STAGE:

This is the last stage of burnout which has been drawn from the realm of physical education and sports. It is said a marathon, actually begins at the 'twenty-mile mark with six yet to go'. It is at this stage that the runner has hit the wall. This is a kind of devast: experience which can knock-out
a person from the main stream. This leads to muscle paralysis, dizziness, and fainting and even complete collapse. Similar experience have been observed in the executive when all the energy depleted like the glycogen of a marathon runner, one may lose control over one's life; it may be the end of a professional career. While recovery from this stage may elude some, others may be resourceful enough to tide over the crisis.

**DIMENSIONS OF BURNOUT**

Maslach has identified three major dimensions of burnout; they are -

a) Emotional Exhaustion

b) Depersonalisation

c) Personal Accomplishment

**EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION**:

It is caused by excessive psychological and emotional demands made on people in helping profession it is directly related to high levels of work demand. As defined by Maslach and colleagues (1980, 1981, 1982), it is characterised by a lack of energy and feeling that one's emotional resources are used. This "compassion fatigue" may coexist with feelings of frustration and tension.

**DEPERSONALISATION**:

It refers to treating people like objects and development of negative attitude towards one's self, work and life. It is generally conceptualized as a response to the broader aspects of the job or work environment which is perceived as being bureaucratic, impersonal, rigid, or controlling. As
defined by Maslach and Colleagues (1980, 1981, 1982), it is marked by. treatment of subordinates and colleagues as objects rather than people. Individuals may display a detached and an emotional callousness and may be cynical toward colleagues, subordinates, and organisation.

PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT:

It is the demotivational effects of feeling of inefficiency about their ability related to recipients that may result in a self imposed verdict of failure. Feelings of diminished personal accomplishment result from factors suggesting one is unappreciated or that one's efforts are ineffective. According to Maslach and colleagues (1980, 1981, 1982), it is characterised by a tendency to evaluate oneself negatively. Individuals experience a decline in feeling of job competence and successful achievement in their work or interactions with people.

CAUSES OF BURNOUT

These are some important causes of burnout, such as:

i) Burnout clearly affects the staff member's morale and psychological well being.

ii) Burnout seems to affect the quality of care and treatment provided to clients.

iii) Burnout may have a strong influence on administration functions, high rates of burnout can cause havoc in community programme.

iv) Finally, burnout in other community settings, would seem to be legitimate in fact, necessary concern of human service programme.
Paine (1984) clearly narrated the reason, why professionals are victims to burned out -

i) Chronic distress is causal factors in burnout.

ii) Burnout is real person problem.

iii) Burnout is a human condition.

iv) Burnout is an energy crisis.

v) Burnout affects the whole person.

Different psychologist have described different causes of burnout. Among the most cited factors are: over commitment, excessive dedication, lack of awareness of one's limitations (Freudenberg, 1975, 1977; Petric 1979), lack of separation between one's life and work (Mattingly, 1977), stressful working conditions or environment (Maslach & Pines, 1979; Pines & Maslach, 1973), responsibility without authority or resources to accomplishments, lack of support system; stress in personal lives, emotional demands and failure to realize one's expectations.

The professionals requires unidirectional giving increase to the risk of burnout. Often person with many of the most valued and appreciated personal qualities seek careers that support use of these inherent or developing capacities; their success may support burnout risk factors.

Harris (1984) reported that the organisational variables related to burnout include bureaucratisation, communication, and level of decision making, role models, job expectation, physical environment and psychological environment. Schwab (1983) contends that people involved in prolonged constant, intensive interaction with people in an emotionally charged atmosphered are susceptible to the symptoms of burnout.
Pareek (1982) describe nine factors, which contribute either to glow up or burnout; they are -

1. **LEVEL OF STRESS**: When stress is either too little or too much it leads to hyperstress or hypostress.

2. **TYPE OF STRESS**: It can be either functional or dysfunctional - the first is called 'eustress' and the second 'dystress'.

3. **PERSONALITY**: There are certain personality dimensions which lead to burnout - external locus of control (a feeling that the executive is being controlled by other people and force), low interpersonal trust, low self esteem, rigidity and suspiciousness, withdrawal, alienation and machiavellism (a tendency to manipulate people).

4. **NATURE OF JOB OR THE ROLE**: The job is highly routinised, does not allow any diversity or freedom and does not provide opportunity for creativity and growth, it can lead to burnout. Research has found that role efficacy has a very negative relationship with perceived role stress.

5. **NON-WORK LIFE**: The executive's social or economic conditions, family life and relationships, family and other obligations, health conditions, etc., also contribute to his glow up or burnout.

6. **LIFE STYLE**: The pattern of structuring one's time may be called the life style. Stress dissipating life style, contributing to executive glow up, is characterised by a relaxed life, taking up creative pursuits, spending meaningful time with family and friends, involvement in meaningful activities like religions ideology, social cause, working
underprivileged, etc. On the other hand, stress absorbing life style is characterised by narrow interest, limiting oneself to work and leading a tense and structural living, such people are called workaholics.

7. ROLE STYLE: Role style can be broadly classified into avoidance and approach. Approach is indicated by hope or success, influence, orderliness, relevance, acceptance and growth. Avoidance style is indicated by an executive acting out of fear of failure, helplessness, chaos, irrelevance exclusion or inadequacy.

8. COPING STYLE: Dysfunctional style is characterised by fatalism, blaming, showing aggression towards others and defensive mode - denying the stress or justifying or rationalising it. Functional styles are persistent in nature, characterised by the hope for the solution of a problem or attempts to solve the problem alone or seeking others help or jointly working with others for the solution.

9. ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE: A supportive organisational climate can as much contribute to executive glow up as a hostile climate to executive burnout, one finding showed that organisational climate perceived as developing excellence in people was significantly associated with low role stress and one perceive as characterised by strong control over people with high role stress.

SYMPTOMS OF BURNOUT

The stages and symptoms of burnout can be amply emphasized in the following manner:

i) The individual who burns out is likely to be very enthusiastic, when first entering the organisation. One can become emotionally
exhausted unless there is first an emotional commitment.

ii) The initial enthusiasm soon gives way to stagnation as the individual realizes that he or she will not be able to solve all the problem the organisation faces.

iii) This leads to frustration on the part of the individual because important problems are not being solved.

iv) This frustration may eventually lead to apathy towards the organisation.

v) Eventually the only way an individual may be able to do something about his/her individual burnout is through outside intervention. This intervention may take the form of counselling, or more likely, leaving the situation that caused the burnout.

These stages can be explained by the following Figure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Exhaustion</th>
<th>→ Depersonalization</th>
<th>→ Low Personal Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feel drained by work</td>
<td>Have become calloused by job</td>
<td>Cannot deal with problem effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel fatigued in the morning</td>
<td>Treat people like objects</td>
<td>Not having a positive influence on others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel burned out</td>
<td>Don't care what happens to people</td>
<td>Cannot understand other problems or empathize with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrated</td>
<td>Feel other's blame you for their problems</td>
<td>No longer feel exhilarated by job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. The stages of burnout and their symptoms.
Burnout is job-related, and it is most common among people who entire their jobs with especially high ideals. Their expectation of being able to 'change the world' are badly frustrated when they encounter the reality shock of troubled clients and the inability of the organisation to help them. Like, teachers get fed up with being disciplinarians, nurses get upset when patients die, and police officers get depressed when they must constantly deal with the 'losers' of society.

Burnout professionals are more frequently absent or late for work than their non-burnout colleagues. They become noticeably less idealistic and more rigid, their performance at work deteriorates markedly, and they may fantasize or actually plan on leaving the profession. Furthermore, the frustration attend and to the phenomenon of burnout may lead to emotional stress (often manifest as esteem), psychosomatic problems (insomnia, ulcers, headaches, backaches, fatigues, high blood pressure) and increase marital and family conflicts. First of all, there is a general agreement that burnout occurs at an individual levels. Second, there is general agreement that burnout is an internal psychological experience involving feeling, attitudes, motives and expectations. Third, there is a general experience for the individual in that it concern problems, distress, discomfort, dysfunction and other negative consequences.

CONSEQUENCES OF BURNOUT

Various professionals typically begins their career with a strong sense of commitment and sacrifice (Cherniss, 1980). Initially, the career is seen as intrinsically rewarding and major source of gratification, but as work demands and interaction with others begin to take their toll, may come to
feel increasingly isolated and less committed. They became less interested in the intrinsic aspects of their work and more interested in the extrinsic rewards (Edelwich & Broadsky, 1980). The decreased professional commitment thus reflects a shift in attitudes concerning the significance of work (i.e. the career is seen as a burden rather than a calling), and represents one way of reducing emotional strain. Edelwich and Broadsky (1980) suggest that when apathy takes hold, employees either give up on the job by becoming less committed or give up the job and profession altogether. Career dissatisfaction can thus lead to thoughts of changing careers, which in turn may lead to job search behaviour (Bartel, 1979; Rhodes and Doering, 1983).

Cherniss (1980), Shinn, Rosarie, Morch and Chestrut (1984) firmly believed that emotional exhaustion is indirectly a function of (i) Social support, and (ii) direct and indirect control, since previous literature has tended to argue that social support and control exert a more direct effect on burnout. In turn, emotional exhaustion is directly related to:

(i) Depersonalisation and reduced personal accomplishment, and

(ii) Psychological withdrawal, including turnover intentions and reduced professional commitment.

Shelly identified 32 significant organisational job specific and individual variables of burnout among respiratory care practitioners in Georgia.

Significant relationships were indicated between certain organisational and individual variables and burnout. Of, these the strongest were time off, control, respect, role clarity, job stress, satisfaction with work, age, number of dependent children at home, social support and health. Further,
burnout, absenteeism and attribution were related. Finally, as job satisfaction declined, burnout increased.

**BURNOUT AND ITS CORRELATES**

There are some important antecedents of burnout, such as:

**PERSONALITY AS AN ANTecedENT OF BURNOUT:**

In examining the psychological manifestations of occupational stress, the literature supports the role of personality as key mediator between stimulus and response (Cooper and Marshall, 1976). There are two central features of stress at work, the interaction of which determines either coping or maladaptive behaviour and stress related disease (Cooper and Marshall, 1975) -

(i) the characteristics of the person, and

(ii) potential sources of stress in the work environment.

Kobasa, et al. (1982) also viewed that several types of individuals differences at work either as mediators or as moderators in the work stress process, included personality traits, work expectations and health related factors, also the importance of biographical data as an input for predictive, diagnostic and counselling purposes has been shown. While, other reported age, tenure in organisation and hierarchical position to be negatively related, marital status and education to be unrelated with stress and job search.

There are five personality traits that influence an individuals responses to stress, they are neurotic anxiety, locus of control, flexibility, introversion and Type-A syndrome.
NEUROTIC ANXIETY:

Neurotic anxiety is a constellation of traits and dispositions that tend to occur together. Neurotically anxious individuals have strong, punitive superegos. They set extremely high goals for themselves and punish themselves severely if they fail to achieve these goals, and also suffer if their goals and aspirations conflict with one another, and they are unable to resolve those conflicts.

Another trait of neurotic anxiety is emotionality and instability. That is, the neurotically anxious individual is more emotional than others and this often interferes with adaptive functioning. In time of stress the person tends to be fearful and apprehensive. That is, the individual who is high in neurotic anxiety will display strong and conflicting motivations, high emotionality, low self esteem, an excessive concern with the approval of others, and a reliance on defense mechanisms as a means of coping.

Grinker and Spielgel (1945) found that unrealistic, neurotic motivation was a major cause of negative stress reactions in combat flies. Khan et al. (1964) found that individuals who scored high in neurotic anxiety (as measured by a pencil and paper test) experienced more strain and tension in high role conflict situation than did those who scored low on this trait.

LOCUS OF CONTROL:

Locus of control is another personality dimension. According to Rotter (1966), individuals differ in the degree to which they believe that they control important sources of reinforcement in their lives. Internals' tend to believe that they control their destinies, if they want something, they
assure they can get it. And if they fail -- it is because they lacked the will or the ability. 'External' believe that they are at the mercy of fate and powers beyond their control. And if something turns wrong they attribute the cause not to their own efforts or abilities but to external forces.

That is, 'externals' are more prone to stressful situations. They are helpless and have no control over a situation and consequently will tend to give up and withdraw in the face of stress and frustration.

FLEXIBILITY:

Flexibility is another personality trait that affects reactions to stress. Flexible individuals are more likely to experience role conflict in work organisations, and they react to role conflict with more manifest anxiety, tension, and worry. That is, these people are more susceptible to role conflict, than rigid individuals (Khan et al., 1964).

INTROVERSION:

Another personality trait associated with stress reaction is introversion. Introverts experience more tension in high role conflict situation than extroverts. They are more likely to withdraw from their co-workers in the face of conflict and stress, and this withdrawal impeded effective coping and resolution of the conflict (Khan et al., 1964).

TYPE 'A' SYNDROME:

Type 'A' syndrome is one more personality trait that is susceptible to stress and burnout.

Nath (1980) reported a negative relationship between length of service and role ambiguity, and turnover and age and
tenure, implying that employees with less age and shorter length of
service showed a higher tendency to quit has been reported in a number of
studies. Friedman and Rosenman (1974) showed a relationship between
behavioural patterns and the prevalence of chronic heart diseases (CHDs).
They divided individuals into 'Type A' and 'Type B'.

Type-A exhibited overt behavioural syndrome or style of life,
characterised by extremes of competitiveness, striving for achievement,
aggressiveness, haste, impatience, restlessness, hyperalertness,
explosiveness of speech and feeling of being under pressure of time and
under the challenge of responsibility. It was suggested that 'people having
this particular behaviour pattern were often so deeply involved and
committed to their work that other aspects of their lives were relatively
neglected'.

Many studies have confirmed the vulnerability of Type-A men to CHDs.
This behaviour pattern has also been found to intensify health complaints
such as loss of appetite, depression or headaches. Some researchers
placed strong emphasis on interaction between type-A behaviour and other
personality variables that have been linked to coronary reactivity or strain.

Lee et al., studied in depth the dimensions of optimism.

He emphasized the moderating role of optimism in the type-A behaviour
dimensions and health risk relationships that lowers the health risks for
the achievement striving individuals.

Sarason and Spielberger (1975) maintain that there are mediating factors
between the stressor and the coping response, which affect the detection,
appraisal and interpretation of the stressor by the person.
1) Age
2) Sex
3) Birth order
4) Marital status
5) Stage in his developmental cycle at which he is affected.
6) The individuals and the group's race or ethnicity is important at least for the likelihood, degree and nature of its exposure to discrimination.
7) Child rearing practice also partly affects the type of defence mechanisms learned and used.
8) The family structure
9) Marital satisfaction and intra-familial quarrels.
10) Socio-economic class.
11) Status and reference group of the individual.
12) Nature of role demands on the person, their clarity and the degree of flexibility in role performance allowed.
13) The type and nature of one's occupation.
14) The power relationships involved in the transaction.
15) Coping is also affected by culturally patterned attitudes to threat, injury, pain, illness, etc.
16) Other mediating factors are the individuals's health and intactness of his CNS prior to the onset of the stressor, heredity and nutritional factors and the quality of one's 'in born endocrine equipment'.
17) Psychological factors also mediate:

a) Degree of motivation or arousal.
b) Characteristic level of activity and stimulation.
c) Expertise and success in self-regulating emotional reactions.
d) Capacity to maintain focal attention.
e) Degree of 'hypersensitivity' to the demands everyday life.
f) Characteristic pattern of threat appraisal.
g) Introvert or extrovert
h) Strength of his ego.
j) Whether there is a family history of vulnerability.

Pestonjee (1990) views stress as a personal response to a certain variation in the environment. Pestonjee conceived that some set of stressors could be differently perceived depending on:

a) the nature and magnitude of the strategy;
b) the importance of the stressor to the individual;
c) the personal and social support system available to the individual, and

d) the involvement and willingness on the part of the individual 'to do something' about the state of stress.

Pestonjee has identified 3 important sectors of life in which stress originates:

a) jobs and the organisation.
b) the social sector, and
c) intra-psychic sector

Job and organisational, refers to the totality of the work environment (task, atmosphere, colleagues, compensations, policies, etc.). The social sector refers to the social/cultural context of one's life. It may include religion, caste, language, dress and other such factors.

The intra-psychic sector encompasses those things, which are intimate and personal, like temperament, values, abilities and health. It is contended that stress can originate in any of these three sectors or in combinations there of.

WORK OVERLOAD AS AN ANTECEDENT OF BURNOUT:

Work overload is another antecedent of burnout. French and Caplan (1973) have differentiated overloads in terms of 'qualitative' and 'quantitatively' overload. Quantitative refers to 'having too much to do' and qualitative refers to work that is 'too difficult'.

French and Caplan (1973) found that objective quantitative overload was strongly linked to cigarette smoking. In a study of 100 young coronary patients, Russeck and Zhman (1958) found that 25% had been working at two jobs and an additional 455 had been working at jobs, which required 60 or more hours per week. They have found that prolonged emotional strain preceded the attack in 91% of the cases.

Another substantial investigation on quantitative workload was conducted and it was found that overload was significant by related to a number of symptoms or indicators of stress: escapist drinking, absenteeism from
work, low motivation to work, lowered self-esteem and an absence of suggestions to employees. The results from these and other studies (Quinn et al., 1971; Porter and Lawler, 1965) and relatively consistent and indicate that this factor is indeed a potential source of occupational stress that adversely affects both health and job satisfaction.

French and Caplan (1973) summarized their research by suggesting that both qualitative and quantitative overload produce at least 9-different symptoms of psychological and physical strain: job-esteem, threat, embarrassment, high cholesterol level, increased heart rate, skin resistance and more smoking.

INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT AS AN ANTecedENT OF BURNOUT:

Interpersonal conflict has been identified as one of the major organisational stresser leading to increased feeling of emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation. If the employee lacks supportive relationship with his immediate supervisors or with co-workers, or if his abilities are under-utilised, he experiences decreased feeling of personal accomplishment (Leiter, 1991). Cooper (1978) has enlisted relations within the organisation: poor relations with boss, poor relations with colleagues and subordinates, difficulties in delegating responsibilities, etc., as one of the chief sources of managerial stress. Social support has also been identified as an antecedent of burnout alongwith others like work autonomy and role stress. The major finding are -

(i) Autonomy over various aspects of work and social support from the organisation and supervisor were each inversely related to role stress (i.e., role conflict and role ambiguity).
(ii) Role stress was positively related to exhaustion.

(iii) Exhaustion was positively associated with turnover intentions. Neither autonomy nor support effected burnout directly and neither moderated the relationship between stress and burnout.

STATUS INCONSISTENCY AS AN ANTECEDENT OF BURNOUT:

Researchers have also identified 'status inconsistency' as possible determinant of psychological and occupational stress. Jackson et al. (1986) argued that status inconsistency becomes salient to the individual in the form of conflicting expectations. For example, when a person's education and income are inconsistent, the status inconsistent person are those around him/her may hold conflicting expectations about his/her behaviour. In line with subsequently developed person-environment-fit theory, it is the uncertainty and frustration embedded in these conflicting expectation that Jackson viewed as causing the psychological stress. However, empirical research indicated that not all forms of status inconsistency are directly linked to strain.

A number of factors moderate the linkage between status inconsistency and strain like individual age and degree of extrinsic motivation. There are interesting case studies of individuals showing behavioural disorders as a result of either being over-promoted (when a person has reached the peak of his abilities with little possibility of further development and is given responsibility exceeding his capacity) or under promoted (not given responsibility commensurate with ability level). In each case the progression of the status disorder was from minor psychological
symptoms to marked psychosomatic complaints and then to mental illness.

MODES OF BURNOUT

Different models of burnout have been given by different researchers, such as:

BURKE MODEL OF UNDERSTANDING STRESS AND BURNOUT

Burke (1987) presents a simple model of understanding stress and burnout as presented in the Fig. This model suggests that to understand stress and burnout in organisations one must consider the environment (both organisational and extra organisational) in which individual functions and individuals themself (what individual bring with them as they interact with events in their environment.

The environment is a source of stressors or demands on the individual. An individual differs (e.g. past experience, personality, behavioural repertoire and social support) in what they bring to the challenges, opportunities and demands in their environments. The concept of stress, then is an interactional or transactional one. Individual with particular characteristics interacts with work and home environments with certain characteristics, which results in varying amounts of experienced stress.

Fig. 3. Burke's Model of Stress
Burke illustrates the model by providing concrete examples with in each of the panel starting with stress reactions or symptoms. Individual react to stressors with response of various kinds. Stress reaction can be emotional (depression, resentment, physiological - rapid heart beats rate, heavy breathing and behavioural smoking, eating, drinking more). These responses then describe an individual immediate (short-term) response to experienced stress. These responses are typically exhibited by all individuals and are in some sense involuntary (Cannon, 1929). The model in the given figure proposes that the experience of long term are chronic stress is likely to result in the individual developing emotional and physical health problem. Individuals predisposition to illness or health, health practices, coping responses, personal ambition, perfectionalism, impatiences, inability to say no, fear or failure, liking of tension, lack of confidence, chronic anxiety stress and timidity.

Sources of stress in the environment, includes: diverse work and life stressors, work hassles. Most models of burnout and stress pay only feeling attention to extra work and satisfaction. However, the research that is available (Burke & Bradshaw, 1981; Bhagat, 1983) shows clearly that work experiences influence of work experiences and vice versa. There has been considerable convergence of the nature of stress and burnout experiences in the organisation.

CHERNISS MODEL OF BURNOUT

A comprehensive model of burnout has been proposed by Cherniss (1980) - illustrated in the following figure.
Cherniss model proposes that particular work setting characteristics interact with individuals who are entering the job with certain career orientations. These individuals also bring with them their own unique extra work demands and supports, these factors, in concern, results in particular sources of stress being experienced to varying degrees by job incumbents. Individuals cope with these stresses in different ways, some employ techniques and strategies which might be term active problem solving while others cope by exhibiting the negative attitude changes, Cherniss identified in his definition of burnout. According to Cherniss 'burnout'...
represents a response to an intolerable work situation. The process begins when the helper experiences stress and strains that can not be elevated through active problem solving. These changes in attitude and behaviour associated with burnout then provide a psychological escape and ensure that further stress will not be added to the strain already being experienced.

**ROGER'S MODEL OF BURNOUT**

In the following model there are two paths of burnout. As shown in the figure these two paths have a cumulative effect. The first route is a direct outgrowth of the model of occupational stress. That is, traditional work-related stressors produce stress, which leads to attitudinal and behavioural symptoms that may culminate in burnout. Burnout does not automatically occur as a result of stress and occasional symptoms of burnout. Instead, burnout develops in phases and ultimately takes place when symptoms become so severe that an individual gives up trying to perform effectively.

![Diagram of Roger's Model of Burnout](image)

Source: Based in part on Donald P. Roger's 'Helping Employees Cope with Burnout', Business (1984).
CORDER & DOUGERTY MODEL OF BURNOUT:

This model has been developed and popularised by Corder and Dougherty. According to this the fundamental premise underlying the model is that burnout develops in phases. The three key phases are emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and feeling a lack of personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion is due to a combination of personal stressors and jobs and organisational stressors. People who expect a lot from themselves and the organisations in which they work tend to create more internal stress, which, in turn, leads to emotional exhaustion. Similarly, emotional exhaustion is fuelled by having too much work to do, by role conflict, and by the type of interpersonal interactions, encountered at work. Frequent, intense face-to-face interactions that are emotionally charged are associated with higher level of emotional exhaustion.

![Diagram of Corder & Dougherty Model of Burnout]

**Personal Stressors**
* High achievement expectation
* High organisational expectations
* Levels of job involvement

**Job and Organisational Stressors**
* Role overload
* Role conflict
* Duration, frequency, and intensity of interpersonal interactions

**Emotional Exhaustion**

**Depersonalization**

**Feeling a lack of Personal accomplishment**

**Attitudinal and behavioural symptoms of burnout**
* Negative attitude
* Fatigue
* Frustration
* Helplessness
* Withdrawal from friends and socializing.

Fig. 6. Burnout Model of Organisation

Thus, emotional exhaustion leads to depersonalization, which is a state of psychologically withdrawing from one's job. This ultimately results in a feeling of being unappreciated, ineffective, or inadequate. The additive effect of these three phase is a host of negative attitudinal and behavioural outcomes.

**BURNOUT MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES**

There is consensus among psychologists that job burnout differs from mid-life crises that affect the employees, as it is a specific set of symptoms brought on by severe or chronic stress directly related to job. Since stress cannot be eliminated from daily life, the solution is to effectively manage it. However, there are some important techniques through which burnout among various professionals can be minimized easily such as:

(i) **FLIGHT & FIGHT**:

Flight and fight are two reactions that can serve as a primary means of successful coping. Flight, or leaving a distressing situation, is a perfectly reasonable response to stress if an avenue of flight is available. Fight, or confronting a threat or stressor, can also be an effective response. The desire to confront a threat may actually be the best way to bring about a charge that will reduce the level of stress.

(ii) **RELAXATION TECHNIQUES**:

Techniques for managing stress/burnout involves some form of physical or mental relaxation. Some of these techniques have been advocated with the zeal and enthusiasm of new fads; the two simple relaxation techniques, muscle massage and abdominal breathing, can effectively calm a person. A
muscle massage consists of slowly massaging the muscles of the neck, arms, back, legs or feet, depending on the surroundings. Abdominal breathing means taking long, deep breaths, which cause the body to relax and counteract the stress responses associated with an alarm reaction. Another technique, that is, transcendental meditation. In this a meaningless sound called a mantra is used so as to condition the subject to reduce the level of excitation and disorderly activity of the nervous system and to quiet the mind while maintaining alertness. Evidence evaluating transcendental meditation indicates that metabolic changes occur during meditation that move the body toward a deep state of rest.

(iii) BIOFEEDBACK:

Biofeedback is another relaxation technique. It uses sophisticated equipment to observe some internal body processes and report this information in observable ways. Biofeedback equipment can monitor such events as muscular tension, skin temperature, heartbeat, blood pressure, and brain waves. This information is reported in the form of sounds, lights, or wavy lines on a graph, which helps the persons to eventually control the stress responses.

(IV) SOCIAL SUPPORT:

A social support system refers to an interlocking network of people with whom an individual is able to interact to satisfy important human needs. A social support system may include a wide variety of people, such as a spouse, family members, other religious or civic group associates, and health and welfare professionals. The most important form of social
support is emotional support, which consists of providing empathy, love, caring, and trust. Research evidence indicates that the most important source of social support comes from the family unit, especially from one's spouse. The death of a spouse is usually a traumatic experience that influence both the physical and mental health of the surviving partner. The trauma is much less severe, however, if individuals have other social supports that can help them, such as an understanding supervisor, co-workers who are willing to listen and empathise, and a counsellor who can provide supportive, non-directive counselling.

(v) PHYSICAL EXERCISE:

A carefully designed physical exercise program is not only an effective stress management technique, but also an important element in maintaining good mental and physical health. During a vigorous physical exercise routine, internal chemical changes occur that eliminate the tension that causes stress. At the same time, it improves physical conditioning, thereby making individuals better prepared to endure future stress. The benefits of physical exercise have encouraged companies to adopt a variety of physical exercise programs.

(VI) JOB REDESIGN:

Organisations can redesign jobs to minimize the creation of stresser to reduce their stressful characteristics. In theory, it's possible to redesign jobs anywhere in the organisation to this end. Thus, an overloaded executive might be given an assistant to reduce the number of tasks he or she must perform. In practice, most formal job redesign efforts have involved enriching operative level jobs to make them more stimulating and
challenging. This is usually accomplished by giving employees more control over the pace of their work and permitting them to use more of their skills and abilities. Although enrichment often increases job satisfaction and reduce withdrawal. Therefore, job redesign is an important method of dealing with stress because it attempts to remove stressors rather than simply helping employees to cope with stressors.

(VII) TIME MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES:

Time management technique may be used to reduce stress. Such simple devices as developing a list of things to do and a system for handling telephone or visitors interruptions can be useful for gaining control of one's work life and, thereby, one's sanity.
ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS

According to Pareek (1987) role can be defined as a set of functions which an individual perform in response to the expectation of the significant members of social system, and his/her own expectations about the position that he/she occupies in it.

There are two role systems,

(i) Role Space

(ii) Role Set.

The concept of role, and the two role system have a built-in potential for conflict and stress.

ROLE SPACE CONFLICTS

Role space (the dynamic relationship amongst the various roles an individual occupies and himself) has three variables i.e. self, the role under question, and the other roles he occupies. These conflicts are as follows.

1. SELF-ROLE DISTANCE:

This stress arises out of the conflict between the self-concept and the expectations from the role, as perceived by the role occupant. If a person occupies a role which he may subsequently find as conflicting with the self concept, he feels stressed. For e.g. an introvert who is fond of studying and writing, may develop a self-role distance if he accepts the role of a salesman in an organisation, and comes to realize that the expectations from the role would include his meeting people and being
social. Such conflicts are fairly common, although they may not be so severe.

2. INTRA-ROLE CONFLICT:

Since an individual learns to develop expectations as a result of his socialization and identification with 'significant' others, it is quite likely that he sees certain incompatibility between the expectations (functions) of his role. For e.g. a professor may see incompatibility between the expectations of teaching students and of doing research. These may not be inherently conflicting, but the individual may perceive these as incompatible.

3. ROLE STAGNATION:

As the individual grows older, he also grows in the role that he occupies in an organisation. With the advancement of the individual the role changes, and with this change in role, the need for taking up a new role becomes crucial. This problem of role growth becomes acute especially when an individual who has occupied a role for a long time enters another role in which he may feel less secure. However, the new role demands that an individual outgrow the previous one and take charge of the new role effectively. This is bound to produce some stress. In organisations which are fast expanding, and which do not have any systematic strategy of manpower development, managers are likely to experience this stress of role stagnation when they are promoted.

4. INTER-ROLE DISTANCE:

Where an individual occupies more than one role there are bound to be conflicts between the different roles that he occupies. For e.g. a lady
executive often faces the conflict between her organisational role as an executive and her family role as a wife and a mother. The demands of her husband and children for sharing her time may be incompatible with the organisational demands. Such inter-role conflicts are quite frequent in a modern society, where an individual is increasingly occupying multiple roles in various organisations and groups.

**ROLE SET CONFLICTS**

The other field which is important vis-a-vis an individual's role, is the role set which consists of important persons who have varying expectations from the role that he occupies. The conflicts which arise as a result of incompatibility amongst these expectations by the 'significant' others (and by the individual himself) are referred to as role set conflicts. These conflicts are as follows:

(1) **ROLE AMBIGUITY**:

When the individual is not clear about the various expectations that people have from his role, the conflict that he faces is called role ambiguity. Role ambiguity may be due to lack of information available to the role occupant, or due to lack of understanding of the 'cues' available to him. Role ambiguity may be in relation to the activities, responsibilities, priorities, norms, or general expectations. Often role ambiguity may be experienced by persons occupying roles which are newly created in the organisation, roles in organisations which are undergoing change, or process roles (with less clear and concrete activities).
2. ROLE EXPECTATION CONFLICT:

When there are conflicting expectations or demands by different role senders (persons having expectations from the role), the role occupant may experience this stress. There may be conflicting expectations from the boss, subordinates, peers or clients.

3. ROLE OVERLOAD:

When the role occupant feels that there are too many expectations from the 'significant' others in his role set, he experiences role overload. Role overload has been measured by asking questions about people's feelings on whether they could possibly finish work given to them during a modified work day and whether they felt that the amount of work they do might interfere with how well it was done. Most of the executive role occupants experience role overload. Role overload is more likely to occur where role occupants lack power, where there are large variations in the expected output, and when delegation or assistance cannot procure more time.

4. ROLE EROSION:

A role occupant may feel that the functions which he would like to perform, are being performed by some other role. The stress felt may be called role erosion. Role erosion is the subjective feeling of an individual that some important role expectations he has from the role are shared by other roles within the role set. Role erosion is likely to be experienced in an organization which is redefining its role and creating new roles. Studies indicates that in several organisations which were redefining their
structure, the stress of role erosion was inevitably felt. In an organisation, a particular role was abolished and in its place two roles were created to cater to the executive and planning needs. This led to a great erosion, and a feeling that the new roles were less important as compared to the previous role.

5. RESOURCE INADEQUACY:

Resource inadequacy stress is experienced when the resources required by the role occupant for performing the role effectively are not available, these may be informing, people, material, finance or facilities.

6. PERSONAL INADEQUACY:

When a role occupant feel that he is not prepared to undertake the role occupant may feel that he does not have enough knowledge, skills, or training, or he/she has not had time to prepare for the assigned role. Persons who are assigned new roles without enough preparation or orientation are likely to experience this kind of stress.

7. ROLE ISOLATION:

In a role set, the role occupant may feel that certain roles are psychologically closer to him, while others are at a much greater distance. The main criterion of distance is the frequency and ease of interaction. When linkages are strong, the role isolation will be high. Role isolation can therefore be measured in terms of the existing and the desired linkages. The gap between the desired and the existing linkages will indicate the amount of role isolation.
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

MEANING OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE:

Discovering how the organisation is a psychologically meaningful environment for individual, organisation members has led to the concept of organisational climate. This term is used loosely and in a variety of ways by different psychologists.

Forhand and Glimer defined 'organisational climate' as those stimuli constrains on freedom, rewards and punishment that affect workers attitudes and performance'. For many, it is basically 'anything in the working environment that affects worker satisfaction productivity'.

The concept of 'organisational climate', however, becomes more useful when, as defined by Likert and his colleagues, it is more limited to conditions inside the organisation but is outside the immediate face to face working group. In this sense, 'organisational climate' involves such matters as extent of upward receptivity, lateral communications, interdepartmental decision - making, control and co-ordination.

Dunnette (1975) defined 'organisational climate' objective and subjective measures as some climate dimensions also seem to be structural measures. Campbell (1970) also offered a definition of 'organizational climate' and usefully described its four major dimensions as -

(i) Individual autonomy.
(ii) Degree of structure imposed on the position.
(iii) Reward orientation
(iv) Consideration, warmth and support.
According to Korman (1977) the climate of an organization may, for example, be the extent to which it is seen by either those who are inside or outside the organization as ego supportive, hierarchical, ambiguous, conflict prone and routinized, to cite just a few of the descriptive terms often used, so climate has, as a concept, become a matter of great controversy. In this view, 'organizational climate' is a dependent variable in that it results, at least partially, from mechanisms that management can control and it is also an independent variable in that it can influence job behaviours and attitudes.

And finally, Schneider and Synder (1975) defined 'organisational climate' as "a summary perception which people have of an organization". It is basically impression of what the organization is. Now a days, increasing recognition is being given to the nature of 'organizational climate'. Every organization has characteristic aura under which it functions which is at times evidence to a discriminating but transient visitor to the organization. The 'organisational climate' can be manifested in diverse ways in the general behaviour of the workers and state of discipline at the work place, the interest the workers take in their work, the frequency of task-irrelevant activities among them, their sense of personal freedom, etc. Perhaps the most important single factor in the determination of 'organizational climate' is the nature of leadership under which the workers function. It is the function of the leader to organize or integrate his men into a highly motivated and cohesive work group so that everyone identifies himself with the group and the group goal and takes pride in belonging to it. If the group is split up into fractions fighting with each other, if its members are different to the interest of the organisation and its work and do not hesitate to change their jobs for minor material benefits, then the primary responsibility for this state of affairs is with the leader of
organisation; and the higher the leader is in the organization, the greater is his responsibility for the proper functioning of the organization, as stated by Ganguly (1964).

Although, there can be no doubt that "organizational climate" description, measurement and control are rather difficult. The first attempt to experimentally set up a particular 'social climate' in a work group was made by Kurt Lewin and his associates and reported in 1939 (for example Lewin et al. 1939). Another classic study on different types of leader behaviour and organisational climate' has been reported by Rolph White and Ronald Lippilt (1954). They had set up four groups of five 10 years old boys as their subjects. On the whole, the atmosphere created by democratic leadership was superior, and more desirable than the authoritarian climate. All except one boy of the two groups that had experience of all three types of leadership preferred the democratic order, however, no clear cut preference existed between the authoritarian and laissez-fair types.

Studies on organizations have led to the distinction of four organisational climates i.e. bureaucratic, autocratic, idiocratic, and democratic. Companies with 'bureaucratic climate' insist on strict obedience to company rules and regulations. Employees can feel secure so long as they confirm to these. The preoccupation and chief goal of the leaders here are to maintain and expand the particular system or organization as it is. In 'autocratic organizations' obedience to the superior is emphasized. Its leader desire to express themselves as fully as possible in their jobs. They want maximum autonomy for themselves and accept strict obedience to their personal orders on the part of their subordinates. The atmosphere is idiocratic, manipulative, and
psychological. The focus is on the individual worker and on his personal ambition. In the 'democratic organisation', informal group customs, codes and conventions are important and the leader derives his authority from these and from the group as a whole. Most ongoing organisations show characteristics of all these different climate, in different spheres of their activities.

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND ITS CLASSIFICATIONS

Various classification of climate factors have been propose by various researchers, including Halpin and Crafts, in the following manner:

(a) The consideration management had far the personnel as people,
(b) The emphasis that was placed on getting work done,
(c) The emotional distance that existed between manager and subordinate,
(d) The perception people had that their social needs were being satisfied,
(e) The enjoyment they received from social relationships in the organisation,
(f) The desire management showed, through task-oriented behaviour, to motivate the work force,
(g) The perception people had regarding whether they were singly going through motions to complete a task, and
(h) The feeling they had of being burdened with busy work.

Another classification was given by Forehand, who lists such characteristics as the size and structure of the organisation, the leadership patterns employed by the managers, the communication networks used to convey messages, the goals of the enterprise, and the complexity of the entire system. Forehand
contends that characteristics such as there not one describe an organisation but also influence the behaviour of the personnel as well.

The third categorization was made by Likert in the following order:

(i) Communication flow. How well do subordinates know what is going on? How receptive are superiors of communiques? Are subordinates given sufficient information to do their jobs well?

(ii) Decision-making practices. Are subordinates involved in the decision making process? Is the know-how of all the personnel at every level being utilized?

(iii) Concern for people. Does the organisation organize work activities sensibly, try to improve work conditions, and show an interest in the individual's welfare?

(iv) Influence on the department. Do lower level supervisors and employees who have no subordinates have an influence on the department?

(v) Technological adequacy. Are equipment and resources well managed and improved methods quickly adopted?

(vi) Motivation. Do people in the organisation work hard for both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards and are they encouraged to do so by the organisation?

Further, Richard M. Hodgetts has classified organisational climate into two major categories. He has given an analogy with an iceberg where there is a part of the iceberg that can be seen from the surface and another part that is under water and is not visible. The visible part that can be observed or measured include the structure of hierarchy, goals and objectives of the
organisation, performance standards and evaluations, technological state of the operations and so on. The second category contains factors that are not visible and quantifiable and include such subjective areas as supportiveness, employee's feelings and attitudes, values, morale, personal and social interaction with peers, subordinates and superiors and a sense of satisfaction with the job. Both of these categories are shown below in the form of an iceberg.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERT FACTORS</th>
<th>COVERT FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Hierarchy</td>
<td>* Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Financial resources</td>
<td>* Feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Goals of organisation</td>
<td>* Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Skills &amp; abilities of Personnel</td>
<td>* Norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Technological state</td>
<td>* Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Performance standards</td>
<td>* Supportiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Efficiency measurement</td>
<td>* Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DIMENSIONS OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE**

Likert (1967) proposed six dimensions of organisational climate (leadership, motivation, communication, decision, goals and control) while Litwin and Stringer (1968) proposed seven dimensions (conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organisational clarity, warmth and support and leadership). A review of their studies and those of others indicates that twelve processes or dimensions of organisational climate relate specifically to motivation such as.
1. ORIENTATION:

The dominant orientations, characterized by the main concerns of members of the organisation, are important determinants of the motivational climate. If the main concern or orientation is to follow laid down rules, the climate will be of one kind (control), if the orientation is to excel and achieve goals, it will be of another kind (achievement).

2. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS:

Interpersonal relation processes are reflected in the way informal groups are formed. If the groups are formed for protecting their own interests, there may be cliques, creating a specific climate (control), as contrasted with another climate if people have informal relationships with their supervisors (dependency).

3. SUPERVISION:

The supervisory process contributes significantly to climate formulation. If the supervisors help their subordinates to improve personal skills and chances of advancement, their behaviour will develop a climate (extension) different from one in which the supervisors are more concerned about maintaining good relations with their subordinates (affiliation).

4. MANAGING PROBLEMS:

Problems can be seen as a challenge, or they can be seen as unnecessary tribulations. Problems can be solved by the supervisors, or jointly with the concerned employee, or can be referred to the higher levels. These different ways contribute to the creation of a climate.
5. MANAGING MISTAKES:

The attitude of the supervisor towards mistakes develops employee orientation. One of annoyance, or concern, or tolerance. Again who helps and how in dealing with mistakes influences the climate.

6. MANAGING CONFLICTS:

The same is true of conflicts. The conflicts may be seen as annoying and embarrassing and may be covered, or they may be seen as problems to be solved. The process of dealing with conflicts is equally significant for the climate.

7. COMMUNICATION:

Communication is concerned with the flow of information, its direction (top-down, bottom-up, horizontal), its spread (selective or all concerned), mode (formal or informal), and type (instructions or feedback on state of affairs).

8. DECISION MAKING:

What is the main orientation in decision making: maintaining good relations or achieving results. Who make the decisions, people high in the hierarchy, or experts, or those who are involved in the matters about which decisions are made? Such questions will be relevant to see how the decision making process creates a particular motivational climate.

9. TRUST:

Amount or lack of trust amongst various members and groups in the organisation is relevant for the climate who are trusted more by management is also relevant.
10. REWARD MANAGEMENT:

What is reward in an organisation will influence its motivational climate, because what is rewarded reinforces the specific behaviour or orientation, arousing and sustaining a motive.

11. RISK TAKING:

How people react to risks, whose help is sought in risking situations, and how people respond to risks are relevant for the climate.

12. MANAGEMENT OF CHANGE:

Regarding management of change, the pertinent questions will be who initiates change, how change and innovation are perceived, how change is implemented.

Thus the above dimensions can be used to determine organisational climate. And the way its dimensions operate in an organisation may indicate the underlying motive of the top management, and the motive it is likely to arouse and sustain amongst the members in the organisation.

THEORY OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE:

Organizational climate theories has been classified into three different categories in the following sequence:

1. Theories of individual behaviour
2. Management theory
3. Organization theory

1. THEORIES OF INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOUR:

Many psychologists who have addressed themselves to the study of individual behaviour in organizations have classified environmental factors in
terms. Vroom (1964) in the conclusion of his comprehensive analysis of 'work and motivation' stated the following two propositions:

PREPOSITION-I:

The valence of an outcome to a person is monotonically increasing function of the algebraic of the product of the valence of all other outcomes and his conceptions of its instrumentality for the attainment of these outcomes.

PREPOSITION-II:

The force on a person to perform an act is monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the products of the valances of all outcomes and the strength of his expectancies that the act will be followed by the attainment of these outcomes.

'Vroom's model' acknowledges the importance of situational variables, but does not provide a format by which such variables can be mapped and measured most other theories of individual behaviour also fail to provide a systematic and useful linkage between 'climate' and 'behavioural concept'.

2. MANAGEMENT THEORY

Organizational psychologists interested in the management process have developed various terms to describe the indirect and subtle effects of management practices on the attitudes and behaviour of subordinates. Several of these terms attempt to define the phenomenon identified as "organizational climate". In the human side old enterprise, MC Gregor (1960) developed what he called the 'managerial climate' defined in terms of the manifestations of the assumptions of the management Blake & Mouton (1960), in "the Managerial Grid", used the term "organizational culture" stating that "when a
manager sees his responsibility as that of managing culture rather than just managing people to get work out of them, the basic unit of development is no longer the individual considered separately and alone". "However, they stop short of explaining what 'organizational culture' implies for the people, and most important, if it is the manager's responsibility to arrive at a total organizational perspective, how can he carry out his responsibility without a linking concept that allows to relate individual and organizational elements?

3. ORGANIZATIONAL THEORIES

Organizational theorists interested in descriptive explanations of human behaviour in organizations have dealt indirectly with notions of organizational environments.

'Classical organization theories', as represented in the writings of Fayol (1949) Koontz and O'Donnel (1955) and other render such concepts unnecessary.

The cognitive or economic behaviour theories of organization such as those proposed by March and Simon (1959) and Cyert and March (1964) view organizations as systems for making decisions and deal tangentially with climate.

The main group of organizational theories have concentrated on the objective framework of organization, the structure. Lorsch and Lowrence (1967) distinguish 8 structural dimensions which have been widely used to characterize the situational influences on motivated behaviour. These are:

1. Focus of formal authority,
2. Time span of responsibility,
3. Specificity of goals,
4. Number of levels of hierarchy,
5. Standardization of procedures,
6. Quality of formal rules,
7. Span of control, and
8. Rule specialization.

The model proposed above and those proposed by Likert (1961) and Woodward (1958) are related to Human's (1950) analysis of behaviour in groups. In these, the environment is viewed as having 3 parts i.e., a physical environment, a cultural environment, and a technological environment. The mutual interaction of these 3 parts specifies certain activities and interactions for the people involved in the system. These activities and interactions arouse sentiments among people. The environmentally determined activities, interactions and sentiments make up the external system. But increasing interactions arouse new sentiments and new activities not necessarily specified by the external system. New norms and frame of reference create internal system. The external and internal systems are mutually dependent on one another.

'Motivation' variables are not given adequate attention in these models, implying their drawback.

The concept and theory of climate development took place as a result of some original studies done in this field. The first explicit studies of 'psychological climate' were initiated by Krul Lewin in the 1930's. In describing the essential dynamics that linked human behaviour to generalized environmental stimuli, he stated that "To characterize properly the psychological field, one has to
take into account such specific items as particular goals, stimuli, needs, social relations as well as more general characteristics of the field as the atmosphere (e.g. the friendly, tense or hostile atmosphere) or the amount of freedom. Psychological atmosphere are empirical realities and are scientifically describable facts”.

Lewin, Lippit and White (1930) studied climate in an experiment involving the behavioural effects of three different leader-induced-atmosphere. The three leadership roles were authoritarian, democratic and Laissaz Fane.

The adult role was found to be a strong determiner of the pattern of social interaction. In other words, the 'climate' provided more powerful than previously 'acquired' behaviour tendencies.

In Lewin’s theory of motivation, the concept of 'atmosphere' was an essential functional link between the person (P) and the environment (R).

Under the other 'Climate' type theories, the most promising of these is the 'interpersonal organization theory', proposed by Khan and his associates (1964). They stated it is the key assumptions of this approach that "the behaviour of any organizational performer is the product of motivational forces that derive in large part from the behaviour of members of his role set because they constantly bring influence with the role expectations they hold for him".

There is not necessarily an incompatibility between the use of the 'climate framework' and the 'role set theory'. Rather, both serve as useful explanatory concepts.
Now, moving towards an 'Integrated theory', if the concept of 'organizational climate' is to demonstrate real value in understanding an explanation of behaviour in an organization, then it must be integrated with the kinds of theories of organizational behaviour that they evolve and are in current use. These theories, as discussed, tend to emphasize such factors as management practices, decision making processes, technology, formal organizational structure and social structure (viewed as arising from the interaction of technology, organizational structure and individual needs. These factors are largely objective features of an organization system, Relatively little attention is given to the member perception of and subjective responses to the organization environment. Thus, it has been difficult for these theories to utilize motivational concepts, many of such are based on subjective elements.

Litwin and Stringer (1968) have illustrated schematically an 'integrated model' of 'organizational behaviour'. In this model, the concept of organizational climate' is used as an intervening variable, mediating between organizational system factors and motivation tendencies. The perceptions and subjective responses which comprise the 'organizational perceptions and subjective responses which comprise the 'organizational climate' are as follows:
"INTEGRATED MODEL" OF 'ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOUR'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational System</th>
<th>Perceived Organizational Environment</th>
<th>Aroused Organizational Motivation</th>
<th>Emergent Organizational Behaviour</th>
<th>Consequence for Organizational Productivity Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Perceived Organizational Environment</td>
<td>Aroused Organizational Motivation</td>
<td>Emergent Organizational Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Dimension of Affiliation Activities</td>
<td>Organizational Climate (Or Role-Set Expectation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Structure</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td>Retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>Sentiments</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Assumptions &amp; Practices</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Adaptability Reputative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making Process Needs of Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LITWIN and STRINGER, 1968, "Motivation and Organizational Climate".

The diagram in this reflects an attempt to outline an 'input-output systems model'. The organization system features are seen as generating an 'organizational climate' which in turn arouses (or suppresses) particular motivational tendencies. The patterns of motivated behaviour that results are
seem as determining a variety of consequences for the organization including productivity, satisfactions, retention (or turnover), adaptability and reputation. The importance of interaction and feedback cycles is noted schematically.

An analysis of an organization's climate would inevitably lead to the tracing of its roots into the contextual source - the socio-cultural values and systematic features of the surrounding milieu, the body of knowledge regarding work and work forms, technological advancements and the resultant trends and issues in the realm of work. According to Sinha (1930) 'Organizational Climate' can be Soft or Synergetic, and these may be conceptualized as the extremes on a continuum of how work is viewed and valued, and what and how organizational (e.g. socio-cultural etc.) factors affect these viewing and evaluating processes. Basically, in a 'soft work climate', work is displaced from its central place in the organization by non-work activities and interests, such as, socio-personal interests and obligations. Employees do not tend to work hard, do not feel positive affect for work, do not derive satisfaction from their jobs, and do not locate work at the centre of their life space. They are not clear about their roles. In nutshell, social and personal considerations are allowed to undermine the importance of work. The opposite, however is true in a 'Synergetic work Climate'.

MODELS:

Regardless, there are three other models of Organizational Climate such as:

(i) Autocratic Model
(ii) Custodial Model
(iii) Supportive Model
(I) AUTOCRATIC MODEL:

The autocratic model has its roots deep in history, and certain it become the prevailing model of the industrial revolution. It depends on power. In an autocratic environment the managerial orientation is former, official authority. This authority is delegated by right of command over the people to whom it applies. Management assumes that it knows what is best and that the employee's obligation is to follow orders without question and without interpretation. Management assumes that employees are passive and even resistant to organisational needs. They have to be persuaded and pushed into performance, and this is management's task. Management does the thinking; the employees obey the orders.

Under autocratic conditions the employee orientation is obedience to a boss not a manager. The psychological result for employees is dependence on their boss, whose power to hire, fire and "perspire" them is almost absolute. And due to this there was minimum output and the pay was also minimum.

(II) CUSTODIAL MODEL:

As manager, began to study their employees, they soon recognized that although autocratically managed employees did not talk back to their boss, they certainly 'thought back'. Employees inside were a seething mass of insecurity, frustration and aggressions toward their boss. And it was necessary to develop feeling of satisfaction and severity among the employees.

To satisfy the security needs of employees, a no. of companies in the United States began welfare programs in 1890 and 1900s. In 1930s welfare programs evolved into a host of fringe benefits to give the employee security.
Employers - and unions and government began caring for the security needs of workers (i.e. they were applying a custodial model of organisational behaviour).

The custodial approach leads to employee dependence on the organisation. Rather than being dependent on their boss for their weekly bread, employees now depend on organisations for their security and welfare. Employees working in a custodial environment are well maintained, happy and contented, but they are not strongly motivated, so they give only passive co-operation. The result is that they do not produce much more vigorously than under the old autocratic approach.

(iii) SUPPORTIVE MODEL:

The supportive model of organizational behaviour was originally stated as the "principle of supportive relationships" by Rensis Likert, who said: "The leadership and other processes of the organisation must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and all relationships with the organisation each member will, in the light of his background, values, and expectation his sense of personal worth and importance".

Through leadership, management provides a climate to help employees grow and accomplish in the interests of the organisation the things of which they are capable. The leader assumes that workers are not by nature passive and resistant to organisational needs, but they are made so by an inadequately supportive climate at work. They will take responsibility, develop a drive to contribute, and improve themselves if management will give them half a chance. Supportive behaviour is not the kind of behaviour that require money. Rather it is a part of management's life-style at work, reflected in the way
that it deals with other people. The manager’s role is one of helping employees solve their problems and accomplish their work.

The supportive model tends to be especially effective in nations with affluence and complex technology, because it appeals to higher-order needs and provides intrinsic motivational factors.

The models of organisational behaviour are sequentially related to a hierarchy of human needs. As society has climbed higher on the need hierarchy, models of organisational behaviour have been developed to serve the higher order needs that became paramount at the time. Using Maslow’s need hierarchy for comparison, the custodial model of organisational behaviour is seen as an effort to serve employee’s second level security needs. It moved one step above the autocratic model, which was reasonably serving subsistence needs but was not effectively meeting needs for security. Similarly the supportive model is an effort to meet employee’s higher level needs, such as affiliation and esteem, which the custodial model was unable to serve. Therefore, the need hierarchy suggests that each model is built upon the accomplishment of the other.

IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE ON EMPLOYEES MOTIVATION AND PRODUCTIVITY

Organisational climate have a major influence on motivation, productivity and job satisfaction. It does this by creating certain kinds of expectancies about what consequences will follow from different actions. Employees expect rewards, satisfaction, and frustrations based upon their perception of the organisational climate: These expectations tend to lead to motivation. Thus the organisational climate provides a type of work environment in which
individual feels satisfied or dissatisfied. As motivation and satisfaction of individual goes a long way in determining his efficiency because the organisational climate is said to be directly related with his performance in the organisation which is in turn related to the productivity of the organisation.

There are 4 mechanisms by which organisational climate affects performance, satisfaction and attitudes of people in the organisation.

(i) Organisational variables can operate as constraint system in both a positive and negative sense by providing knowledge of what kind of behaviour by attaching different rewards and punishments to varying behaviour. This assignments of different values to behaviour outcomes would then influence the behaviour of those people most interested in those specific values.

(ii) Organisational variables may affect behaviour through evaluation of the self and others, and this in turn influence behaviour. There are both physiological and psychological variables associated with this evaluation process.

(iii) Also these organisational factors work as stimuli, so as to influence an individuals arousal level which is a motivational variable directing behaviour. The level of arousal will directly affect the level of activation and hence performance.

(iv) This organisational variables influence the behaviour of the individuals to form a perception of the organisation. This perception then influences the behaviour in turn.

Thus, the organisational climate influences the way an individual in the
organisation behaves. This climate consists of total organisational factors, including its authority pattern, leadership pattern and communicational pattern which as a whole influences the behaviour.

As climate is defined as the perceived attributes of an organisation and its subsystems as reflected in the way an organisation deals with its members, groups and issues. One conceptual framework of climate (Litwin & Stringer, 1968) emphasise motivational linkages in the following manner:

(i) ACHIEVEMENT:

This motive is characterised by concern for excellence; competition in term of the standards set by others or by oneself; the setting of challenging goals for oneself awareness of the obstacles that might be encountered in attempting to achieve these goals; and persistence in trying alternative paths to one's goals.

(ii) EXPERT INFLUENCE:

This motive is characterised by a concern for making an impact on others; a desire to make people do what one thinks is right; and an urge to change situations and develop people.

(iii) CONTROL:

This is characterised by a concern for orderliness; a desire to be and stay and informed; an urge to monitor events and to take corrective action when needed; and a need to display personal power.

(iv) EXTENSION:

This is characterised by a concern for others; interest in subordinate goals; and an urge to be relevant and useful to large groups, including society.
(v) DEPENDENCY:

This motive is characterised by a derive for the assistance of others in developing oneself; a need to check with significant others (those who are more knowledgeable or have higher status, experts, close associates and so on); a tendency to submit ideas or proposals or approval; and an urge to maintain a relationship based on the other person's approval.

(vi) AFFILIATION:

This is characterised by a concern for establishing and maintaining close, personal relationships: an emphasis on friendship; and a tendency to express one's emotions.
SOCIAL SUPPORT

The study of social support was derived from epidemiological and public health models of disease that were applied in psychological phenomena, the literature on stressful life events was used to operationalise noxious environmental factors and social support was sized upon as the appropriate representative of psychological assets or resources. Social support has long been a topic of study and theory in organisational psychology even before occupational stress became a topic of frequent study in this field. Versions of social support went disguised under norms such as supervisor support, leader consideration, and group cohesiveness, etc. Regardless of this, support is a stress reducer. As a form of hygienic management, support helps to reduce the feelings of dissatisfaction and oppression that many workers feel when they are confronted by the pressure, rigidities and strilities of their jobs.

Social support, like stress, is a concept that everyone understand in general sense but it gives rise to many conflicting definitions and ideas when we get down to specifies. Social support has been implicitly or explicitly central in earlier literary, religious, sociological, psychological and medical thought. Social support is the amount of perceived helpfulness derived from social relationships. It can be determined by both the quality and quantity of individual's social relations. It has different names like love, caring, friendships, a sense of community, social integration. Definitions of social support have been inconsistent, diverse, vague and even contradictory (Beehr, 1985b; House, 1981). Different researchers and writers have given different definitions according to their perceptions and findings. As many studies have been carried out to find its effect on stress, strains, and relationships among
people, that may be supervisors, co-workers, non-work sources like spouses, family and friends, etc.

Lin, Simeone, Ensel, and Kuo (1979) define social support as support that is social. Social support may also be defined "as support accessible to an individual through social ties to other individuals and groups". The information, classification, assistance, and reassurance that an individual receives from others is called social support (Cobb, 1976; Cobb & Erbe, 1978; Caplan, 1979; Goltilieb, 1981, 1983; S. Cohen and McKay, 1984).

Regardless, social support has also been defined as "interpersonal transactions that include one or more of the following key elements effects, affirmation and aid". Social support is an exchange of resources that takes place between at least two people, usually members of the same social network (Shumaker et al., 1984). Most people name friends or immediate family members as their supporters, especially female friends, relatives and particularly relative of about the same age.

Social support in the work context varies from simple reassurance to sharing information for solving work problems. Coworkers often are helpful with objective job problems, for which they can provide facts and opinions, and with career development concerns (Burke, Weir & Duncan, 1976).

Social support has been conceptualized as structural integration into a social network of relationships as well as functional resources provided as part of ongoing interpersonal relationships (Cohen & Syme, 1985; House & Kahn, 1985; Barrera, 1986; Cutona, 1986), and these two approaches seem to represent sociological and psychological perspectives respectively.
As Vaun (1988) noted "People assist each other in an astonishing variety of ways", and most of these have been labelled social support at one time or another.

Social support has been identified as a moderator of stress in stress research (Cohen & Syne, 1985; Greenglass, 1993; Greenglass, Fiksenbaum & Burke, 1996; Marshall & Barnett, 1992; Sud & Prabha, 1987, Sud, 1998). Generally it is proposed that having supporting relationship to rely on can help people in dealing with stressful situations. These who lack such relationship are vulnerable to the effect of stress (Burke, Shearer & Deszca, 1984, Cummins, 1990; Dollard & Winefield, 1995, Greenglass et al. 1996; Leiter, 1998a, 1991; Richardson, Burke & Leiter, 1992). Main sources of social support have been identified as supervisor, co-worker, spouse, friend and family (Beebr, King & King, 1990; Greenglass et al., 1996; Russell et al. 1987).

**TYPES OF SOCIAL SUPPORT**

There is growing recognition that social support is a complex, multifaceted phenomenon. Payne and Jones (1987) have distinguished different facets or dimensions of social support; the sources of support, the content or type of support, the disposition of support, the evaluation of support and the direction of support. Several theorists argued that supportive actions can be divided into different types of assistance or resources (Barrera & Ainalay, 1983; House 1983; Lin, Dean & Ensel, 1981; Moos & Mitchell, 1982; Turner, 1983). The implication being that the different types may play different roles in dealing with challenging events. In their review of the literature on social support, Cohne and Wills (1985) identified 4 major types of support that have appeared in the previous research literature:
(a) emotional support, the expression of feelings that a person is well-regarded and valued;

(b) instrumental or material support, the provision of financial and material resources, as well as actual assistance toward completing a task;

(c) informational support, the giving of a device intended to help a person understand his or her situation; and

(d) companionship, involvement with others in leisure or recreational activities.

Though Cohen and Wills (1985) divided social support into two categories, structural and functional. Here, their review was of general life stressors, however, rather than being focused on work-related stressors. Structural social support referred to the existence of a social network within which the person was embedded, for example the existence of connections of the person with neighbours, relatives and community organisations. In this regard, most employees have some structural social support. That is, they are usually part of an organised set of people who have relationship with each other.

Functional support refers to definitions and measures of social support requiring an indication that the socially supportive person or people serve as a function for the focal person. Examples of such functions include the provision of esteem, information, or companionship, or being instrumental for the accomplishment of the focal person's tasks.

Virtually previous studies of social support in relation to work related stress have used functional measures of social support. Both emotional and tangible support, are forms of functional support (Caplan et al., 1975). Of the two,
emotional support is the one that most people think of when the term social support is mentioned, as it would help to alleviate the effect of occupational stress better. Thus, when questions asked about different types of social support, such as a supervisor these types are usually strongly correlated. There are several studies in which this was found (e.g. Caplan et al. 1975; Kaufmann and Beehr, 1986, 1989; Mattimore, 1990), and it has become common to combine these types of support, thus keeping the source of social support separate but not the types of support in occupational stress studies (e.g. Dunseath & Beehr 1991; Ganster et al., 1986).

Several studies have consistently demonstrated buffering effects for different types of support (Cohen & Hoberman, 1983; Hill, 1987b; Paykel, Emms, Fletcher & Rassaby, 1980). Different types of support have been shown with different impact upon the self-perception of physical health by high and low affiliative need individuals (Hill, 1987b). In this, latter study; more tangible, instrumental support uniformly buffer the self-perceived physical health of all individuals, regardless of affiliative need. Whereas, less tangible support, a composite of emotional, informational and companionship support, benefited only low affiliative need individuals. High affiliative need individuals, on the other hand, tended to experience somewhat of an opposite effect, meaning that they experienced lower levels of symptoms under conditions of greater negative life events, especially when they receive less social support.

The differential influence of the two types of support was interpreted in terms of the proposal made by Lefcourt and his colleagues (1984) that low affiliative need individuals tend to view interpersonal resources in a more
instrumental way than high affiliative need individuals. All forms of potentially helpful input from others presumably are treated as instrumental coping resources and contribute effectively to attempts by low affiliative need individuals to eliminate or manage the source of stress. In contrast, high affiliative need individuals are assumed to perceive less tangible forms of social support.

The content of social support has been classified into various categories in the following manner such as, Caplan and others (1985) distinguished affect, affirmation and aid as types of support. Curtona (1986) have identified esteem, information, social integration, and tangible as types of support. While House (1981) observed emotional, instrumental, informational and appraisal as types of support. Although there is considerable overlap among these approaches, it is clear that some researchers make distinctions that others chosen not to make. Moreover, different types of support from the same person tend to be highly inter-correlated (House & Kahn, 1985) and all types of support are perceived to have an emotional component (Barling, MacEwen and Pratt, 1988). Parasuraman et al. (1992) distinguished tangible support from emotional support. Tangible support includes information, advice and suggestions (informational) as well as aid in time, money or other forms of tangible help (instrumental). Emotional support includes the provision of esteem, affection and trust (emotional) as well as feedback and affirmation (appraisal).

FUNCTIONS OF SOCIAL SUPPORTS

Social support can affect work stress and directly enhance health and well-being because it meets important human needs for security, social contacts,
approval, belongingness and affection. Its function can be illustrated by the following figure.

![Diagram of social support functions](image)

Fig. 7. Functions of social support

- Arrow 1 - Health sustaining function
- Arrow 2 - Stress prevention function.
- Arrow 3 - Buffering function.

The figure indicates three roles of social support in the stress process. The "health sustaining" (Shumaker & Brownell, 1984) function of social support, represented by arrow-1 in figure, reflects a positive main effect of support on well-being. This main effect has been observed consistently in the literature, and presumably reflects the impact of social support on the recipients affiliative satisfaction, sense of self identity, feeling of self-work and self esteem stability (Shumaker & Brownell, 1984; Cohen & Wills, 1985). The main effect of support on well-being occurs regardless of the level of stress experienced by the individual.

The "Stress prevention" function of social support, represented by arrow-2 is a negative main effect of support on the stressor. In this role, social support reduces the environmental pressures that produce the stress in the first place. For e.g. cognizant of the pressure generated by a project with a tight deadline, a supportive supervisor might provide additional staff help to an employee that makes the work demands more manageable and prevents the resultant feelings of overload. Although the stress prevention perspective does not
seem to be as widely adopted as the health sustaining perspective. There is evidence suggesting that social support can reduce the level of stress in the work environment (Beehr, 1985; Ganster, Fusilier & Mayes, 1986; Fusilier, Ganster & Mayes, 1987) and in the family environment (Parasuraman et al., 1992).

The "buffering" function of social support, represented by arrow-3, reflects moderating effect of support on the relationship between stress and well-being. The buffering hypotheses proposes that support weakens or attenuates the negative relationship between stress and well-being, thereby, protecting an individual from the severe consequences of stress. In this role, support directly affects neither stress nor well-being but rather the relationship between stress and well-being. It is believed that support acts as a buffer because it enhances the recipients cognitive and behavioural coping abilities that enables the recipient to manage the stressful situation more effectively (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Pearlin, 1985). Because of the enhancement of coping skills that are responsible to a particular stressful situation, the buffering perspective - unlike the health sustaining perspective assets that support only promotes well-being in the presence of high levels of stress.

Empirical research provides inconsistent support for the buffering hypotheses despite its intuitive appeal. For e.g. although the work stress literature has revealed despite occasional support for the buffering prediction (Fusillier, Ganster & Mayes, 1987), many studies have observed either no buffering effect or "reverse buffering". These inconsistent findings have led some researchers to conclude that buffering should occur only when there is an "optimal match" between the types of stress experienced and the types or
source of support provided (Beehr, 1985; Cohen & Syme, 1985; Pearling, 1985; Cutiona and Russell, 1990). Since different types of stress require different coping skills, "there must be a reasonable match between the coping requirements and the available support in order for buffering to occur" (Cohen & Will, 1985).

MODELS OF SOCIAL SUPPORT

Social support is a flow of emotional concern, instrumental aid, information and for appraisal (information relevant to self-evaluation) between people. It is determined by both the quantity and quality of an individuals social relationships. This can be illustrated by the following figure.

![Flow model of the mechanism of Social support](image)

Fig. 8. A flow model of the mechanism of Social support
As figure shows, one's support network must be perceived before it can be used. Support networks has been evolved the following sources:

(a) Cultural norms
(b) Social institutions
(c) Companies,
(d) groups, or
(e) individuals.

For example, there is more cultural emphasis as caring for the elderly in Japan than in America. Japanese culture is thus a strong source of social support for older Japanese people. Alternatively, individuals may fall back on social institutions such as social security or the American Red cross, religious groups, or family and friends for support. In turn, these various sources provide again 4-types of support:

* Esteem Support : Providing information that a person is accepted and respected despite any problems or inadequacies.

* Informational Support : Providing help in defining, understanding and coping with problems.

* Social companionship : Spending time with others in leisure and recreational activities.

* Instrumental Support : Providing financial aid, material resources, or needed services.

If social support is perceived as available, an individual then decides whether or not to use it. Generally, support is used for one or two purposes. The first
purpose is very broad in scope. Global social support, encompassing the total amount of support available from the four sources, is applicable to any situation at any time. The narrower functional social support buffers the effects of stressors or stress in specific situation. When relied on it the wrong situation, functional social support is not very helpful, for e.g. if you lost your job, unemployment compensation (instrumental support) would be a better buffer than sympathy from a bartender. On the other hand, social companionship would be more helpful than instrumental support in coping with loneliness. After social support is engaged for one or both of these purposes, its effectiveness can be determined. If consolation or relief is not experienced, it may be that the type of support was inappropriate. The feedback loop in the figure, from the effect of social support back to perceived availability, reflects the need to fall back on other sources of support when necessary.

Another model based on the uncertainty approach to occupational stress has been offered by Beehr (1985b).

Fig. 9. Effects of instrumental and emotional social support in the context of job stress.
A - Main effect of instrumental social support on job stressors.
B - Main effect of emotional social support on strains.
C - Buffering effect of emotional social support on the relationship between job stressors and strains.

(+) or (-) → indicates the direction of the effect, i.e. increasing (+) or decreasing (-) the strength of the variable.

Here the figure illustrate the proposed relationship between social support and this model of job stress. It addresses two types of social support that have been studied most often in occupational stress, instrumental (or tangible) and emotional, and it allows for all of the types of effects of social support on the stress process that are discussed here: direct effects on job stressors, direct effects on individual's strains, and buffering effects on the relationship between job stressors and strains. The arrows in the model show the theoretically causal direction of relationships between variables, and the signs on the arrows (plus or minus) indicate the positive or negative direction for these causal relationships.

Instrumental support is proposed to have a main (direct) effect on the job stressors (arrow A), while emotional support is expected to have a direct effect on the employee's strains (arrow B). It has been noted that, measures of these two types of support are typically correlated with each other in non-experimental field studies. Because of this, it is unlikely that one would find instrumental support only related to job stressors and emotional support only related to the strains, but it would be expected from the model that instrumental support will have a stronger effect on job stressors than emotional support and that emotional support will have a stronger effect on strains than instrumental support.
A further reason why instrumental support should be related to strains is that it is related to them indirectly through its effect on the intervening variables of uncertainty and importance. Instrumental support from people who have the power to affect stressors is more likely to have this effect that instrumental support from people who do not really have such power. The most important source of instrumental support will vary according to what the stressor is, but on the average, one might expect that the supervisor's instrumental support would be the more important. This is because on the average, the supervisor is formally more powerful in the work situation than the other sources typically studied (co-workers, and family and friends).

Emotional support, on the other hand, is proposed to have a main effect on strains. It seems intuitively obvious that providing comfort and sympathy to people could put them at case figuratively and literally, and this could be an operational definition of emotional social support. As noted earlier there does seem to be a main effect of social support on emotional or psychological strains, and this model proposes that the emotional type of support does this quite directly.

Using the Beehr (1985b) model, the buffering effect is expected to occur mainly through the effects of emotional support on importance in the Beehr and Bhagat (1985b) model. This is proposed to happen through the effects of emotional social support on individual's values and needs (arrow C). The assumption is that the importance employees place on the outcomes in a given situation is in part a function of their need and values. The social information processing approach to organisational behaviour (e.g. Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978) holds that employee's needs are influenced by the information they
receive from other people. Since the definition of social support in past research has been so varied, it is easy to conclude that it could take the form of providing information about what needs are appropriate in the situation.

But one obvious problem with testing this model is the previously noted problem of measuring the instrumental and emotional social supports independently. The typically strong empirical relationship between the two types of support makes it difficult to come up with very different results for them. The only subsequently direct test of parts of this model has been a study by Fenlason and Beehr (in press). They used the commonly employed global emotional and instrumental social support measures of Caplan et al. (1975) and found that the difference between eight of the twelve pairs were significantly different. Each of three sources of emotional support (supervisors, co-workers, and extra-organizational sources) was correlated both with (two) job stressors and a psychological strain, and each of the three sources of instrumental support was also correlated both with (two) job stressors and a psychological strain. Of the six correlations between emotional support and job stressors, five were weaker (less negative) than the correlation between the corresponding emotional support and psychological strain, but only one difference was significant. Only three of the six pairs of correlations were in the predicted direction for the instrumental support indices, however, one of which was significant. This part of the model is probably worth further research, but the first attempt by Fenlason and Beehr met with only modest success (The development of more accurate measurement of the types of social support could be an important breakthrough).
EFFECTS OF SOCIAL SUPPORT

There are three general types of effects that have been proposed for social support in conjunction with occupational stress (Beehr, 1985b; Beehr and McGrath, in press). The first is a main effect of social support on stressors, i.e. social support might reduce the harmful effects of job stressors by reducing the strength of the stressors themselves. The second is a main effect of social support on strains; social support, in this view, would directly reduce the strength of the aversive effects of stressors on the person. The third contention is that there is some type of interaction effect. The most commonly proposed interaction effect in the job stress literature is the interaction between job stressors and social support to affect the level of strains.

(I) MAIN EFFECTS OF SOCIAL SUPPORT ON JOB STRESSORS:

Of the 3 types of effects that social support might have, its effects on job stressors have been explicitly studied the least. Most of the occupational stress studied, have used non-experimental field methods, and some of them report correlation among most or all of the variables in the study. Among the studies that did report these correlations, about 38 to 60 correlations between job stressors and social support were significant (P<0.05), but the median correlation was only -0.22 (Beehr, 1976; Beehr and Drexler, 1986; Beehr et al. 1990; Etzion, 1984; Ganster et al. 1986; La Racco and Jones, 1978; Marcelissen et al. 1988; Seers et al. 1983).

In a study of 181 employees of a small midwestern city, Caplan et al. (1975) three sources of social support (i.e. supervisor, co-worker and organisational) and six job stressors (role conflict, role ambiguity,
quantity of workload, work variability, underutilization of skills and responsibility for others) were measured (Dunseath and Beehr, 1991).

Beehr (1985b) hypothesised that instrumental or tangible support might affect the stressors more than emotional supports. Tangible supports are, by definition, often aimed at materially helping with problems experienced in the situation. One of the major situational problems during occupational stress episodes is the stressor itself. It would be tangible social support, for example, to help the stressed people get the jobs tasks done at a time during which they are overloaded. This would materially relieve the overload (the stressor).

A second hypothesis is that support offered from the source of the stressor might be more helpful than support offered from other sources. If the co-workers are the sources of stressors, for e.g. and they offer social support, this might be especially appreciated and tension-relieving of the focal employee.

A third hypothesis about the potential for specificity of social supports effects on job stressors is that the social support from the supervisor might be more effective in reducing stressors than social support from other sources would be. This is based on the more general hypothesis that support offered by more powerful people is more important than support offered by less powerful people when one experiences stressors in the workplace. The supervisor is the sources of support with the most formal power among the sources usually studied in workplace stress research. However, one might hypothesize that support from people in the organisational hierarchy above the supervisor would be even more effective at reducing stressors.
(ii) MAIN EFFECTS OF SOCIAL SUPPORT ON INDIVIDUAL STRAINS:

Some of the earliest thinking and observations about general stress (not job stress, necessarily) and social support concerned the potential effects of social support on individual's strains. Social support was often offered by researchers sometimes as a post-hoc explanation, for the relatively good health (i.e. lack of strains) of people who were married, had friends or co-workers and so forth in various stress studies (House, 1981).

In the occupational stress research domain, both House (1981) and Beehr (1985b) concluded that many studied of social support have reported positive main effect of social support on individual strains, but this has been most consistent with psychological strains. In a set of social supports and strains, about thirty five of fifty three correlations between social support and types of psychological outcomes were significant (Beehr, 1976; Beehr and Drexler, 1986; Beeher et al., 1990; Chisholm et al., 1986; Etzion, 1984; Gonsler et al., 1986; Seers et al. 1983). In a study by Dunseath and Beehr (1991) utilizing 3 social supports emotional and instrumental combined for supervisor, co-workers, and others) and three possible psychological outcomes (life dissatisfaction, job dissatisfaction, and depression). Seven of nine correlations were significant.

Eight of the ten (Beehr, 1976; Beehr and Drexler, 1986; Beehr et al. 1990; Chisholm et al., 1986; Seers et al., 1983; Gansler et al. 1986; La Rocco and Jones, 1978; Kaufmam and Beehr, 1989). Studies included various types of satisfaction measures as psychological outcomes. Satisfaction had a median correlation of about +0.15 with the various types of social support. Variety of
psychological strains has also been studied in relation to social support. Psychological strains include measures of things such as depression, self-esteem, anxiety and burnout. Studies cited above (Beehr, 1976; Beehr et al. 1990; Chisholm et al., 1986; Etzion, 1984; Ganster et al. 1986; La Rocco and ones, 1978; Kaufmann and Beehr, 1989; Marcelissen et al. 1988) has seen measures.

(III) INTERACTIVE EFFECTS OF SOCIAL SUPPORT:

The most interesting hypothesis about social support and occupational stress is that social support interacts with occupational stressors to affect individual stories. This is the buffering hypothesis that Ganster et al. (1986) called the dominant hypothesis regarding social support and occupational stress.

THE BUFFERING HYPOTHESIS

The buffering hypothesis has been described and tested in a few different ways when considering both the job stress and life stress literature. Here the figure, shows the typical buffering effect that would be expected in occupational stress research. The fact that the low social support line is above the high social support line indicates the main or direct effect of social support on strains.

![Fig. 10. Social support's expected buffering effect in occupational stress](image-url)
The key for the buffering hypothesis, however, is the difference in slopes between the high and low social support groups. Buffering is usually defined in the occupational stress literature as the finding of a more positive relationship between stressors and strains at higher levels, of social support than at lower levels of social support (Beehr, 1985b; House, 1981). Somehow, the causal link between job stressors and individual strains is broken, or at least lessened, by having supportive others. The low social line in the figure represents the situation for most people experiencing occupational stress, but the high social support line shows no relationship or at least a less strong relationship. The presence of social support is said to buffer or protect the person from the experience of strains in the presence of what would otherwise be stressful job situation.

Cohen and Wills (1985) reviewed the literature on social support and life stress, but in a subsection of that article, they concluded that the occupational stress literature provided considerable support for the buffering model, even though they reviewed only 3 studies (House and Wells, 1978; La Rocco et al., 1980; La Rocco and Jones, 1978) of which two supported the buffering hypothesis. In the same year, Beehr (1985b) reviewed seven occupational stress studies (Beehr, 1976; Blau, 1981; House and Wells, 1978; La Racco et al., 1980; House's 1981 graphing of Cobb and Kasl's 1977; and two studies that were unpublished at that time but subsequently published as Kaufmann and Beehr, 1986, 1989) two of which were in common with Coben and Wills, and concluded that the evidence regarding the buffering hypothesis is mixed.

The dominant social support hypothesis has been that it buffers the impact of stressors on manifestation of strains. Most authors have used the term in a
consistent with the explicit definition of La Rocco, House and French (1980). Social support is hypothesized to interact with stressors such that the relation between stress and strain is stronger for persons with low levels of social support than for those with high levels of support. In other words, social support moderates the stress-strain relation. It is important to distinguish between the terms moderate and mediate, because both have been used in reference to the buffering effect. In this context the term buffering role of social support refers to a moderating effect, which could be used interchangeably.

Findings have been inconsistent. Several studies report evidence of the moderating effect (Abdel-Halim, 1982; Gore, 1978; House McMichael, Wells, Kaplan and Landerman, 1979; Karasea, Triantis, and Chaudry, 1982; Kobasa & Puccetti, 1983; LaRocco et al., 1980; Lefcourt, Martin and Saleh, 1984; Saudler and Lakey, 1982; Seers, McGee, Serey and Gram, 1983; Wilcox, 1981). Many of these investigation, however, did not find consistent effects across different -

(a) stressors and indexes of strain,
(b) sources of support, and
(c) personal characteristics of the subjects.

For e.g. La Rocco et al. (1980) reported that social support moderated the effects of stressors on health outcomes such as depression and somatic complaints, but they found no evidence of the effect on job-related strains such as job dissatisfaction and boredom. Kobasa and Puccetti (1983) reported that support from the boss buffered the effect of critical life events on illness
symptoms but that support from the family did not. Sandler and Lakey (1982) found social support buffered the impact of critical life events on depression and anxiety for persons with an internal locus of control but not for those with an external locus of control.

In sum, the evidence of moderating effects is equivocal, suggesting that their existence may depend on the source of support, the recipients, the stressors and strains.

In addition to the studies that to some extent support buffering effects, other investigations have not (Aneshensel and Stone, 1982; Blau, 1981; Ganellen & Blaney, 1984; Lin, Simone, Ensel & Kuo, 1979; Turner, 1981). Still others have reported what might be termed opposite buffering effects. That is, social support appeared to exacerbate the effects of stressors on strains for eg. Beehr (1976) noted that work group support tended to increase the impact of role ambiguity on job dissatisfaction. Similar opposite buffering findings were reported by Abdel-Halim (1982) and Kobasa and Puccetti (1983).
Chapter - II

Review of Literature
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter review of literature would create maximum awakening among us regarding existing trend of research on burnout vis-a-vis organisation role stress, organisational climate and social support among middle managers of public and private undertakings.

Review of literature implies locating, reading and evaluating reports of earlier conducting reports of earlier conducted researches causal observation and opinion that are related to the researchers planned academic program. A systematic survey of literature has many advantages in the following manner:

(a) It gives insite and relevant information about the field under study.

(b) It projects new thoughts and ideas for future research in the concerned area.

(c) It also provides the opportunity to compare different aspects of social setups of the field in which research is being carried out.

In the light of above points, this chapter is set to deal with relevant studies and researches which sets light on the variables, which are used the present study.

BURNOUT

Burnout is a chronic state of emotional exhaustion stemming from an unrelenting series of job-pressure and stress. Number of studies have been carried out in this direction. Before 1980s a sizeable amount of research work on various burnout issues has been carried by following well-known researcher:
Schwartz and Will (1961) observed staff burnout and recorded changes in staff and patient behaviour on a mental hospital patients. Staff burnout increased sharply because of organisational changes occurring in the settings. The researchers found that as staff burnout increased, the patients were neglected and soon regressed, becoming more anxious, depressed, suicidal and violent. A similar study was conducted by Scotland and Kobler (1965).


Burnout have been studied in a variety of service professions, including business organisation employees by Golembiewski, Munzenrider and Carter (1983), among lawyers by Maslach & Jackson (1978), police officers also by Maslach & Jackson (1979), health and mental professionals by Maslach & Jackson (1982), Pines (1978), Raquepaw and Miller (1989) and teachers by Anderson and Iwaniki (1984), beck and gargiulo (1983).
Wax and Hales (1984) found that burnout among school principals involved the following six factors: expectations, relationship, motivation, fulfilment, psycho-physical status and time. Based on these six factors, they developed a scale for measuring burnout on school principals, that they applied and validated (Wax and Hales, 1987).

Cunningham (1982) and Farber & Miller (1981) found that teachers burnout is one of the reason for the increasing numbers of competent teachers who leave the class rooms for alternative careers. Russell, Altmaier and Velze (1987) studied the effects of job-related stressful events and social support on burnout among teachers. Teachers burnout has been the topic of investigation as reflected in the numerous studies conducted in different countries in US by Farber (1984a), McIntyre (1984), in UK by Blase (1982), Capel (1987, 1989), in Israel by Kremer & Hofman (1985), in Hong Kong by Mo (1991).

Frank (1983) conducted a research in the area of administrative stress. He found that administrators were experiencing the following factors which were playing a critical role in burnout and job-related stress (i) administrative constraints, (2) organisational structure and climate, (3) relationship at work, (4) role expectation, and (5) career development. Glogow (1984) conducted a research on personnel organisations in Los Angeles, California, amongst 103 individual and observed that burnout was a problem with 41% of the respondents and upper management was considered to be a major source of burnout.

Fuehrer and McGonagle (1988) studied the individual and situational factor as predictors of burnout among resident assistants.
Friedman & Lotan (1985) studied the source of burnout in teaching, the teacher is perceived as a person exposed to pressures stemming from a variety of sources. A teacher's ability to withstand the pressures explains the level of her or his burnout. Farber (1982), schwab & Iwanicki (1982) found burnout related to background variables such as sex, age, education and experience in teaching. Etzion (1984) studied the moderating effect of social support on the relationship between life, work stresses and burnout. Participants in the study were 657 Israeli managers and human service professionals. The initial analysis revealed that women experienced more burnout and stress in life as compared to their counterparts. Burnout was positively correlated with stress in both work and life and negatively correlated with social support in life and in work.

Hock (1988) studied the professional burnout among public school teachers. The results indicated that there was a wide variation in the degree of burnout. No difference were found in susceptibility of burnout due to demographic variables such as age, grade level, subject taught or years of experience. Hendrix, Antrell and Steel (1988) examined the effect of social support on burnout, with the following results. It was found that job stress and life stress correlated positively with burnout, while job and life support were negatively correlated with burnout, neither job support nor life support moderated job stress or life stress burnout relationship. Females exhibited significantly higher levels of burnout, job stress and life stress than males, however, there was no difference between male and females in the amount of social support received.
Hale and Pratt (1988) examined the difference in nursing burnout by occupational level. The result showed para-professional subjects significantly higher as two dimension of burnout (i.e. emotional exhaustion and depersonalization) than professional subjects. In addition, para-professional subjects perceived less support in their work environment than did professional subjects. Subjects working in long term care facilities experienced emotional exhaustion more frequently than did subjects working in acute care facilities. Lemken, Purdy, Refferty and Rudisill (1988) studied the correlate of burnout among family practice residents. The result showed a few significant relationship between background and situational factors and burnout scores.

Topj (1989) studied the personality hardiness, occupational stress and burnout. Findings of the study provide partial support for hypothesis that greater hardiness would be associated with less stress and burnout. Support was not found for the hypothesis that greater stress would be linked with greater burnout.

Burke and Kirchmeyer (1990) supported Cherniss's hypothesis that people who begin their careers with a social activist's orientation run the greatest risk of experiencing a negative work setting, highened stress, reduced work standards and poor emotional and physical well being. Finding suggest a poor fit between the social activists orientation and actual realities of the police work setting.

Miller, Eillis, Zook and Lyles (1990) studied an integrated model of communication, stress and burnout in the work place. Participants in decision-making and social support had important impact on perceived
work place stress, burnout, satisfaction and commitment for care givers and support personnel. Perception on participation in the decision making process was particularly crucial in reducing role stress and increasing perception of satisfaction and personal accomplishment for hospital care givers. Lee and Ashforth (1990) examined the dimensionality of Maslach's (1982) three aspects of job burnout, namely, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment among a sample of supervisors and managers in the human services. The three aspects were found to be differently related to other variables reflecting aspects of strain, stress coping, and self-efficacy in predictable and meaningful ways.

Manning (1991) found that two of the three sub-scale of Maslach's burnout inventory (emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment) was significantly related to stress. Professors who published three or more articles per year and contributed 29% or more of their time to research experienced burnout more than who devoted less of their time to research. Stress and burnout were not found to be related to gender, age, marital status, the presence of children in the house, faculty rank or teaching load. Bacharach et al. (1991) examined an unmediated model of work based role stress and its consequences on job satisfaction and burnout to two models in which the role stress-affective work outcome relationship is mediated by work-home conflict across two sample of public sector professional : engineers and nurses. The model findings indicate that a model in which role conflict and overload have both direct and indirect effects viz. work home conflict on the job burnout and satisfaction. Findings suggest that while two
of the work-home relationship differently, for both groups, work-based role conflict is an important antecedent of work-home conflict, and increased burnout an important direct consequence of work-home conflict.

Cherniss (1992) explored the relationship between degree of burnout experienced during the first year of the career and career adaptation the next-decade. Subjects were human service professionals originally working in the fields of public service law, public health nursing, high school teaching, or mental health. They were studied during the first year of their careers and again 12 years later. Results showed that subjects who were more burned-out early in their careers were less likely to change careers and more flexible in their approach to work as rated by confidants at the time of follow-up. The result suggests that early career burnout does not seem to lead to any significant, negative, long-term consequences. However, burnout occurring later in the career might have more serious - long term effects.

Friedman et al. (1992) investigated the relationship of teacher burnout to the various ways that teachers view themselves professional and to the ways in which they sense that others within the educational system view them. Findings indicate the following results: (i) the three dimensions of professional self-concept used in the study. The factors of professional satisfaction - how teachers feel about the gratification they receive from their work - bore the strongest negative correlation to burnout; (ii) among the possible discrepancies regarding scores on the self concept dimensions, the discrepancy between teacher's view of themselves as
professionally competent and professionally satisfied bore the strongest correlation to burnout; (iii) stronger correlation to burnout existed in terms of how teacher's perceive themselves rather than how they feel others perceive them; (iv) from teacher's perspective, students have a more accurate view of their overall professional self-concept than do parents or principals; (v) teacher's perceptions of how students view them bore a stronger relationship of burnout than did perceptions how either students parents or their principals view them; and (vi) from teacher's point of view, both parents and principals have an exaggerated sense of teachers professional satisfaction, discrepancies that both cases bore significant correlation with burnout.

Lee et al. (1993) examined a model of managerial burnout among human service supervisors and managers. Their findings suggest that emotional exhaustion play a central mediating role in the burnout process. Furthermore, they found that social support and direct control were associated with exhaustion through role stress. Research on burnout among managers, including school principals was conducted by Cooper and Kelly (1993), Lee and Ashforth (1993) and Whitaker (1992). Cordes and Dougherty (1993) theorized burnout as a process or syndrome of responses, and suggested sequential relationships among the dimensions. They also investigated the relationship between the burnout components and several critical variables that are theoretically linked to the phenomenon.

Cordes and Dougherty (1993) reviewed the literature on the burnout and provided a conceptual framework designed to improve the understanding
of burnout. Capner and Caltabiano (1993) studied the factors affecting the progression towards burnout. They compared 49 professional and 32 volunteer counsellors and a number of key variables in the progression of burnout - including stressors, strains, defensive coping, social support, type A personality and breakdown. Questionnaire responses revealed job stressors unique to each group, but there was overwhelming evidence for professionals and volunteers belonging to a homogeneous counselling population as evidenced by similarity across major constructs.

Sandoval (1993) studied personality and burnout among school psychologist. He examined the relationship between personality characteristics, as measured by the California Psychological Inventory, and burnout as measured by the Maslach Burnout inventory among 100 school psychologists. Subjects with well-integrated personalities were less prone to burnout than others.

Corrigan et al. (1993) studied staff burnout in a psychiatric hospital. They investigated the relationship between staff anxiety and collegial support and burnout in 35 staff member of psychiatric hospitals. The directionality of these relationships was inferred using a cross-lagged panel designs. Subjects completed measures of burnout, social support and anxiety twice - 8 months apart. Findings from 1st cross-lagged panel suggested that emotional exhaustion caused state anxiety and 2nd cross-lagged panel showed lack of collegial support caused due to depersonalization.

Manlove (1993) studied multiple correlates of burnout in child care workers. Hierarchial multiple regression was used to assess the extent to which personality, background, characteristics and perception of work
setting were associated with three factors of burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment). Neuroticism, work role conflict and work ambiguity were positively associated with higher level of burnout. Higher levels of organisationals commitment were associated with less emotional exhaustion and greater personal accomplishment. Those reporting better supervisor and co-worker relations as well as more autonomy at work reported lower levels of depersonalization. Those with more education/training and work experience reported higher levels of personal accomplishment.

Caldwell et al. (1994) differentiated between burnout and copout in organisations. They argued that burnout and copout are two phenomenon that are often confused by public managers. Burnout is often used as a copout. A better understanding of the differences between the two is important to the managers who must deal with individuals suffering work productivity as well as more positive relationships between managers and the work force.

Savicki and Colley (1994) examined working conditions that lead to burnout among workers working in child protective service (CPS) and found that work environment and three dimensions of MBI were significant by related to increased burnout. Van et al. (1994) studied burnout among general practitioners. They investigated the relationship of harassment by patients, feelings of inequality, and social support on burnout in 567 Dutch C1P4. Burnout inventory and LISREL-VII was used to test on a prior specified linear structural equation model that was based on equity theory. Gross (1994) conducted a pilot study of the contribution
of empathy to burnout in salivation army officers. He examined the hypothesis that emotional empathy rather than cognitive empathy is associated with burnout, using 71 salivation army officers.

Nowack et al. (1994) tried to explore differences in self-reported lifestyle habits, substance use (alcohol, drugs and smoking) and predictors of job burnout in 879 professional working women (aged 20-65 years) employed in dental health officer. Subjects with higher levels of drinking reported significantly lower quality over all lifestyle practices, eating nutrition habits and more frequent use of avoidant coping strategies in the face of work and life hassles compared to non-drinkers.

Deckard et al. (1994) assessed burnout among physicians in health maintenance organisations (HMOs) and examined the relationships between physicians burnout and personal, professional and organisation/work life factors by using Maslach Burnout inventory. Sonnentage and Sabine et al. (1994) studied stressor burnout relationship in software development teams. They hypothesis that in a technical profession, work stressors are related to burnout and this relationship is moderated by control at work, task requirements, and the quality of team interaction. In a sample of 180 software professionals from 29 software development projects, stressors were found to be positively related to burnout measure. Control of work, complexity at work, and openness to criticism within the team were all negatively related to lack of identification. Moderated regression analysis revealed that high cognitive requirements, high learning requirements, and low competition within the team enhanced the relationship between stressors and burnout.
Lamude & Scuelder (1994) studied burnout of teachers as related to influence tactics within the college classroom. Sample of 143 college teachers was taken. Burnout in subjects was positively related to pressure to exchange of rewards, rational argument and feed back tactics of influence. Singh, Jagdip, Goolsby, Jerry, Gary (1994) studied behavioural and psychological consequences of boundary spanning burnout for customer service representatives. They hypothesised to examine if burnout acts as a partial mediator between role stressor and key behavioural and psychological job outcomes. Survey responses from 351 customer service representatives revealed that burnout prone occupations (e.g. police, mental health workers) and that burnout has consistent significant and dysfunctional effect on their behavioural and psychological outcomes. Moreover, burnout mediates the negative effects of role stressors on job outcomes, whereas the positive effect of role stressors are unmediated.

Dolan (1995) studied organisational and social determinants of managerial burnout. And focused on several aspects of the proposed relationships between job/organisational demands. Personal characteristics, social support and burnout for managerial settings. The purpose of the study was (i) to ascertain the relative impact of the job environment (i.e. organisational factor) Vs individuals differences (i.e. personality traits) in predicting managerial burnout, and (2) empirically test the role of social support in buffering managerial burnout. Sample of 224 senior executives was taken from different private sectors.

Friedman (1995) conducted a study on school principal burnout. He used facet theory to identify the unique components of burnout among 571
Israeli elementary and secondary school principals by using a questionnaire. The results showed that burnout was present among school principal. They experienced exhaustion, self-discontent, aloofness and depression. Yaniv (1995) presented a model of burnout process that derives a positive relationship between absenteeism and over-employment under stress conditions. Applying this connection to a firm's cost-minimization problem, it is shown that burnout induced absence produce a Kink in the labour cost function, as a result of which the firm will employ less overtime per worker and more worker in the presence of absenteeism than in its absence. This result substantially modifies R.G. Ehrenberg's (1970) conclusion that a rational economic response to a certain absentee rate involve increasing overtime per employee, while the effect on the number of workers is ambiguous. A list of parameters and variables related to burnout is appended.

Soderfeldt et al. (1995) reviewed 18 studies that reported findings on burnout in social worker viz-a-viz three questions - (i) whether social workers are burned out; (ii) what kind of factors are associated with burnout in social workers; and (iii) what should be done about burnout in social workers. Literature indicated that social workers suffers less burnout than comparable occupational groups. The methodological quality of the studies is analyzed and recommendation for improving research on burnout in social work are made. It is argued that the demand control support model of job stress should integrate the concept of burnout as a complementary outcome variable. Parker et al. (1995) examined how job stress and work support predict the experience of burnout and how burnout is related to absenteeism and job performance in a sample of 73 registered
nurses (aged 23-65 yrs.). Analyses suggest that level of burnout served as a mediator of the relationships between social support and self-rated job performance, absences for mental health reasons, and intentions to quit. The findings suggest that burnout not only may negatively affect health care but also may influence objective absenteeism and supervisor perception of employees performance.

Grosch and Olsen (1995), therapist burnout. They described a self psychology and systems perspective and offered suggestions for helping clinicians (in the mental health) prevent personal and professional burnout. Sahu and Misra (1995) attempt to find out relationship between life stress and burnout among female college teachers. Results reveal that stress experienced in family area is significantly and positively related with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization and negatively with personal accomplishment, while society related stress is found to be related with depersonalization only. Chan and Hui (1995) studied burnout and coping among Chinese secondary school teachers in Hong Kong. The tripartite components of burnout and eight coping strategies were assessed in a sample of 415 teachers of secondary school. Emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation were relatively undifferentiated among teachers, but a reduced sense of accomplishment as a distinct component of burnout was reported. The findings suggest that avoidant coping strategies were consistently related to all three aspect of burnout.

Pradhan et al. (1996) investigated the greater difference in type A behaviour pattern and its relationship with burnout among dual career medical professional couples. Results reveal moderate level of type-A
behaviour pattern but low levels of burnout among the subjects. No significant gender differences were found in the experience of burnout. Findings reveal that there is a significant gender difference in the relationship between type-A behaviour pattern and burnout, the relationship being stronger in case of female than male.

Van et al. (1996) investigated the relation between burnout and inequality as experienced by human service professionals. Two studies were conducted among 112 therapists working with inmates in a forensic psychiatric centre and among 189 staff members of an institute for the direct care of mentally disabled. Two type of inequality were examined - interpersonal inequality in the relations with recipients and inequality in relation with the organisations. The majority of the professionalism were felt under benefited in relation with recipients as well as organisation. Inequality was curvilinearly related to burnout, especially with the emotional exhaustion dimension. No gender effects were found for the distribution of inequality nor for the relation between inequality and burnout.

Medvene et al. (1996) assessed the relationship between burnout, communal orientation and leader's perceptions of balance in their relationship with group members. 102 self help group leaders were interviewed. Result showed that leaders had low-moderate level of burnout, measured by Maslach Burnout Inventory. Lee & Ashforth (1996) examined how demands and resource correlates behavioural and attitudinal correlates were related to each of the three dimension of burnout. They have found that both the demand and resource correlates were more
strongly related to emotional exhaustion than to either depersonalization or personal accomplishment consistent with the conservation of resources theory of stress, emotional exhaustion was more strongly related to the demand correlates than to the resource correlates, suggesting that workers might have been sensitive to the possibility of resources loss.

Wesolowski and Mossholder (1997) studied relational demography in supervisor-subordinate dyads and its impact on subordinate's job satisfaction, burnout and perceived procedural justice. Results showed that relational race was found to correlate with perceptions of procedural justice and job satisfaction, but not job burnout. Corders, Dougherty and Blum (1997) studied patterns of burnout among managers and professionals. Maslach burnout inventory was assessed on 354 human resource professionals. Results support the Maslach's three-factor sequential model of burnout and showed relationship between the burnout components and several theoretically linked variables and indicated significant paths between (a) role overload and emotional exhaustion, (b) non-contingent punishment and depersonalization, and (c) contingent rewards and personal accomplishment.

Zohar (1997) conducted a study by predicting burnout with a hassle-based measure of role demands. The data indicate that the new Role Hassles Index (RHI) shows substantial increment with regard to the MBI's exhaustion and depersonalization scales, but not in regard to self-accomplishment. Westman and Eden (1997) examined the relief from job stress and burnout afforded by a vacation respite among clerks. They have
found a decline in burnout during the vacation and a return to pre-vacation levels by the time of the second post-vacation measure.

Van Yperen (1998) studied informational support, equity and burnout as moderating effect of self-efficacy. The study was conducted among 114 maternity nurses. The results show that nurses with weak self-efficacy beliefs were apparently sensitive to the degree of informational support. While in contrast, nurses with strong self-efficacy beliefs feel equitably treated by the organization for which they worked even when they felt that they received relatively little informational support. The findings indicate that perceptions of inequity are accompanied by burnout symptoms.

Gilbar (1998) studied relationship between burnout and sense of coherence in health social workers. The main finding indicates that health social workers who have a strong sense of coherence experience less burnout than those with a weak sense of coherence. Male and May (1998) examined stress and health, workload and burnout among further education learning supporting co-ordinates. The results of the study have found that high level of worker is an evidence for heightened stress and stress cause burnout.

Kalliath et al. (1998) studied the relationship between dimensions of burnout and employee commitment to the organisation. The results show that low commitment contributes to the experience of burnout specifically in the case of nurses, commitment showed direct effects on emotional exhaustion and depersonalization and a weaker indirect effect on depersonalization. In case of laboratory technicians from the same organisation such relation was not significant. Pradhan (1998) discusses
various strategies to reduce work stress and burnout among employee in organizations. Results suggest that role characteristics, job characteristics, interpersonal relationship, organisational structure, climate and human resource management system as the source of burnout.

Kelly et al. (1999) studied stress and burnout among collegiate tennis coaches. Three alternative models of stress-mediated relationships between personal/situational variables (Hardiness, coaching issues, competitive level, gender, trait anxiety, initiating and consideration leadership styles) and burnout were examined. Analysis of the data revealed that the tennis coaches were suffering from levels of burnout similar to those of other helping professionals working in higher education. Nicholien and Euwema (1999) examined the relationship among reciprocity (with civilian, colleagues, and the police organisation), burnout and interpersonal conflict management among Dutch police officers. Results of the study show that lack of reciprocity is related to higher levels of burnout. Police officers who experience burnout have more negative attitude towards conflict management and act differently in confrontation with civilians.

Acker (1999) conducted a study to examine the impact of client's mental illness on social worker's job satisfaction and burnout. Results show that gender involvement was related significantly to higher levels for emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Further, results suggest that social workers are affected negatively by this type of work.

Vredenburgh et al. (1999) investigated the extent of burnout experienced by counselling psychologists and the relationships between levels of
burnout and different type of practice settings, selected demographic variables and work-related variables. 521 members of the American Psychological Association (APA) who had received a doctoral level degree from counselling psychology programs completed a demographic questionnaire and the MBI. Results show that counselling psychologists in private practice reported the lowest levels of burnout, while those employed in hospital settings reported the highest level of burnout. Pezet-Langeuis and Rolland (1999) studied job-characteristics, burnout and withdrawal from work attitude. The findings showed that burnout is related to a set of perception of various characteristics of job in two samples of social workers. Further, results suggests that burnout may be an intermediate variable between situational antecedents and personal consequences.

Sears, Urizar and Evan (2000) examined a stress coping model of burnout and depression in extension agents. Results indicated that a significant proportion of extension agents reported burnout symptoms above established cut off scores for the burnout subscales, but fewer than 3% of the sample reported significant symptoms on all 3 dimensions of burnout. Stepwise multiple regression indicated that extension agents who used an emotion-oriented coping strategy were more likely to (a) display high levels of depression, emotional exhaustion, and depersonalization, (b) exhibit low levels of personal accomplishment. Task-oriented coping strategies were found to be negatively associated with the 3 dimensions of burnout.

Salanova et al. (2000) studied the moderating role of computer self-efficacy in the relationship among computer training, frequency of usage
and burnout. The sample was made up 140 workers (aged 20-56 yrs) using computer aided technology in their job. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis were carried out. Results show that frequency of usage and computer training are positively associated with computer self-efficacy and burnout. Vettor & Fredrick (2000) studied work-stress burnout in emergency medical technicals and the use of early recollections. Eight central themes of early recollection have been reported: getter, controller, driver, pleaser, martyr/victims, aginner, feeling avoider and excitement seeker. This article discuss the early memories that are more representative of emergency medical technicians who may be susceptible to burnout, as well as other memories that may indicate and individual's resistance to burnout and proposed research to substantiate the effectiveness of early recollections in predicting burnout in emergency medical technicals.

Van Dierendock et al. (2001) studied burnout and inequity among human service professionals. Sample of 245 human service professionals was taken to test between equity in professional recipient relationship and burnout (i.e. emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduce personal accomplishment). The results confirm that equity affects the central component of burnout (i.e. emotional exhaustion) and that this relation is curvilinear. Feeling more deprived and feeling more advantaged resulted in high future emotional exhaustion. No indication was found for a longitudinal relation between inequity and depersonalization. While a synchronous relation was found between personal accomplishment and equity.
Cam (2001) examined the level of burnout in nursing academicians in Turkey and investigated the variables which are strongly correlated with the burnout nursing education settings. Sample of 135 nursing academicians was taken from different universities and MBI was applied. Results show that the most significant predictor of emotional exhaustion was work setting satisfaction, of depersonalization was job pressing, and of personal accomplishment was job satisfaction in nursing education settings. Finally these findings were compared with those previous studies in the field.

Demerouti et al. (2001) studied the job demans - resource model of burnout. The model proposed that working conditions can be categorized into two broad categories, job demand and job resource, that are differentially related to specific outcomes. Van Dierendonk et al. (2001) examined causal relations among 3 dimensions of burnout as measured by the Maslach Burnout Inventory (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment). Three causal models were examined using data from 5 earlier published longitudinal studies. Models were fitted using structural equation modelling with multi-group analysis. The findings showed that personal accomplishment might be the setting point of the burnout process.
In this 21st century our life is full of stress because of rapid growth on the part of urbanization, industrialization and the increase in scale of operations in the society. As a result, stress has become an inevitable consequence of socio-economic complexity and to some extent its stimulant as well. Therefore a sizeable section of studies have been extensively reviewed and highlighted in the following manner, in this regard:

Kahn et al. (1964) found that high levels of role conflict were related to (a) low levels of job satisfaction, (b) a high degree of job related tension, and (c) low confidence in the organisation. Watson & Baumal (1967) and Houston (1972) observed that stress is expected when beliefs about the location of control and perceived freedom to take action are incongruent. Rizzo et al. (1970) examined role conflict and ambiguity that tended to (a) correlate weekly, but positively with anxiety and propensity to leave the organisation and (b) negatively with influence in the organisation. Lastly, they concluded that role ambiguity and role conflict result in undesirable consequences not only for organisational members but also for the organisation itself.

Johnson (1979) investigated the relationship of situational and individual difference variables with role stress, psychosomatic symptoms and job satisfaction in entry-level police and safety officers. He found that high role stress was significantly correlated with low group cohesiveness, high need for independence, low need for achievement, high dogmatism, less
distortion in responding, external locus of control, and more psychosomatic symptoms. Fielder et al. (1970) investigated the conditions under which personnel in leadership and staff position effectively use their intelligence and experience in the performance of their task in military organisation. Results provide consistent evidence that individual use their intelligence if the relationship with their immediate superior is non-stressful; they fail to use their intelligence or they misuse it when stress with the superior is high. Experience is used effectively when this kind of stress is high but not when it is low.

La Rocco, House & French (1980) highlighted that stress and social support suggest that the support system implied by families roles can moderate the impact of work-related stressors. Jones and Butler (1980) referred that role conflict indicates tensions between family and work roles and can lead to poor marital adjustment, inadequate role performance and other negative outcomes. Szilagyi & Holland (1980) surveyed dimensions of job characteristics, role stress, work satisfaction, functional interact and investigated its relation to social density changes with professional employees in a petroleum-related organisation. The results revealed that employees who experienced increased social density reported significantly less role stress and job autonomy but significantly greater feedback, friendship opportunities, and work satisfaction at the same time.

Nahta (1980) experienced that role conflict decrease with the increase job tenure in an organisation. Harigopal (1980) studied the impact of various personality factors such as ego strength and dominance versus
submissiveness on role stress variables, viz. role ambiguity and role conflict. The result obtained by him indicates that high and low ego strength groups differ significantly on role ambiguity and role conflict. Ego strength was found to moderate the relationship between role ambiguity and company satisfaction; role ambiguity and job involvement; and finally between role conflict and job involvement. Dominance versus submissiveness was found to moderate the relationship between role conflict and job involvement. Shah (1980) studied the impact of stress on a sample of officers representing co-operative banks, marketing and consumer society, industrial society and co-operative departments. The physiological changes felt by various organisational officers were found to be fatigue, exhaustion, migraine headaches, hypertension, loss of appetite, indigestion, sleeplessness and dizziness on their part.

Koch et al. (1982) conducted a study on job-stress among school administration and observed that four of factors perceived job-related stress were found to have differential effects among subjects depending upon respondent's age, years of administrative experience and their position in organisation. Parkes (1982) studied occupational stress among student nurses. Sen (1982) reported that bank managers with intermediate level of qualification experienced less inter-role distance, role ambiguity and role overload, because they thought that they are educationally handicapped in going up in the organisation and thus they offered their duties rather lightly. Sen (1982) again reported that income is inversely related to role stress; the higher the income, the less is the level of reported role stress in bank managers.
Parasuram and Alutto (1982) conducted a study on employees in middle and junior level positions. He found that role frustration and technical problems were the major sources of stress, i.e. stressors reflecting quantitative overload, low status, and inadequate technical resource inadequacies that managers tended to be more stressed by factors impinging on responsibility for production and quality. Srivastava (1982) determined whether or not the employees' potentiality to produce comparatively more influences their perception of role based-stress. The results indicated that the employees belonging to high and low production groups significantly differed from each other with regard to their indices of perceived role stress. The employee producing more were observed to perceive lesser ambiguities, conflicts and workload with regard to their job roles as compared to those belonging to low production group.

Smilansky (1984) conducted a study on external and internal factors related to teachers satisfaction and willingness to report stress and indicated that work stress have special meaning in relation to teaching profession. Crook and Rousseau (1984) investigated a study on stress and strain from family-roles and work-role expectation and highlighted that the results of this study are generally consistent with role theories predictions for work-role expectations. They also observed that family-roles were found to be related to strain in three different manners. Bhagat et al. (1984) conducted a study to validate a construct called total life stress and examine the separate effects of negative versus positive stress in both the organisational and personal life domains of the employees on selected organisational outcomes.
Marino and White (1985) studied departmental structure, locus of control, job stress and the effect of a moderator. Gorell et al. (1985) suggested that elementary school teachers reported significantly higher levels of stress than secondary school teachers.

Osipaw et al. (1985) showed that older respondents generally reported more over load and responsibility, boundary role, and physical environmental stresses than did their young counterparts. Older subjects also played a trend towards decreasing vocational, psychological, physical and inter-personal strain than did younger ones, and greater recreational self care and rational cognitive resources than younger subjects. This study bring out the possibility of age moderating the stress-strain relationship. Ahmad et al. (1985) conducted a study of stress among executives. A group of 30 executives from the public sector and another group of 30 executives form the private sector were compared on role stress. Out of ten dimensions of role stress, however, significant difference were observed on only three dimensions. such as, role isolation, role ambiguity and self-role distance.

Motowidlo et al. (1986) conducted a study on occupational stress: its causes and consequences for job performance and indicated that occupational stress leads to depressions, which in turn, causes decrements in interpersonal and cognitive/motivational aspects of job-performance. Jasmine (1987) compared the level of job related stress among public and private sector blue-collar employees. The analysis of the data revealed that role incumbents of public sector organisations experienced significantly more stress than those of private sector organisation.
Srilatha (1988) found that opportunity for promotion was negatively and significantly associated with role stress variables. It was reported that managers who had received five or more promotions exhibited significantly less role overload, role conflict, and overall stress than those who had not received any promotion during their career.

Singh (1989) studied the profiles of stress experienced by two hundred and fifty junior and middle level executives belonging to seven private and three public sector organisations in north India. It was found that junior level executives experienced higher stress (viz. lack of group cohesiveness, role conflict, inequity, role ambiguity, role overload, lack of leadership support and inadequacy of role authority) than their middle level counterparts. Singh and Nath (1991) explored the effects of organisational role stress on job involvement among banking personnel. The result shows that subjects with high organisational role stress (overall as well as dimensionwise) were less involved with their job in comparison to subjects of low organisational stress group. Jennings (1990) studied stress, locus of control, social support and psychological symptoms among head nurses. Parasuraman et al. (1992) examined relationships among work-family role stress, work-family conflicts, social support and well-being. Results showed that within domain relationships of stressors with well-being are stronger than between-domain relationships. And work-family role stressors as well as work-family conflicts were associated with overall life stress.

Korabik et al. (1993) examined stress, coping and social support in women managers. Vander Pompe and Detteus, (1993) examined the work stress,
social support and strain (depression, health problems and job satisfaction) among male and female managers. Buunk et al. (1993) perceived reciprocity regarding support in relationship at work and stress at work together.

Akinnusi (1993) found education to be significantly associated with stress. The more qualified the managers, the more psychological stress they experience. They are also more subject to organisational stressors but suffer less job stress, probably because they occupy positions of authority and their jobs are more intrinsically satisfying than their less qualified counterparts. Fenlason and Beehr (1994) examined social support and occupational stress in female employees. Aitken and Schloss (1994) assessed levels of occupational stress and burnout among staff providing services to people with an intellectual disability both in institutional and community settings. The staff consisted of direct care, therapy and managerial workers. It was found that levels of personal achievement were highest among managerial worker and lowest among direct care workers. Also general staff working within an institution held more negative and cynical attitudes and reported higher levels of occupational stress than did direct care staff working in community.

Miller (1995) studied the nature, causes, consequences, symptoms of stress and burnout among health-care staff. Tyler & Cushway (1995) tested the effect of coping strategies, social support, job satisfaction and psychological distress from occupational stressors in nurses. Noor (1995) tested the interaction between job role quality, locus of control, and social support in order to measure women's psychological well-being-
happiness and symptoms of distress. Wolfgang (1995) examined the influence of coworker social support and job stress on male and female pharmacist's career commitment.

Pandey (1995) conducted a study on rail drivers of Indian railways to determine the relationship between their role efficacy and role stress. The respondents were found to be suffering from the feeling of overload inadequacy and personal inadequacy. In this study education was found to be positively related with role stress. Ptacek (1996) examined the role of attachment in perceived support and the stress and the coping process.

Manning et al. (1996) investigated the relationship among health care costs, social support and occupational stress. Ahmad and Kapoor (1996) examined the relationship between occupational stress and locus of control in white collar employees. Chandraiah et al., (1996) observed occupational stress and job satisfaction among middle and senior level managers. Anirudh (1997) developed models for predicting role efficacy and role stress of workers and supervisors using demographic variables like age, education and experience. Results revealed that out of 11 models for prediction of role stagnation, role expectation conflict, role erosion, personal inadequacy, self role distance, role ambiguity, role inadequacy and role stress total were found to be good predictors.

personality dimensions of individuals and their perceived organisational role stress. The findings of the study indicate that psychoticism-reality and neuroticism-stability dimension are found positively associated with individuals perceived organisational role stress; whereas extroversion-introversion dimension was found to be negatively associated with perceived organisational role stress. Pradhan and Mishra (1999) explored experienced of organisational role stress perceptions of the human resource development climate among younger and older executives from public Vs private sector organisations. Rani (1999) studied stress and job satisfaction among primary care professionals. Dollar and Metzer (1999) conducted a psychological research on occupational stress problems. Flaherty et al. (1999) examined the organisational values and role stress as determinants of customer-oriented selling performance. Searle et al. (1999) tested a three factor model of occupational stress and the impact of demands, control and social support on the mail sorting task.


occupational stress, strain and coping in physicians and executives. Sears et al. (2000) examined stress and coping model of burnout and depression in extension agents. Rowe (2000) explored both short-and-long term approaches to behavioural change relative to occupational burnout and focused upon the teaching skills to manage stress.

Portello & Long (2001) conducted a study extended to a previously developed integrative model of workplace stress by focusing specifically on interpersonal stressors. Fielden (2001) studied stress and gender among unemployed female and male managers. The findings observed by Fielden and Davison indicates that unemployed female managers encounter substantially greater source of stress than their male counterparts in all aspects of unemployment.

Cooper et al. (2001) conducted a study on stress in relation to organisation and reviewed the sources and outcome of job related stress, the methods used to assess levels and consequences of occupational stress, and strategies that might be used by individuals and organisations to confront stress and its associated problems. He also examines burnout and extreme form of occupational stress which has been found to have severe consequences for individuals and their organisations.

Joiner (2001) observed the influence of national culture and organisational culture alignment on job stress and performance.
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Schneider and Synder (1975) defined organisational climate as 'perception which people have of an organisation'. A sizeable section of studies in the area of organisational climate have been conducted by the following researcher:

Payne and Pheysey (1971) studied the correlates of organisational climate scale with the three different facets of job descriptive index scale viz., satisfaction with work, supervision and pupil etc. This study was conducted on a sample consisting 348 managers, supervisors and staff personnel. And in this study, positive correlation were obtained between a positive perception of organisational climate and job satisfaction. According to Payne and Pheysey organisational climate is positively related to job satisfaction in order to highlight the quality of employees work life. A study conducted by Pestonjee in (1973) reported that a supportive organisation be positively related to worker's morale and job satisfaction.

Sharma (1974) replicated Haplia and Croft's study as a random sample of 1066 secondary schools in Rajasthan. As investigated the relationship between organisational climate, faculty size, faculty experience, faculty age and experience of the headmaster. He also determined relationship between organisational climate and school effectiveness. He found significantly positive correlation between teacher satisfaction and school climate, between headmaster effectiveness and school climate. He also observed significantly positive correlation between school academic achievement index and humanized thrust. A study conducted by Schneider
and Snyder (1975), also indicated that climate and satisfaction are positively correlated and almost the same result was found in a study conducted by Lafollte and Sims (1975), as they found organisational climate and organisational practices related to job satisfaction.

A study of organisational climate of teacher's training institutions in Uttar Pradesh and its relationship with their effectiveness was conducted by Bhatnagar (1979). Organisational climate was assessed with the help of an appropriate organisational climate scale in the preceding study. Kalmogorov-Simronov test of significance was employed to test the underlying hypothesis of the present investigation. However the following findings were observed:

(i) The climate of government teacher training colleges is characterized by high social support, high authoritarianism, high trust, high academic emphasis, high discipline and control. Non-governmental teacher training colleges, on the other hand have a climate, dominant characteristics of which are high hindrance, high democracy, freedom and high lack of facilities.

(ii) Large teacher's training institution have significantly high authoritarianism, high trust and high academic emphasis.

(iii) The government and privately managed schools, as a group, did not differ significantly in their organisational climate but differed from school to school and no two schools had similar organisational climate.

(iv) The organisational climate of a school did affect the job satisfaction of the teachers.
(v) There was no positive relationship between the organisational climate and the academic achievement of the students.

Meanwhile another important comprehensive study was conducted by Kumar and Bohra (1979) on the relationship of worker's job satisfaction and with their perception about existing organisational climate. The obtained findings in the present investigation amply indicates that perceived organisational climate significantly effect worker's job satisfaction. The workers perceiving existing organisational climate as democratic were found to be highly job satisfied as compared to those perceiving organisational climate as autocratic.

Askar conducted an important study on public school teachers in the state of Kuwait in 1981. The population of the study consisted of 926 teachers representing the primary, intermediate and secondary school teachers. The data were obtained with the help of questionnaire consisting of nineteen questions in the major part, seven questions related to influential factors, and an open question pertinent to the improvement suggestions. And the following conclusions were drawn :-

(i) Feelings of inadequacy and unfairly determined economic returns exist among teachers.

(ii) The school environment is not conductive to teacher's professional growth, and

(iii) Insufficient opportunities were found for their career advancement.

Horner (1981) studied a number of variables which effects job satisfaction and thus, job productivity of the public school teachers. A
sample population of the public school teachers in the 29 southern most
countries of Illinois was selected as the population to be studied in the
investigation. Crane (1981) attempted to study the relationship between
teachers perception of actual climate conditions and their expectation of
ideal climate, school size, teaching experience and teaching texture etc. A
highly reliable thirty seven item based questionnaire was used in the
present investigation. The application of the questionnaire sought to
determine if inverse relationships existed between perceptions of climate
and experiences texture and school size. The data supported the hypothesis
which proposed an inverse relationship between ideal climate and teaching
experience. The data also supported the hypothesis which proposed an
inverse relationship between ideal climate and tenure. And no significant
differences in the perception of school climate by their respective
principals and teachers. Though in a number of other cases principals were
found to be having more positive attitude as compared to teachers
regarding climate condition of their schools.

Chopra (1983) investigated over all job satisfaction of teachers working
in school with different climate condition. Forty two girls and boys
secondary and senior secondary school were taken. Organisational climate
description questionnaire by M.L. Sharma and teacher job satisfaction
Inventory by wall were used. Teachers working in school with open
climate were found to be more likely to show higher overall jobs
satisfaction than their counterpart.

Sharma (1983) investigated the importance of the organisational climate
for employees motivation and satisfaction at work. The study consisted of
50 individual organisations which was surveyed by the investigator himself personally. He observed the tolerating work related facets like grievance handling, recognition, opportunities for career-growth and participative management. Nevel (1984) determined the relationship that exists between the degree of teacher professionalism and their job-satisfaction. The sample consisted of 208 public school teachers from Kentucky. The teacher professionalism scale and the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire were used to determine the respondents' perceptions of their degree of professionalism and level of job satisfaction respectively. The findings indicated a significant inverse relationships between the teachers, autonomy and intrinsic facets of this job satisfaction. And no significant relationship were found between the other dimension of teacher, professionalism and their job satisfaction. Finger (1984) explored the relationship between the perceived leadership behaviour of the quasi-administrator and teacher job-satisfaction. In addition, the study also considered how the variables of the quasi-administration prior assignment, teacher age and teaching experience affected teacher's job satisfaction. The sample consisted of 131 teachers from New York City School system. The test instrument used were the Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDO) and Job Satisfaction Index (JSI) and a personal data form. Ronnenkamp (1985) conducted a study to determine the extent to which relationship among organisational components were expressed in terms of their congruence and adaptability. An 87-item instrument was used to obtain the data necessary to obtain these objectives. The management population in three division of a selected corporation was asked to complete the questionnaire. It was concluded that levels of
adaptability did correspond with levels of congruence within the divisions studied. The divisions rated highest in adaptability also achieve the highest congruence rating. Similarly, the division rated lowest in adaptability had correspondingly low congruence scores. Another interesting study in this connection was carried out by Lofland (1985) in order to investigate the relationship between the established organisational climate and different job satisfaction levels of teacher. The organisational climate descriptional questionnaire (OCDQ) and Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire were administered as the instrument to measure organisational climate and job satisfaction. The data were analyzed with the help of analysis of variance and t-test. Finally it was concluded that organisational climate has significant effect on job satisfaction of the teachers while at the same time the other variables such as sex, age and at all level of experience had no significant effect.

Solomon (1986) conducted a research on private and public sector managers. This empirical research compared job characteristics and organisational climate in the private and public sectors. Perceptions and satisfaction of 240 top managers from a variety of private and public organisations in Israel were compared. In this investigation the following hypothesis were tested: (a) performance-based rewards and (b) policies that promote efficiency would be significantly more prevalent in private sector organisations and (c) that higher levels of satisfaction would be expressed by managers in the private sector. Two way analyses of variance, private versus public and production versus service organisations were performed. Results yield significant effects for sector, ownership and provided strong support to the above mentioned hypothesis of the
concerned research. Interaction effects in specific scales were also in the hypothesized direction, revealing that the private/public sector differences are further amplified in service organisations. Sharma and Ratnam (1987) studied the impact of organisational climate on supervisory management relationship in Bharat ISPAT Nigam with a positive result. Singh (1988) studied the effect of frustrations in organisations in relationship to organisational climate. A sample of 250 junior and middle level public sectors of north India. A questionnaire consisting of 49 items was administered and the trend of the result suggests that organisational climate dimension have a definite impact on frustration.

Bhardwaj and Sharma (1990) conducted a empirical study of human relations and organisational climate. The study was conducted on 150 supervisors belonging to five different departments of the organisation. The OC dimension showed positive inter-correlations among themselves and also positive relationship with other factors except alienation. In the same sequence an other important study was conducted by Cheng (1991) to check the characteristics of the organisational environment perceived by senior secondary school teachers in Hongkong. Mott's IDE (1972) was employed and a positive result was observed in various schools. Jain (1993) examined the existing organisational climate of a few selected secondary schools running under different managements in Ulhasnagar, Kalyan and Ambarnath. The sample comprised of 442 schools private/aided, private/non-aided govt., added/govt. and non aided managements. The results showed that 23.8% of the schools had open climate, 16.685 controlled climate and 14.7% familiar climate. Academic achievement
as well as found better in schools pertaining to open climate controlled climate and was found poorer in case of closed climate. A positive relationship was also observed between kind of climate and co-curricular activities of their respective senior secondary school's teachers. Srivastava (1996) pointed out that organisational climate and higher order needs (self esteem - autonomy, and self actualization) are found to be positively related to job involvement.

Johnson and McIntye (1998) conducted a study on organisational culture and organisational climate as a correlates of job satisfaction. Data were collected from 8,126 employees in a large government service agency using an anonymous survey measuring 19 different aspects of organisational culture and climate. Correlation indicated positive and significant associations for the measure of job satisfaction on the survey with all remaining measures. The measures of culture most strongly related to scores on job satisfaction were empowerment, involvement, recognition. Measure of climate most strongly associated with scores on job satisfaction were communication, followed by goals, creativity, innovation, and decision-making. Results are discussed in term of their practical and meaningful relevance to organisational effectiveness.

Hemingway and Smith (1999) studied organisational climate and occupational stressors as predictors of withdrawal behaviour and injuries in nurses. They examined an occupation - specific model of the stress process in nurses in which specific organisational climate dimension were hypothesized to effect withdrawn behaviours and injuries both directly and indirectly through the mediating effect of specific occupational stressors. ...withdrawal behaviours (defined here as turnover and absenteeism) and
work related injuries were significant problem in the nursing profession and are commonly attributed to the stressful nature of the job. Regression analyses on the responses of 252 nurses revealed direct climate stressor and stressor-outcomes relations to exist, as well as an indirect climate outcomes relationship. The findings suggest that researchers/practitioners should concentrate on developing interventions designed to affect specific stressors and their antecedents rather than focusing on generic stress reduction intervention and global measures.

Hart Wearing, Nicholas and Dingle (2000) developed the school organisational health questionnaire, a measure of assessing teacher morale and school organisational climate. A total of 1,520 leaders from 18 primary and 26 secondary school in Australian state of Victoria participated in the study for the construction of the present questionnaire. The underlying studies finally resulted in the 54 item school organisational health questionnaire that measure leader morale. This questionnaire is comprises of different dimension of school questionnaire climate such as appraisal and recognition curricular co-ordination, effective discipline, policy, excessive work demand, goal congruence, participative decision making, professional growth, professional interaction role classify student orientation and supportive leadership, etc.
SOCIAL SUPPORT

Social support may be defined as support accessible to an individual through social ties to other individuals and groups. Number of studies have been carried out in this direction, they are as follows:

Pinncau's (1976) investigated that social supports reduce physiological strain (e.g. anxiety, high blood pressure) as well as psychological stress (e.g. role ambiguity) and provide a buffer against strains caused by psychological stress. Andrews et al. (1978) observed that the stressor illness model also include the effect of social support and coping behaviour. Results obtained by Andrew and others indicates direct effects of social support and coping behaviour on mental health; House and Well (1978) reported evidence that social support can buffer the effects of job stress on health. Lin et al (1979) found support for independent and direct negative effects of stressful life events, and positive effects of social factors, on mental health. They did not find an interaction between social support and life events in relation to mental health.

Gore (1978) conducted a longitudinal study keeping in view the role of social support in modifying the stressful effects of unemployment. Nonsupported, unemployed men showed higher level of cholesterol, illness symptoms, and self-blame as compared to their counterparts. La Rocco et al. (1980) studied the buffering hypothesis that social support ameliorate the impact of occupational stress on job-related strain and health. The data used for this analysis consist of a randomly stratified sample of men from 23 occupations (N=636). The findings support the buffering hypothesis for mental and physical health variables (anxiety,
depression, irritation, and somatic symptoms) but failed to support the buffering hypothesis in regard to job-related strains job-dissatisfaction, boredom, dissatisfaction with work load. Willims et al. (1981) studied a model of mental health and the effects of life events and tested hypotheses regarding the role of social support in modifying these effects from time to time. However the following results were obtained (i) social support predict improvements in mental health time to time, (ii) life events and physical limitations predict a deterioration in mental health time to time, (iii) the negative effects of life events and physical limitations on mental health do not vary according to amount of social support, and (iv) differences in measurement strategies for life events and social supports produce some variance in results, but not in conclusions about whether effects on mental health are additive or interactive.

LaRocco, House and French (1980) hypothesized social support to interact with stressors in such a way that the relation between stress and strain becomes stronger for persons with low level of social support as compared to their counterparts. LaRocco et al. (1980) reported that social support moderated the effects of stressors on health outcomes such as depression and somatic complaints, but they found no evidence of the effect on job-related strains such as job dissatisfaction and boredom. Kobasa and Puccetti (1983) reported that support form the boss buffered the effect of critical life events on illness symptoms but the support from the family did not. Sandler and Lakey (1982) found social support buffered the impact of critical life events on depression and anxiety for persons with an internal locus of control but not for those with an external
locus of control. House (1981) identified social support as a resource that enables individual to cope with stress.

Kirk & Walter (1981); Moracco & McFadden (1982); Paines (1981); Wangberg (1982) have suggested that increasing the social supports available to teachers may be an useful strategy for preventing teacher burnout. Zabel and Zabel (1982) reported that special education teachers who perceived greater administrative, peer and parental support were found to be less burned out. Schwab et al. (1984) surveyed a random sample of school teachers in New Hampshire and found that higher level of social support from colleagues was associated with lower levels of burnout. Cohen & Wills (1985) studied that social support interacts with stress in predicting physical and mental health. Sandler & Lakery (1982); Lefchort et al. (1984) found significant interactions between negative events of social support in predicting measures of psychological distress among internals (those who attribute a relatively high degree of causal agency to self) but not among external (those who attribute a relatively low degree of causal agency to self). Internals appears to be able to utilize support as an aid to coping with stress.

Lefcourt et al. (1984) suggested that the interaction of locus of control with social support is most viable and may help to clarify the role that LOC play an important role in determining how people react to stress. Sarason & Sarason (1984, 1985) found that person's perceived social support level is a stable attribute over time that has trait like characteristics. Cohen and Wills (1985) studied social support as a kind of help person receives from others i.e. emotional, personal,
informational and instrumental 'functional support' and indicated whether interpersonal relationships serve meaningful function in meeting felt needs of others. Cohen and Wills (1985) pointed out that a clear correspondence between the source, type of support and the stressors that affect the individual can ensure the moderating effect of social support.

Barrera (1986) pointed out that structural and functional measures are moderately related to psychological distress and physical illness. Sarason, Sarason and Shearin (1986) gave evidence that perceived availability of social support levels, like personality traits, are generally stable over time, and suggested the potential advantages of considering social support as an individual difference variable. Duckitt (1986) found that under conditions of high support, extroverts showed a heightened sensitivity to variations in social support and reported less distress as compared to introverts. In contrast, externals showed minimal variation in the relationship between stress and dysphoria as a function of support (Sandler & Lakey, 1982). Lecourt (1985) found that individuals with internal locus of control appear to need more support than externals, benefiting more from its presence and suffering more from its absence.

Kaufmann and beehr (1986) studied interaction between job stressors and social support and some counter-intuitive results.

Russell et al. (1987) examined the effects of job-related stressful event and social support on burnout among teachers. A mail survey was conducted randomly on the sample of public school teachers. In the present investigation social support were found to be highly predictive of teachers burnout alongwith their number of stressful experienced event.
Some evidence of the stress-moderating role of social support was also found. Vinokur and Caplan (1987) studied the attitudes and social support as determinants of job-seeking behaviour and well-being among the unemployed. Hill (1987b) found that different types of supports have different impacts upon the self-perception of physical health by high and low affiliative need of individuals. In this study, more tangible, instrumental support uniformly buffered the self-perceived physical health of all individuals, regardless of affiliative need. Russell, Almayer & Van Velzen (1987) suggest that social support is mainly beneficial for people under stress, commonly referred to as the interaction effect model. Despite the inordinate amount of effort aimed at clarifying the role of social support in the stress-health relationship. Ganster & Victor (1988) noted that even in studies in which buffering effects were reported, they were not always consistent across different types of stressors, outcomes variables and measures of social support.

Caldwell & Reinhart (1988) reported significant relationships between disposition measures of trait anxiety, social anxiety, self-esteem and emotional support. Different sources of support were helpful in different ways. Hotard, McFatter, McWhirter Stegall (1988) conducted a study entitled as "Interactive effects of extraversion, neuroticism and social relationships on subjective well-being", and found that a greater proportion of the overall variance in the prediction of well-being was accounted for by the joint effects of extraversion and neuroticism. Cummins (1989) studied the role of social support and locus of control as determinants of job satisfaction and as moderators of the job stress - job satisfaction relationship.
A study conducted by Hill (1989) entitled as "affiliative need, different types of social support and physical symptoms", indicates less tangible types of social support (emotional, informational and companionship) to predict reports of physical symptoms as a joint function of both relative need and negative life events. While the effects of tangible supports depends only upon occurrence of negative life events. Low affiliative need individuals tended to benefit from both types of support, while high affiliative need individuals benefited primarily from more tangible support.

In the recent past Weir and Okun (1989) hypothesised that structural social support has main effect on teachers different level of satisfaction. In the same finding teachers morale were also found to be boosted by self-esteem and functional social support. Jung (1989) examined the perception of both would-be providers and would-be recipients of social support who recalled rejection of support incidents to determine their attributions about the motivation of the rejections. That is when support was rejected, it was most often perceived as being done by ignoring the provider, and attributed to irritability, resentment and embarrassment.

Jorgensen and Johnson (1990) investigated relationships between the appraisal of life events, genders, locus of control, social support, strain and sensation seeking. Analyses reveals the notion that a range of these variables serve as moderators of life stress, are significantly related to the appraisals of life events. The gender differences obtained for the perception of life events was found to influence several associations between the individual differences and life events appraisal.
Ogus (1990) examined the relationship between burnout, work stress and social support among ward nurses. A sample of 128 female nurses was taken (aged 20-53 yrs). Burnout inventory, a nursing stress inventory, social support questionnaire short form and a family support measures were assessed. Subjects with high social support and high satisfaction with social support reported less burnout than subjects with little social support and less satisfaction with social support, regardless of level of work stress. No buffering effect of family support on burnout were found.

Jennings (1990) studied stress, locus of control, social support and psychological symptoms among head nurses. Data was collected from 300 head nurses representing all Army hospitals. Result supported the hypotheses that perceived stress from both work and non-work sources were positively related to psychological symptoms. Direct effect for both internal locus of control and social support. The stress model derived from this study accounted for gender, the head nursing psychological symptoms were one standard deviated higher than non-patients norms.

Nelson & Quick (1991) conducted a longitudinal study on social support and newcomer adjustment in organisations. A sample of 51 male and 40 female new comers to 3 separate organisation was taken. The results indicates that the availability of support activities such as off site training sessions and business trips were associated with decreased psychological symptoms. Helpfulness of various relationship supports was associated with positive adjustment. Female subjects reported greater helpfulness of support form their supervisors and the secretary. The gender difference findings are consistent with B.Z. Posner and G.N. Powell's results regarding the availability of support.
Loscocco & Spitze (1991) examined the ways in which job demands, job rewards and social support at work combined to influence distress and happiness among non-supervisory factory workers. Subjects completed self-report and organisational social support measures. Data revealed gender similarity in the processes through which work conditions affect indicators of emotional well-being. Both men and women were influenced by factors reflecting job demands, job deprivation, job rewards and by physical and social work environment.

Snapp (1992) studied occupational stress, social support and depression among black and white professional managerial women. In the present investigations findings indicates complex differences in levels of social support (SCS), occupational stress (OS) and depression (DP) across social structural dimensions.

Parasuraman et al. (1992) examined relationship among work and family role stressor (WFRRs), work-family conflicts (WFC), social support and well-being (WB) using data gathered from 119 men and 119 women who were partners in 2-career relationships. Results showed that within domain relationships of stressor with WB are stronger than between domains relationships. Thus WFRRs, were related to job satisfaction and family satisfaction respectively, whereas work and family role stressors as well as WRF were associated with overall life stress : similar results were found for the relationships of social support with WB.

Mansfield et al. (1992) studied the beneficial effects of job satisfaction in relation to social support at work and home in 85 female clerical workers (mean age 39 yrs). Results indicate that perceived social support
from co-workers, supervisors, and spouse contributed to greater job satisfaction.

Kong, Perrucci and Robet (1993) studied the impact of unemployment and economic stress on social support. The results reflect change in social support after job loss, which indicates that unemployment and social support are mutually related and that life events have an impact on social support through economic distress.

Shams (1993) studied different forms of social support and their impact on psychological health. Finally material support was correlated with psychological well-being of the concerned as measured by the general health questionnaire. Viimameki et al. (1993) studied social support in relation to mental well-being among the unemployed.

Rife and Belcher (1993) studied social support and job search intensity among older unemployed workers. 54 employed workers (aged 50+ yrs) were interviewed to examine the relationship between the quality of social support provided by the family and friends for their job search efforts and intensity. Results showed that older workers perceived the supportive message provided by unemployed friends more positive than the support message provided by employed and retired family or friends. Greenglass (1993) examined the role of social support in the development of coping forms employed by 114 Canadian women and men managers when they were coping with job stress. Regressions results indicated that support form one's boss was a significant contribution to preventive and instrumental coping in women.
Aston and Lavey (1993) examined the possible benefits of the workplace experience for women in terms of rewards and concern intrinsic to the job, rewards and concerns extrinsic to the job, social support and cynicism. Results showed that intrinsic factors were more closely associated with physical health. A cynical attitude was found to influence the value of the work role, with effects being particularly marked in the clerical group. Wenzel (1993) investigated the relationship of psychological resources and social support to job procurement self-efficacy in the disadvantage persons in employment-training. Chay (1993) examined the relationships between social support and personality factors as moderators of stress arising from demands in the workplace.

Parkes, Clare (1993) conducted their studies to examine the role of social support in the context of the demand-discretion theory of job stress with particular reference to additive Vs interactive models. Vander Pompe & Gieta (1993) examined the difference between 80 male and 75 female Dutch managers in work stress, social support and strains (depression, health problems and job satisfaction). It was found that although both work and life support were negatively correlated with work stress and work support was strongly related to reducing work stress and was positively related to each measure of strain. Life support were negatively related to depression, unrelated to perceived health problem and positively related to job dissatisfaction.

Fenlasen & Beehr (1994) examined employee's social support using both the traditional global measures of emotional/instrumental support and more focused measure based on the contents. The prevailing finding
indicates that job contents were more positively related to global emotional support as compared to global instrumental support.

Riggio, Watring & Barbara (1994) examined the interrelations of the social skills and various self-report measures related to the psychology adjustment of college students. Osseran & Elmacian (1994) examined the relationship between social support, anxiety and academic achievement among 3 group differing in demographic variable of age, sex and marital status. Results indicates a positive correlation between the anxiety measures, nonsignificant negative contribution of anxiety and a differential effect of various support types to stress related anxiety among the groups. Stepwise multiple regression analysis of social support variable to anxiety found emotional support negatively related to anxiety, while satisfaction with instrumental support negatively related to trait anxiety.

Ray & Miller (1994) studied the nature of home and work stress and investigated the role of social support from both intra and extra organisational source in reducing the stress and buffering its impact on burnout. Sheffield, David, Dobbie, Diane and Canoll (1994) evaluated the relationship between stress and social support and indices of psychological and physical health. The results suggests that self-reported stress is largely associated with psychological well-being and is not substantially related to physical well-being.

Etzion and Westman (1994) examined the interrelationships among job stress, burnouts, social support (i.e. from work and family sources) and sense of control (SOC). Results showed that job stress was positively
related to burnout, whereas SOC and work support were inversely related to burnout, SOC moderated the relationship between stress and burnout. Spicer and Franklin (1994) examined the exploratory effects of social support, stress and locus of control on the conflicts and the tactics of parents at risk for child mal-treatment.

relationships among social support, psychological competence, and adaptation of college students (ie Black, Asian, American, Latino and White students). Wolfgang (1995) examined the influence of coworker social support and job stress on male and female pharmacist's career commitment.


Norris & Kaniasty (1996) evaluated the impact of receiving social support on subsequent levels of perceived social support and psychological distress. Hart (1996) investigated the perceived availability of different types of social support among cynically hostile women.

Lackovic et al. (1996) examined the relationship between the length of unemployment and the self-esteem and general life satisfaction of university graduates and examined the function of social support during the period of unemployment. Lakey, Ross and Butter (1996) conducted a study to predict that people derive initial social support judgement about
others from global qualities, such as attitude, values and personality.

Von Dras and Siegler (1997) investigated the stability in extraversion and aspect of social support at midlife. Jenkins (1997) examined the effect of social support and debriefing efficacy among emergency medical workers after a man shooting. Tyler and Cushway (1997) investigated the effect of coping strategies, social support and job satisfaction on stress with general hospital nurses. Daniels and Guppy (1997) tested the influence of affective psychologists well-being on stressors, locus of control and social support in British accountants. McCann, Russo and Benjamin (1997) studied to determine whether hostility and perceived availability of social support are related to perception of work environment. Kaniasty & Norris (1997) conducted a study to find social support dynamics in adjustment to distress.

Palfai and Hart (1997) conducted a study on "anger coping style and perceived social support", in a very comprehensive and analytic manner with some positive result.

Collins & Di Paula (1997) studied personality characteristics and recipients of social support. Lakey & Drew (1997) conducted a study on a social-cognitive perspective on social support. Hagihara et al. (1997) observed type A and type B behaviours, work stressors and social support at work at the same time.

Perrewe (1998) studied the role of social support in work-family conflict. Latha (1998) conducted a study on social support and health as an overview of theoretical, conceptual and methodological issues. Sud and Sud (1998) attempted to study the effect of experimentally manipulated social support and control conditions on the difficult anagram task and cognitive interference.


Beckman (2000) examined social support networks, social cohesion on health. Zellars and Perreme (2001) conducted a study on previous research by simultaneously examining the influence of affective personality on 4-dimensions of emotional social support and job burnout.

Harris, Moritzen, Robitschek et al. (2001) assessed the relative contribution of social support and interest occupational congruence in job satisfaction and tenure.

Peeters & LeBlanc (2001) examined the relationship between 3 different type of job demands (ie. qualitative, emotional and organisational demand)
and burnout, and determined whether the relationship between the different types of job demands and burnout is moderated by social support from 3 different sources (like colleagues, supervisors and family). Results shows that qualitative job demands and organisational job demands significantly contribute to the prediction of burnout. Further, social support from the family appears to moderate the relationship between quantitative demands and depersonalization, and social support from colleagues appear to moderate the relationship between emotional demand and depersonalization.
Chapter - III

Methodology
METHODOLOGY

This study is an attempt towards making Indian organisations more effective and helping managers in actualizing their full potentials. As middle managers have to interact with people (subordinate, colleagues, top management, customers) and major portion of their working time is utilized in people work therefore, various components job burnout - emotional exhaustion, depersonalizational and diminished personal accomplishment are found among them at large. Lee and Ashford (1993) viewed that though very few studies focused on managers despite the apparent prevalence of burnout at managerial level. The managerial burnout appears to have detrimental effects on the attitude and behaviour of the people that managers, serve and lead. The stress experienced by middle managers has been explained by Albrecht (1979) in the following way, "in many ways, middle management can be one of the most frustrating areas of organisational life". Hence keeping in view, the present investigation is aimed to measure 'the influence of organisational role stress, organisational climate and social support on job burnout among middle managers of private and public undertakings'.

HYPOTHESES

In the light of the available literature related to study the following hypotheses are formulated:

H(a) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Organizational Role Stress dimension.

H(b) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Organizational Climate dimension.
H(c) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Social Support dimension.

H(d) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Job-Burnout dimension.

H(e) Organizational Role Stress dimension and its ten components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(f) Organizational Role Stress dimension and its ten components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(g) Organizational Climate dimension and its nine components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(h) Organizational Climate dimension and its nine components will act as predictor of Emotional Exhaustion feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(i) Social Support dimension and its three components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(j) Social Support dimension and its three components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.
SAMPLE

In the present investigation the sample was randomly selected from various parts of Delhi. It consists of (N=300) middle managers, 150 each from private and public undertaking (Lausreb International, Ottoagn, K.K. Kohli and brother, Orient Craft, Shoff Eye Centre, Sukd'ah Home, Indian Oil cooperation, Maruti Yudeog, Indian Aluminium, Bilai Steel Plant, etc.) Delhi. The gender of the sample was not taken into consideration. The methodology of the study was planned systematically keeping in view its lofty objectives.

VARIABLES AND MEASURES

The present research investigation incorporates four variables, namely, organisational role stress, organisational climate, social support and job burnout. A brief description of the measures used in this study is presented in the following manner.

MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY

The Maslach burnout inventory is used to measure the burnout among middle managers of public and private undertakings. The MBI consists of 22 items that are divided into three subscales:

(i) EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION (EE):

Emotional Exhaustion is caused by excessive psychological and emotional demands made on people in helping profession. Emotional Exhaustion is often considered to be the most significant component of burnout (Gaines and Jermier, 1983; Maslach, 1982). It is directly related to high levels of work demand (Shiron, 1989), the primary determinants of emotional
exhaustion reflects organisational and personal demands placed upon employees. The qualitative and quantitative demands of interpersonal interactions also affect the levels of emotional exhaustion (Jackson, Schwab and Schuler, 1986; Maslach, 1982).

(ii) DEPERSONALIZATION (DP):
Depersonalization refers to treating people like object and development of negative attitude towards one's self, work and life. Depersonalization is generally conceptualized as a response to the broader aspects of the job or work environment which is perceived as being bureaucratic, impersonal, rigid, or controlling (Cordes and Dougherty, 1993). It is characterized by cynical, detached and emotional calloused behaviour toward the organization and those with whom one interacts - regardless of whether these interactions involves clients, coworkers, subordinates, or professional contacts outside of the organisation. Levels of depersonalization will be higher in a work environment characterized by receipt of non-contingent punishment (Jackson et al., 1986).

(iii) PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT (PA):
Personal accomplishment is the demotivational effects of feeling of inefficiency about their ability related to recipients that may result in a self-imposed verdict of failure. Feelings of diminished personal accomplishment result from factors suggesting one is unappreciated or that one's efforts are ineffective (Jackson, Turner and Brief, 1987) or from factors that suggest one's competence or performance is low (Burke, Shearer and Deszca, 1984). The perception of self-efficacy is at the core of the personal accomplishment component (Lee a- 'forth, 1990).
The items comprising these sub-scales are presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-scales</th>
<th>Items No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Depersonalization</td>
<td>10, 11, 12, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each item is rated 1 (very mild) to 7 (very strong). A place is provided for the respondent to check never "if the feeling or attitude described is never experienced. According to Maslach and Jackson person with higher scores in the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation sub-scales and with low scores on Personal Accomplishment sub-scale would be perceiving themselves as burnout. Thus, a person is not classified as "burnout" or "not burnout" but rather placed on a continuum from "more burnout" to "less burnout". Maslach & Jackson reported alpha coefficient for the three subscales as presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-scales</th>
<th>N= 407 (Teachers)</th>
<th>N=1025 (People in Helping Profession)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Depersonalization</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha reliabilities for teachers and person in helping profession, supporting the validity of the measures. Burnout scores have been found to increase stressful job setting and to predict job turnover and absenteeism. Maslach & Jackson (1979) in their research on helping
professions reported that correlation between the frequency and intensity dimension across subscales ranged from .35 to .73 with a mean of .56, the correlation between these dimension for teachers varied form .75 to .94 with a mean of .87, while the helping profession in general. There has been found a moderate relationship between how often one experiences various feelings associated with burnout, whereas for teachers this relationship is fairly strong. On the average the total variance is common between the frequency and intensity scores on a subscale for person in the helping profession.

The scores on all three subscales were summed separately. Respondents with high scores on the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization subscales and with lower scores on a personal accomplishment subscales would perceive themselves as burnout in the present study as suggested by Maslach & Jackson.

SCORING

The scoring range from 1 to 7 with corresponding qualitative categories. These are presented below:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Somewhat moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Somewhat strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS SCALE

Concept of organisational role stress developed by Pareek (1983) is based on role theory. Role is the similarity in the response of different individuals to some situation. According to Pareek (1987) role can be defined as a set of functions which an individual perform in response to the expectation of the significant members of social system and his/her own expectations about the position that he/she occupies in it.

Pareek's (1983) organisational role stress scale (ORS) was used to measure role stress of middle managers at the level of private and public undertakings.

Organisational Role Stress Scale is comprised of the following role stress dimensions:

(i) Intra Role Distance (IRD)
(ii) Role stagnation (RS)
(iii) Role Expectation Conflict (REC)
(iv) Role Erosion (RE)
(v) Role Overload (RO)
(vi) Role Isolation (RI)
(vii) Personal Inadequacy (PI)
(viii) Self Role Distance (SRD)
(ix) Role Ambiguity (RA)
(x) Resource Inadequacy (RIN)
The organisational role stress scale is 5 point rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>If you never or rarely feel that way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>If you occasionally feel that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If you sometimes feel that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If you frequently feel that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>If you frequently or always feel that way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the scores for each role stress dimension range from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 20 and total scores ranges from 0 to 200, as this scale has 10 dimension and each dimension has five items. Validity of this scale was determined by item analysis. Retest reliability of this scale has acceptable reliability. Sen (1981) used ORS on the sample of 500 bank employees and retest reliability coefficient were found for total role stress (0.73) and for the dimension of role stress SRD (0.45), IRD (0.58), RS (0.63), RS (0.65), RO (0.53), RE (0.37), RI (0.58).

**SCORING**

For 5 point scale of ORS, scoring was made as 0, 1,2,3 and 4 for the responses categories, if you never or scarily feel that way, if you occasionally feel that way, if you frequently feel that way or if you very frequently or always feel that way, respectively. On the ORS scale individual could get minimum score of 0 and maximum score of 200.

**ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE**

In this study organisational climate questionnaire developed by Litwin and Stringer (1968) has been employed in order to measure employees
perception towards organisational climate of their concerned organisations. This questionnaire consisted of 50 items with four response categories, namely, strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree. The prevailing questionnaire measures employee's attitude toward following important aspects of their respective organisations.

(i) STRUCTURE:

This dimension measures the feeling that employees have about the contacts in the group, how many rules, regulation, procedures there are? Is there an emphasis on red tape and gapping. Through channels or is there a loose and informal atmosphere.

(ii) RESPONSIBILITY:

This dimension measures the feeling being your own basis not housing a double check all your decision when you have a job to do knowing that it is your job.

(iii) REWARD:

This dimension measures the feeling of being rewarded for a job well done, emphasizing positive, rewarded rather than punishments the perceived fairness of the pay and promotion policies.

(iv) RISK:

This dimension measures the sense of riskiness and challenge in the job in the organisation, is there an emphasis on taking calculated risk or is playing it-safe the best way to operate.
(v) WARMTH:

This dimension measures the feeling of general goal fellowship that period in the work group atmosphere the emphasis as the being well lobed the prevalence of friendly and informal social group.

(iv) SUPPORT:

This dimension also measures perceived helpfulness of the managers and other employees in the group and emphasis on mutual support from above and below.

(vii) STANDARDS:

This dimension measures the perceived importance of implicit and explicit goals and performance standards, the emphasis on doing a good job, the challenge represented in personal and group goal.

(viii) CONFLICT:

This dimension measures the feeling that manager and other worker want to hear different opinions, the emphasis placed on getting problems out of the open rather than smoothing them over or organising them.

(ix) IDENTITY:

This dimension measures the feeling that you belong to a company and you are a valuable member of a working team.

The reliability of the nine sub-scales of the organisational climate questionnaire was determined with the help of split-self method. The indices of the coefficient of correlation between the scores on the sets of the items of this scale has been recorded carefully in the following
manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Prior Scale</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORING**

The scores range from 1 to 4 with corresponding qualitative categories as follows.

1. Definitely disagree
2. Inclined to disagree
3. Inclined to agree
4. Definitely agree

**SOCIAL SUPPORT SCALE**

In order to measure different levels of social support, a modified version of the interpersonal support evaluation list (I.S.E.L.) was used. The original form of this scale consists of 40 statements concerning the perceived availability of potential social resources. The present social support scale was developed by some important academicians known:
Cohen, Merlstein, Kamarek and Hoberman (1985). Finally the modified version of this scale consisted of 18 items with two possible responses probably true or probably false (Appendix-B).

The original interpersonal support evaluation list (I.S.E.L.) falls in 4 sub-scales consisting 18 items each while its modified version consist of 3 sub-scale of 6 items each (Kapoor 1995, Vashistha 1998). There are 3 important aspect of social support known as Appraisal Support, Belonging support and Tangible support.

The tangible sub-scale is intended to measure perceived availability of retinal aid, the appraisal sub-scale is intended to measure the perceived availability of someone to take about one's problems and the belonging sub-scale is intended to measure the perceived availability of people with whom one person may adjust easily and can obtain help from him or her time to time. However the three important dimensions of this scale have the following different items against each aspect as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept of social support</th>
<th>Serial of items constituting different dimensions in the ISEL</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appraisal support</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Belonging support</td>
<td>7,8,9,10,11,12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tangible support</td>
<td>13,14,15,16,17,18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VALIDITY

The general population scale correlates 0.30 with the MOSS Family Environment Scale FES; MOOS, 1981, correlation with subscales of FES
were 0.21 with expressiveness 0.46 with number of close friends 0.46 and with no. of relatives 0.42. The general population ISEL also correlates with the partner Adjustment scale (Mermelstien, Lichtentein 1983) a measure of quality of marital or living partnership.

RELIABILITY

Internal reliability (Alfa coefficient) of the total general population of ISEL ranges from 0.88 to 0.90. In different studies it ranges from 0.70-0.82 for appraisal, 0.73-0.78 for belonging and 0.73-0.81 for tangible support. SDC month test retest correlation were 0.74 for the entire ISEL, 0.49 for the tangible subscale, 0.54 for self esteem 0.68 for belonging and 0.60 for appraisal subscale.

CORRELATION BETWEEN SUBSCALES

The subscale ISEL were independent of one another i.e. subscales did not measure the same thing. The correlation between subscales were 0.41 - 0.81 which indicate that subscale were highly inter-correlated. Complete independence of these scales is neither desirable nor possible since people receive different kinds of resources from the same person in their network.

SCORING OF ISEL

The ISEL is scored simple by counting the number of responses indicating support. Out of 18 items constituting the scale three appraisal support items were negative and remaining three were positive, four belonging support items were positive and remaining two items were negative. Three tangible support items were positive and three were negative.
The data collected through the tools were scored for each dimension separately. Then after, the data was further processed in the computer and the following statistics was carried out using SPSS package.

Statistical treatment of data has been made out in the light of the following techniques such as:

i) descriptive analysis

ii) Stepwise multiple regression analysis

(1) DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS:

Initially descriptive analysis was done in order to know the Mean, and SD of all the variable in each group. Significance of difference was calculated to see whether the groups are differing on each variables by using t-test.

(II) STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS:

Lastly, stepwise multiple regression analysis was computed thriceley in order to know the impact of relative importance of different variables which predicted criterion variable, i.e. burnout.
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Present study is aimed to see the impact of organisational role stress, organisational climate and social support on job burnout. After collection of data of all the (N=300) middle managers, 150 each from private and public sector, the scores were tabulated in the light of scoring procedure suggested by the authors of the respective questionnaires. Finally, the raw data was analysed on the basis of the following statistical techniques known as -

(i) Descriptive analysis, and
(ii) Stepwise multiple regression analysis

(i) DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

 Initially for the sake of analysis of data descriptive analysis was done in order to know the Mean and SD of all the variables in each group. Significance of difference was calculated to see whether the groups are differing on each variable by using t-test.

Table 4.(a) Comparison Between Public and Private Sectors Middle Managers On Organizational Role Stress Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Public (N=150)</th>
<th>Private (N=150)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>8.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107.08</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>82.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level
Table 4(a) indicates that Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 12.02 and 2.54, while it was found to be 8.77 and 3.95 respectively in case of private sector middle managers on which Intra Role Distance (IRD) component of organisational Role stress is significant at .01 level due to member of feasible reasons. The second important component of organisation role stress is known as Role Stagnation (RS) in this case, of public sector middle managers Mean and SD was found to be 11.78 and 2.16, while in the case of private sector middle managers the Mean and SD was found to be 8.18 and 3.55 respectively, which is significant at .01 level. Table 4(a) further reveals that in case of third important component of organisational role stress which is known as Role Expectation Conflict (REC), the Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 11.49 and 2.41, while in the case of private sector middle manager it was found to be 8.05 and 3.54 respectively, which has been found again significant at .01 level. The fourth important component of organisational role stress known as Role Erosion (RE). In this case Mean and SD in case of public sector middle managers was found to be 10.92 and 2.08, while in the case of private sector middle managers it was found to be 8.89 and 3.23 respectively, which has been found again significant at .01 level likewise earlier components of organisation role stress. The fifth important component known as Role Overload (RO) of organisational role stress. In this case Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 10.8 and 2.19, while in the case of private sector middle managers Mean and SD was found to be 8.72 and 3.62 respectively, which is again significant on .01 level due to some
important definite reasons. Likewise the sixth important component of organisational role stress known as Role Isolation (RI), the Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 10.54 and 2.07, while in case of private sector middle managers Mean and SD was found to be 8.34 and 3.45 respectively, which is again significant at .01 level due to some important reasons. The seventh important component of organisational Role stress dimension is known as Personal Independency (PI). In this case the Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 10.28 and 2.13, while in case of private sector middle managers the Mean and SD was found to be 8.14 and 3.32 respectively, which is again significant at .01 level. In the same manner the eight important component of organisation role stress dimension popularly known as Self Role Distance (SRD), indicates that Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 9.68 and 2.03, while Mean and SD in the case of private sector middle managers was found to be 7.75 and 3.57 respectively, which is again significant at .01 level. The ninth important component of organisational role stress dimension known as Role Ambiguity (RA), indicates that Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 9.72 and 1.93, while in the case of private sector middle managers Mean and SD was found to be 7.56 and 3.59 respectively, which is again significant at .01 level. The last component of organisational role stress known as Resource Inadequacy (RIN), indicates that Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 9.82 and 2.10, while in the case of private sector middle managers it was found to be 8.08 and 3.55 respectively, which is again significant at .01 level.
Table 4(a) further reveals that total Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 107.08 and 8.97, while in the case of private sector middle managers, it was found to be 82.51 and 27.05 respectively, which is again significant at .01 level and proves our underlying hypotheses no. H(a) that "public and private sector middle managers differ significantly with each other on organisational role stress dimensions". The result obtained in the table 4(a) is quite meaningful though a bit different to its previous findings carried out by other researches.

However, the prevailing trend of the Means and SDs reveal that the managers from the public sector experience more stress and burnout as compared to their counter-parts from private sectors. Singh (1990) studied the structure and dimensions of stress among middle and lower level executives from five private and three public sector organisations. The study revealed that higher level executives experienced less stress and strain as compared to the middle and lower level executives. Further, executives of public sector organisation experience more stress as compared to private sectors middle managers. Dumaine (1988), Ginsberg (1984) and Hunsakir (1986) have also shown that middle managers from public sectors experience more psychological crises in their carrier as compared to their counter-parts. And earlier study conducted by Jasmine (1987) also found that employees of the public sector experienced more stress than those from the private sector.

Ahmed et al. (1985) conducted a study of stress among executives and came to the conclusion that public sector executive experience slightly more stress than their counter-parts in private sector. Jasmine (1987) compared the level
of job related stress among public and private blue-collar employees. The analysis of the data revealed that role incumbents of public sector organisations experienced significantly more stress than those of private sector organisations. Pestonjee and Singh (1987) investigated computer professionals in public and private sector organisations and came with the same findings. Sharma (1987), observed that public sector employees scored significantly more higher scores on organisational role stress dimension as compared to their counter-parts private sector employees.

The difference in levels of stress in public and private sector middle managers could be attributed to the following reasons -

(i) The organisational climate of the public sector was different from that of private sectors.

(ii) Usually inadequate autonomy is being given to the managers in public sector as compared to their counter-parts.

(iii) In the case of public sector the objectives can be both production and social welfare. This philosophy underneath the two way not be compatible.

(iv) Frequent changes in policies and leadership in the public sectors as compared to the private sector due to political interferences.

(v) Public sector middle managers by and large are expected to meet demands of public responsibilities, they are faced with constant conflict between the goals of accountability and efficiency. While this is not so in the case of their counterparts. Hence private sector middle managers experience less stress and burnout.
Table 4.(b) Comparison Between Public And Private Sectors Middle Managers On Organizational Climate Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Public (N=150)</th>
<th>Private (N=150)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>18.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>16.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>14.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>13.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>14.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>11.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107.48</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>129.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

In the case of first important component of organisational climate dimension known as Structure. Mean and SD, in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 15.93 and 3.18, while Mean and SD in the case of private sector middle manager was found to be 18.92 and 4.06 respectively, which is significant at .01 level. Secondly, Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 15.0 and 2.34, while Mean and SD in the case of private sector middle managers was found to be 16.68 and 13.66 respectively vis-a-vis Responsibility component of organisational climate dimension, which also is significant at .01 level. Further, table 4(b) denotes that in the case fo reward component of organisational climate dimension, Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 13.62 and 2.02, while in case of private
sector middle managers Mean and SD was found to be 15.3 and 2.88 respectively, which is significant at .01 level. Likewise Structure, Responsibility and Reward component of organisational climate dimension, in the case of fourth important component of organisational climate dimension, known as Risk, Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 12.03 and 1.87, while in the case of private sector middle managers Mean and SD was found to be 13.5 and 2.89 respectively, which is also significant at .01 level. In the case of warmth component of organisational climate dimension Mean and SD for public sector middle managers was found to be 11.73 and 1.68, while Mean and SD in the case of private sector middle managers was found to be 14.06 and 2.94 respectively, which is significant .01 level as usual. In the case of support component of organisational climate dimension Mean and SD for public sector middle managers was found to be 11.28 and 1.62, while Mean and SD in case of private sector middle manager was found to be 13.66 and 2.8 respectively, which is again significant at .01 level similarly. Standard component of organisational climate dimension indicates that mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 10.92 and 1.99, while Mean and SD in the case of private sector middle managers was found to be 14.27 and 3.26 respectively, which is again significant at .01 level. Conflict component of organisational climate dimension reflects that mean and SD for public sector middle managers was found to be 8.56 and 1.83, while for private sector middle managers Mean and SD was found to be 11.27 and 2.68 respectively, which is significant at .01 level. The last component of organisational climate dimension known as identity, denotes that Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 8.39 and
2.02, while Mean and SD was found to be 11.34 and 2.27 in the private sector middle managers respectively, which is also significant at .01 level. Likewise in the case of other components of organisational climate dimension. Further table 4(b) indicates that the total mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 107.48 and 7.92, while in the case of private sector middle managers Mean and SD was found to be 129.40 and 15.48 respectively, which is again significant at .01 level due to some important scientific reasons and proves our underlying hypothesis no. H(b) known as "public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on organisational climate dimension".


Briefly speaking, organisational climate dimension is an important antecedent of occupational stress, which has developed positive attitude
among middle managers of private sector undertakings vis-a-vis their high sense of achievement, reward, warmth, affiliation and support respectively, and consequently less stress and burnout as compared to their counterparts public sector middle managers.

In the light of above said findings one can say that organisational climate dimension play a significant role in motivating the employees towards their task and organisational objectives respectively.

Table 4.(c) Comparison Between Public And Private Sectors Middle Managers On Social Support Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Public (N=150)</th>
<th>Private (N=150)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>5.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>10.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>5.96**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>13.97**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

Table 4(c) indicates that in the case of first important component of social support dimension known as Appraisal Support (AS) Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 3.01 and 1.06, while in the case of private sector middle managers Mean and SD was found to be 3.67 and 0.97 respectively which is significant at .01 level. Further, table 4(c) reveals that in the case of second important component of social support dimension known as Belonging Support (BS) Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle manager was found to be 2.82 and 1.06, while in the case private sector middle managers Mean and SD was found to be 4.05 and 1.02 respectively, which is again significant at .01 level. In the case of tangible
support component of social support dimension Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 2.72 and 1.13, while in the case of private sector middle managers Mean and SD was found to be 3.51 and 1.15 respectively, which is again significant at .01 level. Further, table 4(c) indicates that total Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 8.56 and 1.83, while in the case of private sector middle managers Mean and SD was found to be 11.24 and 1.45 respectively which is significant at .01 level and proves our underlying hypothesis no. H(c) entitled "Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on social support dimension". Hence, it goes without saying to say that private sector middle managers have received maximum social support from their high ups as comapred to their counterpart public sector middle managers.

The current faction with social support stems from the believe, that it can reduce the experience of stress, burnout and enhance the level of health, well-being, job satisfaction and job-performance of the employees in the organisation in general. In the present investigation in the case of private sector middle managers the level of social support has been found much high as compared to their counterparts public sector middle managers, which has developed positive attitude in them and causes less stress and consequently low burnout. However, some important studies conducted by Newman (1978); LaRocco and Jones (1978a); Pinneau (1976) lend their kind support to my findings in this regard. The view highlighted by LaRocco, House and French (1980) that social support is hypothesised to interact with stressors in such a way relationship between stress-strain, stress and burnout is stronger for persons with low level of social support than for those will high level of social support also lend their support to my findings in this
regard. The view highlighted by Young and Carayon (1995) that primary social factor hypothesised to mitigate the effect of stress and burnout is the degree of social support that an individual receives, which also extend their support to my findings. The study conducted by Van Dierendock, Schaufeli & Sixman (1994); Van Yperen (1996); Van Yperen, Buunk & Schaufeli (1992) that perceptions of inequality are accompanied by burnout symptoms also extend indirectly their support to my findings. The view highlighted by following researchers that social support is a moderator to job-burnout is also very much similar to my findings. French and Caplan, (1970); House, McMichael, wells, Kaplan & Landerman (1979), House (1981) viewed that social support has been identified as a resource that enables individuals to cope with stress and burnout and hence indirectly lend their support to my finding.

Regardless, a number of studies conducted by Pinneau (1975), (1976); Andrews et al. (1978); LaRacco and Jones (1978a); Lin et al. (1979); Kaufman and Beehr (1986); are quite dissimilar and contradictory to my findings due to sample differences on account of a across-cultural research.

Table 4.(d) Comparison Between Public And Private Sectors Middle Managers On Job-Burnout Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Public (N=150)</th>
<th>Private (N=150)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>30.74</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>22.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>11.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>27.22</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>21.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.57</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>55.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .01 level
Table 4(d) indicates that in the case of first important component Emotional Exhaustion (EE) of job-burnout dimension, Mean and SD for public sector middle managers was found to be 30.74 and 6.73, while in the case of private sector middle managers Mean and SD was found to be 22.28 and 11.49 respectively, which is significant at .01 level. In the case of Depressionized (Dp) component of job burnout dimension Mean and SD for public sector middle manager was found to be 15.61 and 4.04 while in the case of private sector middle managers Mean and SD was found to be 11.94 and 6.7 respectively, which is again significant at .01 level. In the case of Personal Accomplishment (PA) component of job-burnout dimension, Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 27.22 and 7.07, while in the case of private sector middle managers Mean and SD was found to be 21.54 and 9.79 respectively, which is again significant at .01 level. Total Mean and SD in the case of public sector middle managers was found to be 73.57 and 10.55, while in the case of private sector middle managers total Mean and SD was found to be 55.76 and 21.17 respectively, which is again significant at .01 level and proves our underlying hypothesis no. H(d) that "public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on job-burnout dimension".

The obtained mean and standard deviation, stated in 4(d), reveal that public sector middle managers by and large experienced more job-burnout as compared to their counterparts private sector middle managers due to the following reasons:

1. Public sector organisations are getting less conducive organisational culture as compared to their counterparts private sector organisation.
2. Public sector organisations are getting non-performance based reward structure as compared to their counterparts. This is another feasible reason for more stress and burnout in the case of public sector middle managers as compared to their counterparts.

3. Private sector organisations are getting employees oriented policies and better promotional avenues as compared to their counter-parts. Hence private sector middle managers perceive less burnout as compared to public sector middle managers.

4. Level of job satisfaction has been found more prevalent in the case of private sector middle managers as compared to their counterparts that is public sector middle managers.

5. Public sector middle managers experienced poor inter-personal relationships as compared to their counterpart private sector middle managers. Hence result is high stress and burnout in the case of public sector middle managers as compared to private sector middle managers.

6. Public sector middle managers perceived more bureaucratic atmosphere as compared to their counterparts private sector middle managers.

7. Public sector middle managers are suffering from less participation as compared to their counterparts.

8. Public sector middle managers are suffering from deep sense of inefficiency as compared to their counterparts.

9. Public sector middle managers are suffering from more alienation as compared to their counterparts.
The following studies conducted by Singh (1990), Jasmine (1987), Dumaine (1988), Ginsberg (1984), Hunsaker (1986) and Sinha (1990) are very much similar in nature to my findings.

In the light of above said facts, it could be easily concluded that public sector middle managers by and large perceived more stress, less social support, poor conducive organisational climate, utilised poor-coping strategies and rated themselves less effective as compared to their counterparts private sector middle managers. Therefore, high rate burnout in the case of public sector middle managers is quite obvious and understandable.

(ii) **STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS**

Another very important technique which is being used in order to analysis the data of the present research is known Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis. Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis denotes relative contribution of each independent variables and it various components against job-burnout. It is worth mentioning is here that since the depend variable i.e. burnout having three components. Therefore, the Regression Analysis in this case is computed three times for each component in each group of subjects and the obtained result through stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis is highlighted in the following manner.
Table 4. Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis Middle Managers (N=300)

Main Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors in total</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORS (private)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS (Public)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level

Table 4.(e) Indicates Impact Of Organizational Role Stress On Job-Burnout Dimension Of Private Sector Middle Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level
Table no. 4(e) indicates impact of organisational Role stress on criterion variable (i.e. job-burnout) of private sector middle managers. The Role Erosion component of organisational role stress has been found utmost important predictor to job-burnout as their F-value being 15.88, (> .01) which is significant at .01 level. Role Inadequacy component of Organisational Role Stress dimension has been found another important predictor of Job-Burnout as their F-value being 11.77, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level. Role Expectation Conflict component of Organisational Role Stress has been found as third important determinant of Job-Burnout as their F-value being 8.02, (> .01), which is again significant at .01 level. Self Role Distance component of Organizational Role Stress dimension also influences greatly Job-Burnout of private sector middle managers as their F-value being 5.97, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level. Likewise Role Stagnation component of Organisational Role Stress dimension has been as fifth important predictor of Job-Burnout in the case of private sector middle managers as their F-value being 5.15, (> .01) which is significant at .01 level. Role Overload component of Organisational Role Stress dimension has also been found an important predictor of Job-Burnout as their F-value being 4.43, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level.

In the same manner other components of Organisational Role Stress dimension which enters into Multiple Regression Equation and known as Role Ambiguity, Role Isolation, Intra Role Distance and Personal Inadquacy as their F-value being 3.98, (> .01), 3.51, (> .01), 3.02 (> .01) and 2.87 (> .01) respectively also influences the element of Job-Burnout but with lesser intensity, which is significant at .01 level. Organisational Role Stress dimension in total also influences Job-Burnout greatly as their F-value
being 3.18, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level and confirmed the underlying hypothesis of research that 'Organization Role Stress' dimension and its ten component will act as predictor of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle manager'. The studies conducted by (Kahn et al. (1987); Rizzo et al. (1970); Johnson (1979); Fielder et al. (1979); Szilagyi and Holland (1980); Harigopal (1980); Nahta (1980); Sen (1982); Parasuram and Alulto (1981); Srivastava (1982); Koch et al. (1982); Cooke and Rousseau (1984); Osipaw et al. (1985); Ahmad et al. (1986); Jasmine (1987); Singh (1989); Westman (1999); Mohan and Chauhan (1999)) extend their support to my findings.

Table 4.(e)-1 Indicates Impact Of Organizational Role Stress On Emotional Exhaustion Component Of Job-Burnout Dimension Of Private Sector Middle Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>51.39</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>40.03</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>36.14</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>34.36</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>30.98</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>24.09</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level
In the case of table no. 4(e)-1 various components of Organizational Role Stress dimension influences Emotional Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout in the following manner. The Role Overload component of Organizational Role Stress dimension has been found as most contributory predictor of Emotional Exhaustion as their F-value being 51.39, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level. In the same manner Intra Role Distance has also been found as next important contributory predictor of Emotional Exhaustion in the same sequence as their F-value being 40.03, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level. Likewise, Personal Inadequacy, Role Expectation Conflict and Role Ambiguity components of Organisational Role Stress dimension has been found as third, fourth and fifth contributory predictor of Emotional Exhaustion as their F-values being 36.14, (> .01), 34.36 (> .01), and 30.98 (> .01) respectively, which are significant at .01 level. In the same manner the other components of Organisational Role Stress dimension known as Role Stagnation, Role Inadequacy, Role Isolation, Self Role Distance and Role Erosion which enters into Multiple Regression Equation also influences Emotional Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout, but comparatively with lesser amount as their F-values being 25.78, (> .01), 24.09, (> .01), 21.59, (> .01), 19.1 (> .01), and 17.39 (> .01) respectively, which are significant at .01 level. Organization Role Stress dimension in total also influences Emotional Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout dimension as its F-value being 11.29, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level.
Table 4.(e)-2 Indicates Impact Of Organizational Role Stress On Depersonalization Component Of Job-Burnout Dimension Of Private Sector Middle Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>54.67</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>37.24</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>28.94</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>23.48</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>16.93</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

In the case of table no. 4(e)-2 various components of Organisational Role Stress dimension also influences Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout in the following manner. The Role Overload component of Organisational Role Stress dimension has been found as most contributory predictor of Depersonalization as their F-value being 54.67, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level. In the same way Role Expectation Conflict component of Organisational Role Stress dimension has been found as next contributory predictor of Depersonalization was their F-value being 37.24, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level. Likewise Self Role Distance, Role Isolation and Role Stagnation components of Organisational Role Stress dimension have been found as third, fourth and fifth predictor of Depersonalization in the same sequence as F-value being 28.94,
(>.01), 23.48 and 20.45 respectively, which are significant at .01 level. In the same manner Intra Role Distance, Personal Inadequacy, Role Erosion, Role Inadequacy and Role Ambiguity component of Organization Role Stress dimension which enters into Multiple Regression Equation also influences Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout but comparatively with lesser intensely as their F-values being 14.43, (> .01), 13.22, (> .01), 11.86, (> .01), 10.66, (> .01) and 18.71 (> .01) respectively, which are significant at .01 level. Organizational Role Stress in total also influences Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout as their F-value being 16.93, (> .01) which is also significant at .01 level.

**Table 4.(e)-3 Indicates Impact Of Organizational Role Stress On Personal Accomplishment Component Of Job-Burnout Dimension Of Private Sector Middle Managers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level**
Table no. 4(e)-3 indicates impact of Organisational Role Stress dimension on Personal Accomplishment component and Job-Burnout dimension in the following manner. In this table Role Erosion component of Organisational Role Stress dimension has been found as an important determinant of Personal Accomplishment as their F-value being 15.88, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level. Role Inadequacy component of Organisational Role Stress dimension has been found as next important determinant of Personal Accomplishment as their F-value being 11.77, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level. Likewise Role Expectation Conflict component of Organisational Role Stress dimension has been found as important determinant of Personal Accomplishment as their F-value being 8.02, (> .01), which is again significant at .01 level. Likewise Self Role Distance, Role Stagnation, Role Ambiguity, Role Isolation, Intra Role Distance and Personal Inadequacy component of Organisation Role Stress dimension have also been found as other important determinants of Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout as their F-values being 5.97, (> .01), 5.15, (> .01), 4.43, (> .01), 3.98, (> .01), 3.51, (> .01), 3.02, (> .01) and 2.87 (> .01) respectively which are also significant at .01 level. Organisational Role Stress in total also influence Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout dimension as their F-value being 3.18, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level.
Table 4(f) indicates impact of Organizational Role Stress dimension on Job-Burnout dimension of public sector middle managers. Role Inadequacy component of Organizational Role Stress dimension has been found as most dominant predictor of Job-Burnout as their F-value being 9.38, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level. Role Ambiguity component of Organisational Role dimension has been found as next dominant predictor of Job-Burnout as their F-value being 4.97, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level. Self Role Distance and Role Stagnation component of Organisational Role Stress has been found as third and fourth dominant predictor of Job-Burnout as their F-values being 3.82, (> .01) and 3.16, (> .01) respectively, which are again significant at .01 level. Likewise Role Overload, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Erosion, Intra Role Distance, Personal Inadequacy and Role Isolation components of Organisational Role Stress
dimension which enters into Multiple Regression Equation influence Job-Burnout rate least dominantly as their F-values being 2.69, (> .01), 2.44, (> .01), 2.17, (> .01), 1.91, (> .01), 1.8 (> .01) and 1.81, (> .01) respectively, which are significant at .01 level. Organisational Role Stress in total also influence Job-Burnout as their F-value being 3.36, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level and partly confirm the underlying hypothesis of research that 'Organisational Role Stress dimension and its ten components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of public sector middle managers'. The following studies conducted by (Ahmad et al. (1985); Jasmine (1987); Srilathe (1988); Singh (1989); Singh and Nath (1999); Sharda and Klandermans (1983); Malki and Sabharwal (1999); Anirudh (1997); Pandey (1998); Mohan and Chauhan (1999); Vander Pompe and Detteus (1993)) extend their whole heartedly support to my findings.

Table 4.(f)-1 Indicates Impact Of Organizational Role Stress On Emotional Exhaustion Component Of Job-Burnout Dimension Of Public Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>&gt;.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>&gt;.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>&gt;.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .01 level
Table no. 4(f)-1 indicates the impact of Organisational Role Stress dimension on Emotion Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout dimension in the following manner. In this table Role Inadequacy, Intra Role Distance and Role Erosion components of Organisational Role Stress dimension have been found as first, second and third most influencing predictors of Emotional Exhaustion as their F-values being 6.09, (> .01), 3.09, (> .01) and 2.05, (> .01) respectively, which are significant at .01 level separately. Other rest of seven important components of Organizational Role Stress dimension known as standard Role Distance, Role Overload, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Ambiguity, Role Inadequacy, Role Stagnation and Personal Inadequacy have been found insignificantly related with Emotional Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout dimension as their F-values being 1.66, (< .01), 1.33, (< .01), 1.81, (< .01), 1.55, (< .01), 1.34, (< .01), 1.35, (< .01) and 1.26, (< .01) respectively, which are consistently insignificant.

**Table 4.(f)-2 Indicates Impact Of Organizational Role Stress On Depersonalization Component Of Job-Burnout Dimension Of Public Sector Middle Managers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level
Table no. 4(f)-2 indicates impact of Organisational Role Stress dimension on Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout in the following manner. This table clearly indicates that all possible ten components of Organizational Role Stress dimension known as Role Ambiguity, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Inadequacy, Role Stagnation, Role Inadequacy, Role Overload, Personal Inadequacy, Intra Role Distance and Standard Role Distance have been found continuously insignificantly related with Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout as their F-values being 1.23, (< .01), 0.09, (< .01), 1.06, (< .01), 0.84, (< .01), 0.98, (< .01), 0.81, (< .01), 0.69, (< .01), 0.61, (< .01), 0.56, (< .01), 1.11, (< .01) and 0.98 (<.01) respectively. Even the total value of Organization Role Stress viz-a-viz Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout have been found amazingly insignificant as their F-value being 0.61, (< .01).

Table 4(f)-3 Indicates Impact Of Organizational Role Stress On Personal Accomplishment Component Of Job-Burnout Dimension Of Public Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level**

Table no. 4(f)-3 indicates impact of Organizational Role Stress dimension on
Personal Accomplishment compound of Job-Burnout dimension in the case of public sector middle managers in the following manner. This table also indicates clearly that all possible ten important components of Organizational Role Stress dimension known as Role Stagnation, Role Ambiguity, Standard Role Distance, Role Inadequacy, Personal Inadequacy, Role Overload, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Erosion and Intra Role Distance have been found apparently insignificantly related with Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout as their F-values being 0.42, (< .01), 0.63, (< .01), 0.75, (< .01), 1.44, (< .01), 1.48, (< .01), 1.28, (< .01), 1.17, (< .01), 1.14, (< .01), 1.01, (< .01) and 0.92, (< .01) respectively. In this case also even the total value of Organizational Role Stress dimension has been found insignificant viz-a-viz Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout dimension as their obtained F-value being 0.78, (< .01).

Table 4.(g) Indicates Impact Of Organizational Climate On Job-Burnout Dimension Of Private Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level
In this table Organizational Climate is studied in terms of achievement of private sector middle manager in their respective organisations viz-a-viz their career. This table 4(g) indicates impact of Organizational Climate dimension on Job-Burnout of private sector middle managers in total in the following manner. The Conflict, Risk, Reward and Support components of Organisational Climate dimension influences Job-Burnout rate greatly as their F-values being 13.17, (> .01), 12.57, (> .01), 11.59, (> .01) and 10.33, (> .01) respectively, which are consistently significant at .01 level as compared to Identity, Warmth, Responsibility and Standard component of Organisational Climate dimension whose F-values were being found to be 9.66, (> .01), 9.59, (> .01), 9.57, (> .01), and 9.39, (> .01), which are significant at .01 level respectively and influences Job-Burnout rate with lesser intensity only. The Structure component of Organizational Climate dimension did not influence Job-Burnout rate significantly as their F-value being found to be 0.4, (< .01), which is quite unique in its nature. Organizational Climate dimension in total also influences Job-Burnout rate of private sector middle managers greatly as their F-value being 11.39, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level, and confirms the concerned underlying hypothesis of research that 'Organizational Climate dimension and its nine components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers', except only one component of Organizational Climate dimension known as Structure. The earlier studies conducted by (Schmidt and Kipnis (1984); Madison, Allen, Porter, Renwick and Mayes (1980); Mowday (1979); Schein (1977); Kipnis and Schmidt (1983); Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson (1980); Cartwright and Zander (1968); Franklin (1975); Likert (1967); Cheng
(1983); Festinger (1950); Salanick and Pfeffer (1978)) directly or indirectly extend their support in this regard.

Table 4.(g)-1 Indicates Impact Of Organizational Climate On Emotional Exhaustion Component Of Job-Burnout Dimension Of Private Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>20.87</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

Table no. 4(g)-1 indicates impact of Organizational Climate dimension on Emotional Exhustion component of Job-Burnout dimension of private sector middle manager in the following manner. In this table Conflict, Support, Risk, Reward and Structure components of Organizational Climate dimension influences Emotional Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout of private sector middle managers greatly as their F-values being 20.87, (> .01), 12.97, (> .01), 9.8, (> .01), 7.67, (> .01) and 7.34, (> .01) respectively, which are significant at .01 level, as compared to Responsibility, Identity, Warmth and Standard component of Organisational Climate dimension which influences Emotional Exhaustion component of
Job-Burnout dimension of private sector middle managers comparatively with lesser intensity as their F-values being 6.71, (> .01), 6.5, (> .01), 6.45, (> .01), 6.19, (> .01) respectively, which are again significant at .01 level. Organizational Climate dimension in total also influences Emotional Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout dimension greatly as their F-value being found to be 5.46, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level.

Table 4.(g)-2 Indicates Impact Of Organizational Climate On Depersonalization Component Of Job-Burnout Dimension Of Private Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>OC Vs DP</th>
<th>(Private)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

Table no. 4(g)-2 indicate impact of Organizational Climate dimensions on Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout dimension of private sector middle manager in the following manner. The Risk, Warmth, Conflict, Standard and Identity components of Organizational Climate dimension influences Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout dimension of private
sector middle manager greatly as their F-values being 10.75, (> .01), 8.69, (> .01), 8.04, (> .01), 7.07, (> .01) and 6.39, (> .01) respectively, which are significant consistently at .01 level, as compare to Responsibility, Support, Structure and Reward components of Organisational Climate dimension which influences Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout dimension of private sector middle manager comparatively with lesser intensity as their F-values being found to be 5.55, (> .01), 5.18, (> .01), 4.72, (> .01) and 4.17, (> .01) respectively, which are again significant at .01 level. Organizational Climate dimension in total also influences Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout dimension of private sector middle manager greatly as their F-value being found to be 8.39, (> .01) which is significant at .01 level.

Table 4.(g)-3 Indicates Impact Of Organizational Climate On Personal Accomplishment Component Of Job-Burnout Dimension Of Private Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level
Table no. 4(g)-3 indicates impact of Organizational Climate dimension on Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout dimension of private sector middle managers in the following manner. In this table Structure, Reward, Standard, Warmth and Conflict components of Organizational Climate dimension which enters into Multiple Regression Equation influences Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout dimensions of private sector middle managers greatly as their F-values were being found to be 6.3, (> .01), 5.83, (> .01), 5.23, (> .01), 5.21, (> .01) and 5.08, (> .01) respectively, which are significant at .01 level as compare to Support, Risk and Identity components of Organizational Climate dimension which influences Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout dimension with lesser intensity as their F-values were being found to be 4.11, (> .01), 4.07, (> .01) and 3.19, (> .01) respectively, which are significant again at .01 level. In this table only Responsibility component of Organizational Climate dimension did not influence Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout dimension of private sector middle manager as their F-value was found to be 0.14, (< .01), which is insignificant. In total Organizational Climate dimension influences Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout of private sector middle managers moderately as their F-value being found to be 5.05, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level likewise.
Table 4.(h) Indicates Impact Of Organizational Climate On Job-Burnout Dimension Of Public Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .01 level

Table no. 4(h) indicates impact of Organizational Climate on Job-Burnout of public sector middle managers in total sample in the following manner. In this table Reward, Warmth, Conflict and Standard components of Organizational Climate dimension influences Job-Burnout of public sector middle managers greatly as their F-values were found to be 11.47, (> .01), 5.32, (> .01), 4.59, (> .01) and 4.31, (> .01) respectively which are significant at .01 level. While at the same time other components of Organizational Climate dimension known as Identity, Structure, Support, Responsibility and Risk also influence Job-Burnout of Public Sector middle managers with lesser intensity as their F-values were being found to be 3.69, (> .01), 3.57, (> .01), 3.14, (> .01), 2.86, (> .01) and 2.85, (> .01) respectively, which are significant again at .01 level. Organizational Climate dimension in total also influences Job-Burnout.
of public sector middle manager with greater intensity as their F-value were being to be 6.39, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level which confirms over underlying hypothesis known as 'Organizational Climate dimension and its nine components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, Feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of public sector middle managers', in total. But separately in case of feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment they did not confirm the hypothesis. The studies conducted by the following investigators (Morgan, King and Rabinson (1979); Keenan and Newton (1984); Litwin and Stringer (1968); Spector (1978); Gouldner (1954); Hage (1980), Solomon (1986)) extend their support to my findings.

Table 4. (h)-1 Indicates Impact Of Organizational Climate On Emotional Exhaustion Component Of Job-Burnout Dimension Of Public Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level.
Table no. 4(h)-1 indicates impact of Organizational Climate dimension on Emotional Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout dimension on public sector middle managers in the following manner. The Warmth, Standard, Conflict, Risk and Reward component of Organizational Climate dimension influences Emotional Exhaustion of public sector middle managers moderately as their F-values were being found to be 4.42, (> .01), 4.38, (> .01), 3.72, (> .01), 3.34, (> .01) and 3.15, (> .01) respectively, which are significant at .01 level. Other components of Organization Climate dimension likewise Identity, Structure, Responsibility and Support do influences Emotional Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout of public sector middle manager but comparatively with lesser intensity as their F-values were being found to be 2.62, (> .01), 2.43, (> .01), 2.18, (> .01) and 1.94, (> .01) respectively, which are significant at .01 level. In total Organizational Climate dimension did not influence Emotional Exhaustion of public sector middle managers as their F-values were being found to be 1.77, (< .01) which is quite insignificant to its level.

Table 4.(h)-2 Indicates Impact Of Organizational Climate On Depersonalization Component Of Job-Burnout Dimension Of Public Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level**
Table no. 4(h)-2 indicates impact of Organizational Climate dimension on Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout dimension on public sector middle managers in the following manner. In this table all the components of Organizational Climate dimension which enters into Multiple Regression Equation likewise Standard, Responsibility, Warmth, Structure, Identity, Support, Reward, Conflict and Risk did not influence at all Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout dimension of public sector middle managers as their F-values were being found to be 0.47, (< .01), 0.33, (< .01), 0.51, (< .01), 0.41, (< .01), 0.72, (< .01), 0.62, (< .01), 0.77, (< .01), 0.72, (< .01), and 0.65, (< .01) respectively which are consistently insignificant. Even Organizational Climate dimension in total too did not influence Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout of public sector middle managers as its F-value was being found to be 0.68, (< .01), which also quite insignificant to its nature.

Table 4.(h)-3 Indicates Impact Of Organizational Climate On Personal Accomplishment Component Of Job-Burnout Dimension Of Public Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>OC Vs PA</th>
<th>(Public)</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level
Table no. 4(h)-3 denotes impact of Organizational Climate dimension on Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout of public sector middle manager in the following manager. In this table Reward, Identity, Warmth and Support components of Organizational Climate dimension influences Personal Accomplishment component of Burnout dimension of public sector middle managers significantly as their F-values were being found to be 3.63, (> .01), 2.57, (> .01), 2.48, (> .01) and 1.98, (> .01) respectively, which are significant at .01 level, while at the same time other components of Organizational Climate dimension, known as Conflict, Structure, Standard, Risk and Responsibility did not influence Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout of public sector middle managers as their F-values were being found to be 1.7, (< .01), 1.60, (< .01), 1.45, (< .01), 1.41, (< .01) and 1.25, (< .01) respectively, which are quite insignificant to their levels. Organizational Climate dimension in total also did not influence Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout of public sector middle manager as its F-values was found to be 0.02, (< .01), which is quite insignificant to its level.

Table 4.(i) Indicates Impact Of Social Support On Job-Burnout Dimension Of Private Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>SS Vs DV</th>
<th>(Private)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level
Table no. 4(i) indicates impact of Social Support dimension on Job-Burnout of private sector middle managers in total sample in the following manner. In this table Tangible Support component of Social Support dimension influences most greatly Job-Burnout of private sector middle managers as their F-value was found to be 7.04, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level. In the same manner Appraisal Support component of Social Support dimension also influences Job-Burnout of private sector middle managers almost in the same manner as their F-value was found to be 6.52, (> .01) which is again significant at .01 level. Likewise third important component of Social Support dimension known as Belonging Support also influences Job-Burnout of private sector middle managers but comparatively with lesser intensity as their F-value was found to be 4.92, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level. Social Support dimension in total also influences Job-Burnout of private sector middle manager significantly as their F-value was found to be 3.82, (> .01), which to a greater extent confirms our underlying hypothesis that, 'Social Support dimension and its three components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, Feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers', except separately in case of Personal Accomplishment and Belonging Support in case of Depersonalization. The studies conducted by the following researchers extend their support to my findings (Hobfoll & Lerman (1988); Stephens, Kinney, Norris and Ritchie (1987); Dolley, Rook and Cataliano (1987); Firth, McIntee, McKeoun and Britton (1986); Ganster, Fusilier and Mayes (1986); Karasek, Triantis and Chaudhry (1982); Russell, Altmaier and Van Velzen (1987); Seer, McGee, Serey and Graen (1983); Ogus (1990); Kong et al. (1993); Etzion and Westman (1994)).
Table 4(i)-1 Indicates Impact Of Social Support On Emotional Exhaustion Component Job-Burnout Dimension Of Private Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

Table no. 4(i)-1 denotes impact of Social Support dimension on Emotional Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout of private sector middle managers in the following manner. In this table Tangible Support component of Social Support dimension influences Emotional Exhaustion of private sector middle managers most greatly as its F-value was found to be 5.75, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level. The next important component of Social Support dimension known as Belonging Support also influence greatly almost in the same manner Emotional Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout dimension of private sector middle managers and its F-value was found to be 5.34, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level. The third important component of Social Support dimension known as Appraisal Support also influences Emotional Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout dimension of private sector middle managers but comparatively with lesser intensity as its F-value was found to be 3.58, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level. Social Support dimension in total also influences Emotional Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout of private sector middle managers but comparatively with lesser intensity as compare to Tangible Support and
Belonging Support and with greater intensity to Appraisal Support as its F-value was found to be 4.05, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level.

**Table 4.(i)-2**  **Indicates Impact Of Social Support On Depersonalization Component Job-Burnout Dimension Of Private Sector Middle Managers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>&gt; .01**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level**

Table no 4(i)-2 indicates impact of Social Support dimension on Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout dimension of private sector middle managers in the following manner. In this table Belonging Support component of Social Support dimension did not influences at all Depersonalization and component of Job-Burnout dimension of private sector middle managers as its F-value was found to be 0.04, (< .01), which is quite insignificant to its level. The other very important component of Social Support dimension known as Appraisal Support influences greatly Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout dimension of private sector middle managers as its F-value was found to be 5.12, (> .01), which is significant at 0.01 level. Tangible Support component of Social Support dimension similarly influences Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout dimension of private sector middle managers but comparatively with lesser intensity as compared to Appraisal Support component of Social Support dimension as its F-value was fund to be 3.35, (> .01), which is
significant at .01 level. Social Support dimension in total also influences greatly Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout of private sector middle managers as its F-value was found to be 4.19, (> .01), which is significant at .01 level.

Table 4(i)-3 Indicates Impact Of Social Support On Personal Accomplishment Component Job-Burnout Dimension Of Private Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>SS Vs PA</th>
<th>(Private)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 4(i)-3 denotes impact of Social Support dimension Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout dimension of private sector middle managers in the following manner. In this table all the components of Social Support dimension known as Tangible Support, Belonging Support and Appraisal Support influences Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout dimension of private sector middle managers quite insignificantly as their F-value was found to be 1.27, (< .01), 1.68, (< .01), and 0.71, (< .01) respectively. Even in Social Support dimension in total amazingly didnot influences Personal Accomplishment component of Job Burnout dimension at all as its F-value was found to be 1.16.
Table 4.(j) Indicates Impact Of Social Support On Job-Burnout Dimension Of Public Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>SS Vs DV</th>
<th>(Public)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 4(j) indicates impact of Social Support on Job-Burnout of public sector middle managers in total sample in the following manner. In this table all possible components of Social Support dimension known as Appraisal Support, Tangible Support and Belonging Support did not influence Job-Burnout of public sector middle managers at all as their F-values were being found to be 0.18, (< .01), 0.41, (< .01) and 0.95, (< .01) respectively, which are quite insignificant to their levels. Even Social Support dimension in its own capacity did not influences Job-Burnout of public sector middle managers likewise earlier as its F-value was found to be 1.22, (< .01), which is amazingly insignificant through and through and disconfirm the underlying hypothesis of the concerned research that 'Social Support dimension and its three components will act as prediction of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of public sector middle managers'. The following studies conducted by (Choen and Wills (1985); Ganster and Victor (1988); Duckitt (1984); Hellar and Swindle (1983); Lefcourt (1985); Pinneaus 1976); Lin et al. (1979); Gore (1978); Caldwell and Reinhart (1988); Cummins (1989)) extend their support directly or indirectly to my findings.
Table 4.(j)-1 Indicates Impact Of Social Support On Emotional Exhaustion Component Of Job-Burnout Dimension Of Public Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 4(j)-1 indicates impact of Social Support as Emotional Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout dimension of public sector middle managers in the following manner. In this table also likewise above mentioned various components of Social Support dimension known as Appraisal Support, Belonging Support and Tangible Support did not influences Emotional Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout dimension public sector middle managers at all as their F-values were found to be 0.59, (< .01), 0.90, (< .01) and 1.04, (< .01) respectively, which are again insignificant to their levels. Even Social Support dimension in total did not influences Emotional Exhaustion component of Job-Burnout of public sector middle managers in its own capacity as its F-value was found to be 1.29, (< .01), which is insignificant.

Table 4.(j)-2 Indicates Impact Of Social Support On Depersonalization Component Of Job-Burnout Dimension Of Public Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table no. 4(j)-2 indicates impact of Social Support on Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout of public sector middle managers in the following manner. This table also indicates that all possible components of Social Support dimension known as Appraisal Support, Belonging Support and Tangible Support did not influences at all Depersonalization component of Job-Burnout of public sector middle managers as their F-values were found to be 1.20, (< .01), 1.14, (< .01) and 0.83, (< .01) respectively, which are quite insignificant to their levels. Even Social Support dimension in total too didnot influences Depersonalization component of Burnout dimension of public sector middle managers as its F-value was found to be 0.76, (< .01), which is quite insignificant to its statistical level.

Table 4.(j)-3 Indicates Impact Of Social Support On Personal Accomplishment Component Of Job-Burnout Dimension Of Public Sector Middle Managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>SS Vs PA (Public)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 4(j)-3 indicates impact of Social Support on Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout of public sector middle managers in the following manner. In this table also all three important components of Social Support dimension know did not influence Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout dimension of public sector middle managers separately as their F-value were found to be 0.73, (< .01) 0.47, (< .01) and 0.64, (< .01) respectively which are insignificant to their levels. Even likewise
earlier Social Support dimension in total also did not influences Personal Accomplishment component of Job-Burnout dimension of public sector middle managers at all as its F-value was found to be 0.30, (< .01), which is again insignificant and quite unique to its nature.

Mostly studies available in the area of Organizational Behaviour are in the form of case studies usually as a single organization, which makes us difficult to draw any scientific and meaningful generalization that are inversely applicable across the organizations. Hence, keeping in view this study was designed to overcome this limitation of earlier researches conducted in the recent past by making it a kind of comparative study between public and private sector middle managers, taking into good consideration Organizational Role Stress, Organizational Climate and Social Support as independent variable and Job-Burnout as dependent variable in this regard.

Table no. 4(a) in which comparison between public and private sector middle managers has been made out viz-a-viz Organization Role Stress dimension clearly indicates that Organizational Role Stress and its various components are significantly and positively related with all the components of Burnout namely Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment on the one hand. But on the second hand the rate of Job Burnout among public sector middle managers have been found high as compared to private sector middle managers due to the following reasons - excessive work pressure, onus of great responsibility, onus of grater accountability, disfavourable attitude of top management towards middle managers, lack of positively interaction between middle manager and top management, feeling of career stagnation, while in the case of private sector
middle managers the rate of Job Burnout has been observed comparatively of lesser degree due to more conducive Organization Culture, comparatively a good Social Support atmosphere throughout the organization along with lesser Organisational Role Stress condition.

Further Table no. 4(e) and 4(f) of Multiple Regression Analysis in this regard also indicates that Organizational Role Stress and its various components are very closely associated with Job-Burnout and its various components i.e. Emotional Exhausion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment in case of both public and private sector middle managers. Role Erosion, Role Inadequacy and Role Expectation Conflict components of Organization Role Stress dimension have been found more closely associated with Job Burnout in the case of private sector middle managers as their F-values were being found to be 15.88, (> .01), 11.77, (> .01) and 8.02, (> .01) respectively as compared to its other components. While, in case of public sector middle managers Role Inadequacy and Role Ambiguity components of Organizational Role Stress dimension have been found more closely associated with Job-Burnout as their F-values were being found to be 9.38, (> .01) and 4.97, (> .01) respectively as compared to it rest of the components.

Keeping in view the nature of the findings, it is suggested that negative perception and feelings of middle managers should be converted into their positive perception and feeling viz-a-viz their respective management.

Table no. 4(b) in which comparison between public and private sector middle managers viz-a-viz Organisational Climate dimension has been made out indicates clearly that all possible components of Organizational Climate dimension: Intra Role Distance, Role Stagnation, Role Expectation Conflict,
Role Erosion, Role Overload, Role Isolation, Personal Inadequacy, Standard Role Distance, Role Ambiguity and Role Inadequacy are significantly and negatively correlated with Job-Burnout of public and private sector middle managers altogether on one hand and on the second hand this table further shows that Organizational Climate score has been found more high in the case of private sector middle managers as compared to their counterparts. Hence, less Job-Burnout in the case of private sector middle managers due to more conducive Organizational Climate conditions in terms of good achievement of the employees towards their respective organization, while, in the case of public sector middle managers the rate of Job-Burnout has been found high because of less conducive Organizational Climate conditions and their negative perception towards their respective organizations. Table no. 4(g) and 4(b) of Multiple Regression Analysis in this regard further indicates that all possible components of Organizational Climate dimensions namely : Structure, Conflict, Risk, Responsibility, Reward, Identity, Support, Warmth and Standard are positively and negatively related with Job-Burnout of public and private sector middle managers altogether in total. But separately in case of public sector middle managers of Organizational Climate dimension has been found insignificantly related with Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment components of Burnout due to depersonalized feelings of public sector middle managers viz-a-viz their respective organizations and their personal feelings of inadequacies. Therefore, in this regard, it is suggested that the high time has come that the attention of top managements of the organisations should be diverted towards good climatic conditions of the organisations which is lacking by and large. It could be made possible by taking good care of promotional avenues of middle manager, interpersonal
relationships between middle managers and top management, a positive
grievance handling, participative management, monetary benefits, welfare
facilities, recognition, appreciation, impartial treatment, handsome scales and
dearness allowances and good quality of life.

Table no. 4(c) in which comparison between public and private
sector middle managers has been made out viz-a-viz Social Support
dimension indicates clearly that Social Support scores has been found high in
the case of private sector middle managers hence less stress and burnout as
compared to their counterparts, because of the good functional support (which
includes tangible, appraisal and belonging) on their part. While in the case of
public sector middle managers the organizational situation has been found
quite different due to following reasons such as it could be because of non-
supportive Social Support atmosphere on the part of public sector middle
managers, it could be because of personality difference and social
incompetence on the part of public sector middle managers, it could be
because of imperfection on the part of interpersonal relationship between
middle and top managerial staff of public sector middle managers, it could be
because of imperfection on the part of operative mechanism of the concept of
Social Support dimension in the case of public sector middle managers.
Hence more stress and burnout in this regard. Table no. 4(i) and 4(j) of
Multiple Regression Analysis further indicates that Social Support dimension
is positively and negatively related with Job-Burnout and its most of the
component in case of private sector middle managers and insignificantly
related with Job-Burnout and its various components in case of public sector
middle managers due to already assigned reasons. Therefore, it is further
suggested that functional support which is lacking in the case of public sector
middle managers must be taken good care of in future. Regardless interpersonal relationship between middle managers and top managerial staff should also be improved without any delay in its near future. The operative mechanism of Social Support dimension comprises of three different steps also must be taken good care of in this regard in the case of public sector middle managers, otherwise management of burnout in the case of public sector middle managers would not be possible which causes dire consequences and horrifying implications in this regard.
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SUMMARY AND SUGGESTION

Research on the causes and consequences of stress and burnout in the organization has gained popularity in the recent past. Researchers investigating organisational stress have cited a number of dysfunctional outcomes resulting from stress both physiological and psychological, which ultimately effect dysfunctioning and effectiveness not only of the organization but also their members.

Burnout is a work related syndrome that stems from an individual's perception of a significant discrepancy between effort (input) and reward (output). It occurs most often in those who work face to face with troubled or needy clients and is typically marked by withdrawal from, and cynicism towards, clients, emotional and physical exhaustion and various psychological symptoms such as irritability, anxiety, sadness and lowered self-esteem (Farber, 1991). Burnout has most of often been conceptualized in the literature as an expression of negative adaptation to stress (Freudenberger, 1974). Burnout is characterised by physical depletion, by feeling of helplessness and hopelessness, by emotional drain and by the development of negative self-concept and negative attitude towards work, life and people. It is a sense of distress, discontent and failure in the quest of ideal. Maslach and Jackson (1981, 1986) defined burnout as a tripartite syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced sense of personal accomplishment that occur frequently among people whose work involve intense interaction with other people.
Emotional Exhaustion - it is caused by excessive psychological and emotional demands made on people in helping profession it is directly related to high levels of work demand.

Depersonalization - It refers to treating people like objects and development of negative attitude towards one's self, work and life. It is generally conceptualized as a response to the broader aspects of the job or work environment which is perceived as being bureaucratic, impersonal, rigid, or controlling.

Personal Accomplishment - It is the demotivational effects of feeling of inefficiency about their ability related to recipients that may results in a self imposed verdict of failure. Feelings of diminished personal accomplishment result from factors suggesting one is unappreciated or that one's efforts are ineffective.

The concept of organizational role stress is based as role theory developed by Pareek (1983). Role can be defined as position one occupies in a social system and by the functions he/she performs in response to the expectations of the significant member of the social system and also his/her own expectation from that position or office. The very nature of role has an in built potential for stress.

Organizational climate is defined as summary of perception which people have of an organizations. (Schneider and Synder 1975). It is basically impression of what the organization is due to the prevailing patterns of values, myths, assumptions, their embodiment in languages, norms, symbols and antifacts, including technology in management goals, practices, participants attitudes, activities and interactions, etc.
Social Support as a construct, refers to helpful social transactions that make people feel better. It speaks of an individual experience of being cared for, loved, esteemed and a member of network of mutual obligations (Cobb, 1976). Social support has been conceptualized as structural integration into a social network of relationships as well as functional resources provided as part of ongoing interpersonal relationships (Cohen & Syme, 1985).

**HYPOTHESES**

H(a) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Organizational Role Stress dimension.

H(b) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Organizational Climate dimension.

H(c) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Social Support dimension.

H(d) Public and private sector middle managers will differ with each other on Job-Burnout dimension.

H(e) Organizational Role Stress dimension and its ten components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(f) Organizational Role Stress dimension and its ten components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.
H(g) Organizational Climate dimension and its nine components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion, feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(h) Organizational Climate dimension and its nine components will act as predictor of Emotional Exhaustion feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(i) Social Support dimension and its three components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of private sector middle managers.

H(j) Social Support dimension and its three components will act as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment of public sector middle managers.

MEASURES

The following psychometric devices have been employed in the present investigation.

1. MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY:

Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) developed by Maslach and Jackson (1981) has been used to measure Job-Burnout among middle managers. MBI consists of 22 items that are divided into 3 -subscales i.e. Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment.
2. ORGANISATIONAL ROLE STRESS SCALE:

Pareek's (1983) Organizational Role Stress scale has been used to assess the extent of role stress of middle manager on the ten role dimensions, namely Inter Role Distance, Role Stagnation, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Erosion, Role Overload, Role Isolation, Personal Inadequacy, Self-Role Distance, Role Ambiguity and Resource Inadequacy.

3. ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE:

The Organizational Climate Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Litwin and Stringer (1968) has been employed in order to measure employees perception towards Organizational Climate of their respective organization. This questionnaire is comprise nine dimension namely Structure, Responsibility, Reward, Risk, Warmth, Support, Standard, Conflict and Identity.

4. SOCIAL SUPPORT SCALE:

Social Support scale has been developed by Kapoor (1995) and Vashistha (1998), which is comprises of 18 items and 3 sub-scales namely-Appraisal Support, Belonging Support and Tangible Support.

SAMPLE

In the present study the sample was randomly selected from various organisations parts of Delhi. It consists of (N=300) middle managers, 150 each from private and public undertakings (Lausreb International, Ottoagn, K.K. Kohli and brothers, Orient Craft, Shaff Eye Centre, Sukdan Home, etc. Indian Oil Corporation, Maruti Udyog, Indian Aluminium, Bilai Steel
Plant, etc.) Delhi. The methodology of the study was planned systematically keeping in view its lofty objectives.

ANALYSIS AND RESULT

Keeping in view the aims of the study, appropriate statistical techniques namely - descriptive analysis and stepwise multiple regression analysis were being used.

1. Public and private sector middle managers differ significantly with each other on Organizational Role Stress dimension since means and SDs in the case of public sector middle managers has been found 107.08, 8.97 and 82.57, 27.05 respectively in the case of private sector middle managers.

2. Public and private sector middle managers differ significantly with each other on Organizational Climate dimension since means and SDs in the case of public and private sector middle manager were found to be 107, 9.72 and 129.04, 15.48 respectively.

3. Public and private sector middle managers differ significantly with each other on Social Support dimension since means and SDs in the case of public and private sector middle managers were found to be 8.56, 1.83 and 11.24, 1.45 respectively.

4. Public and private sector middle managers differ significantly with each other on Job-Burnout dimension since means and SDs in the case of public and private sector middle managers were found to be 77.57, 10.55 and 55.76, 21.17 respectively.
5. Organisational Role Stress and its various components are significantly related with Job-Burnout and its various components in the case of private sector middle manager.

6. Organizational Role Stress dimension has been found significantly related with Job-Burnout dimension but not to its various components known as Emotional Exhaustion, feeling of Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment in public sector middle managers.

7. Organizational Climate and its various components are significantly related with Job-Burnout and its various components except responsibility component of Organizational Climate dimension viz-a-viz Personal Accomplishment component of Burnout in the case of private sector middle managers.

8. Organizational Climate and its various components have been found only significantly related with Emotional Exhaustion component of Burnout and insignificantly related with Depersonalization and 50% of the Personal Accomplishment component of Burnout in the case of public sector middle managers.

9. Social Support and its various components have been found significantly related with Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization of component of Job-Burnout except Personal Accomplishment in case of private sector middle managers.

10. Social Support and its various components have been found insignificantly related with Emotional Exh...
Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment components of Job-Burnout in the case of public sector middle manager.

**IMPLICATIONS**

Burnout represents a significant perspective on how people respond to their work in the organizations. It is used to convey number of social and personal problems of various categories of human professionals in their respective organizations. Burnout is initially a personal related problem. It is a problem for the person whose life it effects. Burnout has impairing effect as the part of physiological and psychological well-being of employees in the organizations. It also effects adversely job-performance, job-commitment, job-involvement, motivation, turnover, absenteeism and level of commitment of the employees in the organisations. It may also have horrifying implications and sever aftermath on the part of functioning of the organization on one hand and physical health of the employees on the second. Many of these symptoms associated to burnout suggest a loss of personal validity. It is also a problem of organization when productivity and profitability is gravely in danger or threatened or when conflict or apathy escalates. A number of professional with such jobs likewise - nurses, social workers, teachers, doctors, police officers, counsellors, lawyers, ministers, and other marginal staffs, etc. are those, whose work involve extensive contact with people in situations that can be emotionally charged.

**LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

It is true to highlight that every research has its own limitation, may be in the area of social sciences. It might be because researcher could not
possibly comprise the whole perspective of particular area in one fine study. As research is perceived to be a learning process, by which researcher tries to prove many conceptual and methodological issues but sometimes one issue becomes clear while other remains ambiguous or vague. In the context of the present study the following limitations have been identified by the researcher.

* There has been conspicuously little research on burnout among managers in particular and middle managers in general.

* Though individual demographic characteristics such as age, gender, race and education have long being studied in connection with work place phenomena but not in case of private and public sector middle managers.

* A cross cultural study is need of time in this direction.

* An extensive class validation of earlier investigation is also need of the time, where full attention of organizational psychologist of our country has not been paid so far.

* A cross validation of existing job-burnout inventories is also need of time.

* A close comparison of upper, middle and lower class managerial staff of private and public sectors viz-a-viz job-burnout dimension is also need of the time in this regard.

* Other psychological determinants likewise - personality hardiness, ego-strength external/internal locus of control and personality A-type is also a need of the time in this regard, where a little attention has been paid by Indian organizational psychologist.
Lastly speaking, right time has come to divert the attention of various heads of the organizations and organizational psychologists towards developing professional skills and identifying various sources of stress of employees (role-based stress, stress intrinsic to the behaviour setting, stress arising from the physical environment, stress arising from the social environment, and stress within the person system) in the organization particularly, of middle managers where job-burnout has been found more prevalent on one hand and developing effective job-burnout coping strategies on the second hand. Regardless level of job-burnout of various professionals can also be minimized with help of social support given by top managerial staff particularly in the case of middle managers. We can also minimize or overcome rate of job-burnout of various professionals particularly of middle managers by providing them more conducive organizational climate in accordance with their needs and expectations. In the case of any kind of organization rate of job-burnout of employees can be easily managed by minimizing organizational role stress of their respective management. It is further suggested that the rate of burnout of various professionals in different disciplines can be managed easily with help of burnout management techniques known as flight and fight, relaxation, feedback, physical exercise, job redesign, time management technique, etc.
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Appendices
MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY (M.B.I.)

INSTRUCTIONS:

These are 22 statements given below. Please read each statement carefully. For every statement, you have to give your response by writing the number, anyone of the given response categories on a 7-point scale showing how much you feel about it. For example, if you feel that response "moderate" is applicable to you, put (4) in the space provided for it. If "very strong" is applicable for you, put (7). If never is applicable to you, write zero (0).

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
(Never) (Very mild) (Mild) (Somewhat (Moderate) (Somewhat (Strong) (Very strong)
moderate) strong) strong)

STATEMENTS

1. I feel emotionally drained from my work. (   )
2. I feel used up at the end of the workday. (   )
3. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and to face another day on the job. (   )
4. Working with people all day is really a strain for me. (   )
5. I feel burned out from my work. (   )
6. I feel frustrated by my job. (   )
7. I feel I am working too hard on my job. (   )
8. Working directly with people puts too much stress on me. (   )
9. I feel like I am at the end of my rope. (   )
10. I feel I treat some students/subordinate, as if they were impersonal "objects". (   )
11. I have become more callous toward people, since I took this job. (   )
12. I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally. (   )
13. I don't really care what happened to some recipients. (   )
14. I feel students/subordinate blame me for some of their problems. (   )
15. I can easily understand how my students/subordinate feel about things. (   )
16. I deal very effectively with the problems of my students/subordinate. ( )

17. I feel I am positively influencing other people's lives through my job. ( )

18. I feel very energetic. ( )

19. I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my students/subordinate. ( )

20. I feel exhilarated after working closely with my students/subordinate. ( )

21. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job. ( )

22. In my work, I deal with emotional problems, very calmly. ( )
ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS (O.R.S.)

INSTRUCTIONS:

People have different feelings about their roles. Statements about their roles. Statements describing some such feelings are given in the attached list. Please read each statement and indicate below how often you have the feeling expressed in the statement in relation to your role in your organization. Use the number given below to indicate your feelings.

Write 0 if you never or scarcely feel that way
1 if you occasionally (a few times) feel that way
2 if you some times feel that way
3 if you frequently feel that way
4 if you very frequently or always feel that way

STATEMENTS

1. My role tends to interfere with my family work. ( )
2. I am afraid I am not learning enough in my present role for taking up higher responsibilities. ( )
3. I am not able to satisfy the conflicting demands of various people over me. ( )
4. My role has recently been reduced in importance ( )
5. My workload is too heavy. ( )
6. Other role occupants do not give enough attention and time to my role. ( )
7. I do not have adequate knowledge to handle responsibility in my role. ( )
8. I have to do things in my role that are against my better judgements ( )
9. I am not clear on the scope and responsibilities of my role. ( )
10. I do not get information needed to carry out responsibility assigned to me ( )
11. My role does not allow me to have enough time with my family. ( )
12. I am too preoccupied with present role responsibilities to be able to prepare for taking higher responsibilities ( )
13. I am not able to satisfy the conflicting demands of various peer level people and my juniors.

14. Many functions of what should be a part of my role have been assigned to some other role.

15. The amount of work I have to do interferes with the quality I want to maintain.

16. There are not enough interactions between my role and other roles.

17. I wish I had more skills to handle the responsibilities of my role.

18. I am not able to use my training and expertise in my role.

19. I do not know what the people I work with, expect of me.

20. I do not get enough resources to be effective in my role.

21. I have various other interests (social, religious, etc.) who remain neglected because I do not get time to attend to these.

22. I do not have time and opportunity to prepare myself for future challenge of my role.

23. I am not able to satisfy the demands of students/subordinate and others since these are conflicting with one another.

24. I would like to take more responsibilities than I am handling at present.

25. I have been given too much responsibility.

26. I wish there were more consultation between my role and other roles.

27. I have not had pertinent training for my role.

28. The responsibilities I have are not related to my interest.

29. Several aspects of my role are vague and unclear.

30. I do not have enough people to work with me in my role.

31. My organizational responsibilities interfere with my extra organizational roles.

32. There is very little scope for personal growth role.
33. The expectations of mine seriously conflict with those of my friends.

34. I can do much more than what I have been assigned.

35. There is a need to reduce some parts of my role.

36. There is no evidence of involvement of several roles (including my role) in joint problem of solving or collaborating in planning action.

37. I wish I had prepared well for my role.

38. If I had full freedom to define my role, I would be doing something different from what I do now.

39. My role has not been defined clearly and in details.

40. I am rather worried that I lack of necessary facilities needed in my role.

41. My family and friends complain that I do not spend time with them due to heavy demand of my work role.

42. I feel stagnant in my role.

43. I am bothered with the contradictory expectations different people have from my role.

44. I wish I had been given more challenging tasks to do.

45. I feel overburdened in my role.

46. Even when I take initiative for discussions or help there is not much response from other roles.

47. I feel inadequate for my present work role.

48. I experience conflict between my values and what I have to do in my role.

49. I am not clear as to what are the priorities in my role.

50. I wish I had more financial or other resources for the work assigned to me.
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE (O.C.Q.)

INSTRUCTIONS:

Below are given 50 statements for several aspects of the work culture or climate of the organization. Where you are operating. For each statement you are required to give response in either of the four categories namely,

- Definitely disagree
- Inclined to disagree
- Inclined to agree
- Definitely agree

Please give most suitable number given below that indicate your own feelings. Answer the items in the order given below:

Write 4 If you definitely agree
      3 If you inclined to agree
      2 If you inclined to disagree
      1 If you definitely disagree

Area Structure

1. The job in this organization are clearly defined and logically structured. (  )
2. In this organization it is sometimes unclear who has the formal authority to make a decision. (  )
3. The policy and organizational structure of the organization have been clearly explained. (  )
4. Red-Tape is kept to a minimum in the organization. (  )
5. Excessive rules administrative details, and red-tape make it difficult for new and original ideas to receive consideration. (  )
6. Our performance/productivity suffers from lack of organization and planning. (  )
7. In some of our projects I have not been sure exactly who my boss was. (  )
8. Our management/staff is not so concerned about formal organization and authority. But concentrates instead on getting the right people together to do the job. (  )
Responsibility (Willing to take)

9. We do not rely too heavily on individual judgements in this organization almost everything is double checked.

10. Around here management recent your checking everything with them, if you think you have got the right approach you just go ahead.

11. Supervision in this organization is mainly a matter of setting guidelines for your subordinates, you let them take responsibility for the job.

12. You would not get ahead in this organization unless you stick your neck out and try things on your own sometimes.

13. Our philosophy emphasis that people should solve their problems by themselves.

14. There are a lot of excuses around here when somebody makes a mistake.

15. One of the problems in this organization is that individuals would not take responsibility.

Reward (Positive)

16. We have a promotion system here that helps the best to rise to the top.

17. In this organization the reward and encouragements you get usually out weights the treats and the criticisms.

18. In this organization people are rewarded in proportion to the excellence of their job performance.

19. There is a great deal of criticism in this organization.

20. There is not enough reward and recognition given in this organization for doing good work.

21. If you make a mistake in this organization you will be punished.

Risk (Willing to take)

22. The philosophy of our management is that in the long run we get ahead fasted by playing it slow, safe and sure.
23. Our job-task/business has been build up by taking calculated risks at the right time.

24. Decision making in the organization is too cautious from maximum effectiveness.

25. Our management is willing to take a chance on a good idea.

26. We have to take some pretty big risks occasionally to keep ahead of the competition in the job/task, business we are in.

Warmth

27. A friendly atmosphere prevails among the people in this organization.

28. This organization is characterized by a relaxed easy going working climate.

29. It is very hard to get to know people in this organization.

30. People in this organization tend to be cool and aloof toward each other.

31. There is a lot of warmth in the relationships between management and workers in this organization.

Support

32. You do not get much sympathy from higher ups in this organization if you make a mistake.

33. Staff/Management makes an effort to talk with you about your, career aspirations within the organization.

34. People in this organization do not really trust each other enough.

35. The philosophy of our management emphasizes the human factors, how people feel, etc.

36. When I am on a difficult assignment I can usually count on getting assistance from my boss and co-workers.

Standards

37. In this organization we set very high standards for performance.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>38.</strong></td>
<td>Our management believes that no job is so well done that it could not be done better. ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>39.</strong></td>
<td>Around here there is a feeling of pressure to continually improve our personal and group performance. ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40.</strong></td>
<td>Management believes that if the people are happy performance/productivity will take care. ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>41.</strong></td>
<td>To get ahead in the organization it is most important to get along than it is to be an efficient performance/ a high producer. ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>42.</strong></td>
<td>In this organization people do not sum to take much pride in their performance. ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>43.</strong></td>
<td>The best way to make a good impression around here is to steer clear of open, arguments and disagreements. ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>44.</strong></td>
<td>The attitude of our staff/management is that conflict between competing units and individuals can be very healthy. ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>45.</strong></td>
<td>We are encouraged to speak our minds even if it means disagreeing with our superiors. ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>46.</strong></td>
<td>In staff/management goal is to arrive of a decision as smoothly and quickly as possible. ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identity (Loyalty)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>47.</strong></td>
<td>People are proud of belonging to this organization. ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>48.</strong></td>
<td>I feel that I am a member of well functioning team. ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>49.</strong></td>
<td>As far as I can see, there is not very much personal loyalty to the company. ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50.</strong></td>
<td>In the organization people pretty much look out for their own interest. ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOCIAL SUPPORT SCALE (S.S.)

INSTRUCTIONS:

Here is a list of statements each of which may or may not be true about you. For each statement we would like you to circle. "T" if the statement is probably or certainly false or not true about you.

You may find that many of the statement are neither clearly true not clearly false. In this cases try to decide quickly whether true "T" or false "F" is the most accurate description of you. Although some questions will be difficult to answer, it is important that you choose one of two alternatives. Remember to circle only one the alternatives for each statement. Now read each item carefully & respond:

1. There is at least one coworker whose advise I really trust. T/F  
2. There is really no one among my coworkers whom I can trust to give me good financial advice. T/F  
3. There is really no one among my coworkers who can give me objective feedback about how I am handling my problems. T/F  
4. I feel that there is no one among my coworkers with whom I can share my private worries and fears. T/F  
5. If a family crisis arose some of my coworkers would be able to give me good advice about handling it. T/F  
6. There is someone among my coworkers I could turn to him for advice about problems related to my job. T/F  
7. There are several different people among my coworkers. T/F  
8. I do not often get invited to do things with my coworkers. T/F  
9. If I wanted to have lunch with someone I could easily find one of my coworkers to join me. T/F  
10. When I feel lonely there are several of my coworkers. I could call and talk to them. T/F  
11. I regularly meet or talk with my coworkers. T/F  
12. I feel that I am on the fringe in my circle of coworkers. T/F  
13. If were sick and needed someone to drive me to the doctor, I would have trouble finding someone among my coworkers. T/F  
14. If I needed a quick emergency loan of Rs. 100.00 there is someone among my coworkers I could get it from. T/F
5. If needed some help in moving to a new home I would have a hard time finding someone among my coworkers to help me. T/F

16. If I had to mail an important letter at the post office by 5:00 O'clock, and I could not make it there is someone among my coworkers who could do it for me. T/F

17. If I needed a ride to the airport very early in the morning I would have a hard time finding one of my coworkers to take me there. T/F

18. If I got stranded ten miles out of my town, there is someone among my coworkers, I could call to come to get me. T/F