IMPACT OF ROLE EFFICACY AND INTERPERSONAL TRUST ON ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS AND JOB SATISFACTION OF EMPLOYEES

ABSTRACT

THESIS

SUBMITTED FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF

Doctor of Philosophy

IN

PSYCHOLOGY

BY

NAZIA MEHMOOD

Under the supervision of

DR. ASMA PARVEEN

(Associate Professor)

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY
ALIGARH (INDIA)

2011
Abstract

The purpose of the present study is to examine the "impact of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on organizational role stress and job satisfaction of employees".

The chapter-I of the thesis incorporates the introduction of the dependent and independent variables i.e. organizational role stress, job satisfaction, role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Organizational role stress is an important factor for the organizations that is experienced by the employees. It can produce strain which is detrimental for the human resources in the organization. It has negative economic implications such as poor quality of work, low productivity, absenteeism, etc. when organizations tried to manage this stress then it will result in improved performance, work satisfaction, involvement and productivity.

The concept of role and the two role systems that is, role space and role set have a built-in potential for conflict and stress.

Role Space has three main variables:

1. Self,
2. The role under question, and
3. The other roles one occupy.

Any conflict among these is referred to as role space conflict. These conflicts may take several forms such as:

1) Self-role distance
2) Role stagnation
3) Inter-role distance
Role set is the role system within the organization of which roles are part and by which individual roles are defined. Role set conflicts take the forms of:

1. **Role Ambiguity**
2. **Role expectation conflict**
3. **Role overload**
4. **Role erosion**
5. **Resource inadequacy**
6. **Personal inadequacy**
7. **Role isolation**

The most used research definition of **job satisfaction** is given by Locke (1976). According to him job satisfaction is “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences”. In this definition he gives importance to both affect or feeling, and cognition or thinking. It means if we think about something then we have feelings for that. Conversely we can say if we have feelings then we think about what we feel. Hence cognition and affect are inter-linked with each other. Therefore when we evaluate the job then both thinking and feeling are involved.

The working environments such as friendly work group, supportive boss, accomplishing goals, etc. are good resources in enhancing job satisfaction. A job that provides satisfaction to the employee is a part of the ‘total compensation’ which an employee receives i.e. a worker with high job satisfaction is often willing to accept a lower wage payment.

In Indian context Uday Pareek (1974, 1980a, 1980b, 1987, and 1993) pioneered the concept of **role efficacy**. Role efficacy means the potential effectiveness of an
individual occupying a particular role in an organization. Role efficacy and other organizational correlates look at organizational roles in the total configuration of organizational processes. It explores the relationship between role efficacy as a central concept both at the individual level and at the macro level.

Role efficacy has several aspects. The more these aspects are present in a role, the higher the efficacy of that role is likely to be. These aspects can be classified into three groups, or dimensions.

1- Role making
2- Role centring
3- Role linking

Under role making four sub dimensions come:
(a)- Self-role integration
(b)- Proactivity
(c)- Creativity
(d)- Confrontation

Role centring covers three sub dimensions:
(e)- Centrality
(f)- Influence
(g)- Personal growth

In the last role linking is consisted the other three sub dimensions.

(h)- Inter-role Linkage
(i)- Helping Relationship
(j)- Superordination
In the organizations interpersonal relations between the employees are centred around interpersonal trust. **Interpersonal trust** is a kind of perception an individual has that other person will not do anything that harms his interest. Trust is emotional as well as logical act. Emotionally, it is where the individual expose his vulnerabilities to people, but believing they will not take advantage of his openness. Logically, it is where the individual has assessed the probabilities of gain and loss, calculating expected utility based on hard performance data, and concluded that the person in question will behave in a predictable manner. An interpersonal relationship is an association between two or more people. This association may be based on love, regular business interactions, or some other type of social commitment. Interpersonal relationships are formed in the context of social, cultural and other influences. Trust is a central ingredient in human relationships, and thus, in organizational dynamics.

According to Solomon (1960), "trust refers to expectations of benevolence, whereas suspicion refers to expectation of malevolence". Interpersonal trust at work has two dimensions:

1. Faith in the trustworthy intentions of others, and
2. Confidence in the ability of others (Cook and Wall, 1980).

According to Argyris (1965), organizational trust is a behaviour that induces members to take risks and experiment, and distrust as a behaviour that restricts and inhibits members from taking risks and experimenting.

In the II chapter review of literature related with variables was discussed. All the relevant studies associated with organizational role stress, job satisfaction, role efficacy and interpersonal trust are incorporated.
Chapter-III of the thesis discusses the methodology adopted. The study was carrying out on a sample of 400 employees. 200 employees were from the government insurance company (LIC) while the other 200 were from the private insurance companies. The sample was further divided hierarchy wise. There were four hierarchies and each hierarchy consisted of 50-50 employees from both government and private insurance sectors, that is, 50/50 branch managers, 50/50 administrative officers / sales managers, 50/50 assistants / operational staff, and 50/50 clerical staff / agents. Employees were drawn from the various government and private insurance companies in Aligarh city and near by cities of Aligarh district.

Four scales were used to collect the required information:

1- Role efficacy scale (RE Scale) by Uday Pareek
2- Interpersonal trust scale (IPT Scale) by S.C.Gupta and Vinita Mathur
3- Organizational Role Stress Scale (ORS Scale) by Udai Pareek
4- Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (JSQ) by Shailendra Singh

The data was collected from 400 employees working in insurance companies. 200 employees were working in government sector whereas the remaining 200 were working in private sector. During the process of data collection the above mentioned scales were distributed among 470 employees, out of them 430 employees returned the questionnaires that were completed in every respect, 40 questionnaires were incomplete so these were rejected. Thus remaining 400 employees constituted as the sample of the present study. Proper instructions were given to the employees to obtain adequate responses. The researcher assured all the respondents that complete confidentiality of their responses be maintained and it will be used for research purpose only. The respondents were requested
In the IV chapter of the thesis data was analyzed in three phases. In the first phase t-test was used to determine the difference between four groups of employees of both government and private insurance companies.

The main findings of t-test were:

1- 'Role overload' was the dimension on which the branch managers of both the sectors were differing significantly (table-4.1). The branch managers of government and private insurance companies found to differ significantly in terms of their overall organizational role stress. The higher mean score of branch managers of private sector shows their high level of stress as compared to branch managers of government sector.

2- The administrative officers of government insurance company and sales managers of private insurance companies differ significantly on 'role overload', 'role ambiguity and 'resource inadequacy' (table-4.2). Both the groups found to differ significantly in terms of their overall organizational role stress. Sales managers scored high mean value on overall organizational role stress because they experience high level of stress.

3- Table 4.3 is showing that 'role overload' and 'self-role distance' were the two dimensions on which the assistants of government insurance company and operational staff of private insurance companies differ significantly. Significant difference is found between both the groups in terms of their overall
organizational role stress. The operational staff scored high mean value on overall organizational role stress.

4- It is evident from table-4.4 that the clerical staff of government insurance company and agents of private insurance companies differ significantly on ‘role overload’, ‘role isolation’ and ‘role ambiguity’. A significant difference between two groups in terms of their overall organizational role stress was found. The organizational role stress found high among the agents of private sector.

5- The facets of job satisfaction on which the branch managers of government and private insurance companies differ significantly were, ‘physical work conditions’, ‘your immediate boss’, ‘amount of responsibility you are given’, ‘your rate of pay’, ‘your hours of work’, ‘the amount of variety in your job’, ‘power and prestige in the job’, and ‘opportunity to make decisions’ (table-4.5). Both the groups found to differ significantly in terms of their overall job satisfaction. The branch managers of government sector found highly satisfied from their jobs.

6- The administrative officers of government insurance company and sales managers of private insurance companies differ significantly on ‘physical work conditions’, ‘your fellow workers’, and ‘your job security’ (table-4.6). A significant difference was found between the two groups in terms of their overall job satisfaction. The administrative officers scored high mean value on the variable job satisfaction.

7- From the 20 facets of job satisfaction the assistants of government insurance company and operational staff of private insurance companies differ significantly on 9 facets i.e. ‘physical work conditions’, ‘the freedom to choose your own method of working’, ‘your immediate boss’, ‘your rate of pay’, ‘your chance of
promotion', 'the way your firm is managed', 'your job security', 'opportunity to make decisions', and 'opportunity to achieve something worthwhile' (table-4.7). A significant difference was found between the two groups in terms of their overall job satisfaction. The assistants found more satisfied in comparison to their counterparts.

8- The clerical staff of government insurance company and agents of private insurance companies were showing significant difference on 12 facets of job satisfaction i.e. 'physical work conditions', 'the recognition you get from good work', 'industrial relations with management and workers', 'your rate of pay', 'your chance of promotion', 'the way your firm is managed', 'the attention paid to the suggestions you made', 'your hours of work', 'the amount of variety in your job', 'your job security', 'opportunity to help others with personal problems at work', and 'power and prestige in the job' (table-4.8). The two groups were found to differ significantly in terms of their overall job satisfaction. The employees of clerical staff found more satisfied from their jobs than the agents of private sector.

9- From table-4.9 it is clear that the two groups of branch managers were differ significantly on 'creativity', 'inter-role linkage', 'helping relationship', and 'growth'. Both the groups of branch managers of government and private insurance companies found to differ significantly in terms of their overall role efficacy. The branch managers of private sector were found to be more effective in comparison to the branch managers of government sector.

10- The dimensions on which the administrative officers of government insurance company and sales managers of private insurance companies were showing
significant difference are, 'centrality', 'integration', 'proactivity', 'helping relationship', 'superordination', 'influence', 'growth', and 'confrontation' (table-4.10). A significant difference was found between the two groups in terms of their overall role efficacy. Sales managers showed high role efficacy in comparison to the administrative officers.

11-From the ten dimensions the assistants of government insurance company and operational staff of private insurance companies were differ significantly on seven dimensions i.e. 'integration', 'proactivity', 'creativity', 'superordination', 'influence', 'growth', and 'confrontation' (table-4.11). Both the groups found to differ significantly in terms of their overall role efficacy. The employees of operational staff found more effective in performing their role in the organization.

12-Table-4.12 is showing that the clerical staff of government insurance company and agents of private insurance companies were showing significant difference on all the ten dimensions of role efficacy. The two groups also differ significantly in terms of their overall role efficacy. Agents showed high mean score on overall role efficacy.

13-The dimensions on which the branch managers of government and private insurance companies found significant were, 'maintenance', 'security', 'intimacy', and 'success' (table-4.13). Both the groups found to differ significantly in terms of their overall inter-personal trust. The branch managers of private sector found to have high interpersonal trust in comparison to their counterparts.
14-It is evident from table-4.14 that the administrative officers of government insurance company and sales managers of private insurance companies found to differ significantly on all the five dimensions of interpersonal trust. Significant mean difference was found between the two groups in terms of their overall interpersonal trust. Sales managers showed high interpersonal trust.

15-'Intimacy' and 'regard' were the two dimensions on which the assistants of government insurance company and operational staff of private insurance companies were showing significant difference (table-4.15). A significant difference was found between the two groups in terms of their overall interpersonal trust. Operational staff scored high mean value on overall interpersonal trust.

16-The dimensions on which the clerical staff of government insurance company and agents of private insurance companies were showing significant difference are, 'security', 'intimacy', and 'regard' (table-4.16). The two groups found to differ significantly in terms of their overall inter-personal trust. Agents found high on interpersonal trust.

Stepwise multiple regression analysis:

In the second phase data was analyzed by using stepwise multiple regression analyses to determine different predictors of dependent variables i.e. organizational role stress and job satisfaction. The main findings of the analyses include-

17- 'Confrontation', 'inter-role linkage', 'superordination', 'centrality', 'growth', and 'proactivity' (dimensions of role efficacy) and 'regard', and 'intimacy', (dimension of interpersonal trust) were found the significant predictors of seven
dimensions of organizational role stress among the branch managers of government and private insurance companies (table-4.17).

18-From table-4.18 it can be observed that among the branch managers of both government and private insurance companies the nine dimensions of role efficacy i.e. 'confrontation', 'creativity', 'superordination', 'inter-role linkage', 'growth', 'integration', 'proactivity', 'helping-relationship', 'influence' and all the five dimensions of interpersonal trust i.e. 'maintenance', 'success', 'regard', 'intimacy', and 'security' were found significant predictors of 15 facets of job satisfaction.

19-Table-4.19 described that the seven dimensions of role efficacy i.e. 'influence', 'growth', 'centrality', 'superordination', 'inter-role linkage', 'confrontation', and 'creativity' and four dimensions of interpersonal trust i.e. 'success', 'maintenance', 'regard', and 'intimacy' were found significant predictors of all the ten dimensions of organizational role stress among the administrative officers of government and sales managers of private insurance companies.

20-It is clear from table-4.20 that 'integration', 'growth', confrontation', 'helping relationship', 'influence', 'inter-role linkage', 'proactivity', 'centrality', 'creativity' and 'superordination' (dimensions of role efficacy) and 'security', 'success', and 'maintenance' (dimensions of interpersonal trust) were found significant predictors of 17 facets of job satisfaction among administrative officers of government sector and sales managers of private sector.

21-Four dimensions of role efficacy and four dimensions of interpersonal trust were found to make significant impact on seven dimensions of organizational role
stress among assistants of government sector and operational staff of private sector. From table 4.21 it can be observed that ‘inter-role linkage’, ‘integration’, ‘creativity’, and ‘integration’ (dimensions of role efficacy) and ‘maintenance’, ‘intimacy’, ‘regard’, and ‘security’ (dimensions of interpersonal trust) were found significant predictors of organizational role stress.

22-Table 4.22 suggested that eight dimensions of role efficacy i.e. ‘confrontation’, ‘helping relationship’, ‘centrality’, ‘creativity’, ‘integration’, ‘growth’, ‘proactivity’, and ‘influence’ and four dimensions of interpersonal trust i.e. ‘success’, ‘maintenance’, ‘regard’, and ‘security’ were found significant predictors of 15 facets of job satisfaction among assistants of government insurance company and operational staff of private insurance companies.

23-Among clerical staff of government sector and agents of private sector ‘growth’, ‘superordination’, ‘creativity’, ‘integration’, and ‘proactivity’ (dimensions of role efficacy) and ‘intimacy’, ‘regard’, ‘maintenance’, ‘security’, and ‘success’ (dimensions of interpersonal trust) were found significant predictors of eight dimensions of organizational role stress (table-4.23).

24-It is evident from table-4.24 that the following dimensions of role efficacy- ‘Confrontation’, ‘helping relationship’, ‘inter-role linkage’, ‘influence’, ‘integration’, ‘superordination’, ‘proactivity’, ‘centrality’, ‘creativity’ and four dimensions of interpersonal trust i.e. ‘regard’, ‘intimacy’, ‘success’, and ‘maintenance’ were found significant predictors of 18 facets of job satisfaction among clerical staff of government insurance company and agents of private insurance companies.
One way ANOVA:

In the third phase of analyses one way ANOVA was used to examined the significance of difference between and within the four groups of employees of government and private insurance companies. This additional information helped us to interpret our results in a more effective manner. The findings of one way ANOVA include-

25- Significant difference was found within the groups of employees of government insurance company in terms of their overall role efficacy, interpersonal trust, organizational role stress, and job satisfaction (table-4.25). From table 4.26 it can be observed that the administrative officers found most effective among the group of government employees. Assistants showed highest interpersonal trust as well as organizational role stress. Job satisfaction was found more among the branch managers.

26- Hierarchy wise the employees of private insurance companies showed a significant difference (table-4.28). The branch managers found most effective in performing their roles and they also got high job satisfaction (table-4.29). From the same table it was clear that the operational staff has high interpersonal trust but side by side they also have high organizational role stress.

In the chapter-V of the thesis conclusion and suggestions were included. This type of research work can be done on other samples such as railway employees, defend personals, teaching and non-teaching staff, policemen etc. study on these kind of samples may lead to some new results which might be more relevant and informative for the area of research.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

During the past decade the organizations had undergone rapid and striking changes such as policy changes due to globalization, increased competition due to the emergence of a number of private organizations, downsizing, implementation of new technologies, etc. These changes become the reason of high level of stress among the employees working in the organizations. The technological changes, especially extensive use of computers in organizations has changed the patterns of doing work by the employees. These types of changes affected the social, economical and psychological domain of the employees and relations with other employees. From the previous studies it is evident that more than 80% of the employees have one or other problem directly or indirectly related to these drastic changes. Along with other sectors the insurance companies also leaning towards the policy of appointing contract labours. They are also using various compulsive and rewarding options for their employees.

As far as the insurance companies are concerned, there are only few studies conducted to show the impact of various organizational stressors on the employees. There is a need to keep employees from leaving and going to work for other companies. To retain employees in the same company it is necessary to provide them job satisfaction and opportunities for advancement in their careers. The present research is aimed to study the “impact of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on organizational role stress and job satisfaction of employees”. The researcher is attempted to analyze those factors which are necessary to enhance the effectiveness and trust of the employees so that they overcome the organizational role stress and achieve more satisfaction from their jobs.
Organizational Role Stress

The term stress in psychology was first coined in the 1930s. According to Lazarus (1960), stress is a feeling experienced when a person thinks that "the demands exceed the personal and social resources the individual is able to mobilize."

According to Mechanic (1962) “stress is the discomforting responses of persons in particular situations”. In the words of Spielberger (1971) “stress is the external forces that act on an individual, that is the objective properties of environmental or stimulus conditions that are characterized by some degree of objective danger”.

Mason (1975) discussed stress in various terms:

- Stimulus or external force acting on the organism,
- Response or changes in the physiological functions,
- Interaction between an external force and resistance opposed to it, and
- More comprehensive combination of the above factors.

Mc Grath (1976) suggested that, “there is a potential for stress when an environmental situation is perceived as presenting a demand which threatens to exceed the person’s capacities and resources for meeting it, under conditions where he has expected a substantial differential in the rewards and the costs from meeting the demand versus not meeting it”.

According to Schuler (1980), “stress is a dynamic condition in which an individual is confronted with an opportunity, constraints, or demands related to what he or she desires and for which the outcome is perceived to be both uncertain and important”.

A key to understand the aspects of stress is the concept of ‘milieu interieur’, the internal environment of the body, which was first given by the great French
physiologist Claude Bernard (1854). He described stress by using the principles of
dynamic equilibrium. In dynamic equilibrium he explains that to survive it is essential
to acquire a steady state in the internal environment, this is called as constancy.
Therefore, external forces that change the internal balance must be reacted to and
compensated for if the organism is to survive. Some of the examples of this type of
external forces include temperature, oxygen concentration in the air, the expenditure
of energy, and the presence of predators.

Walter Cannon (1929) a great neurologist coined the term homeostasis to
further define the dynamic equilibrium that was described by Bernard. He also was
the first person to recognize that stressors could be emotional as well as physical.
Through his experiments, he demonstrated the "fight or flight" response that man and
other animals share when threatened. Cannon also pointed out that during stressful
situations powerful neurotransmitters released from a part of the adrenal gland which
is called as the medulla. The adrenal medulla secretes two neurotransmitters,
epinephrine (adrenaline) and norepinephrine (noradrenalin), in the response to stress.
The release of these neurotransmitters leads to the physiological effects seen in the
fight or flight response, for example, a rapid heart rate, increased alertness, etc.

Hans Selye extended the work of Cannon. He introduced the term stress from
physics and engineering and defined it as "mutual actions of forces that take place
across any section of the body, physical or psychological." Hans Selye (1983)
suggested that psychologists have different orientations for the term 'stress' as
(a) stimulus oriented, (b) response oriented ( both physiological and behavioural ),
and (c) depth oriented ( etiological and psychodynamic). According to Pestonjee
(1987) it is natural and healthy to maintain an optimal level of stress and opined that
success, achievement, higher productivity and effectiveness call for stress. When
stresses are left unchecked and unmanaged, they create problems in performance and, as a result, affect health and well being of the organism.

Pestonjee (1992), has identified three sectors of life in which stress originates-
(a) Job and the organization,
(b) Social sector, and
(c) Intra-psychic sector.

Job and organization sector is represented by all aspects of the work environment. The social sector consists of socio-cultural factors, that is, religion, caste, language etc. Intra-psychic sector consists of intimate and personal factors like attitudes, temperament, interest, health etc. It is pointed out that from any of these sectors stress comes out.

At present one of the major sources of stress is the organization. Every individual has his own capacity and potential to perform the assigned task. When an employee joins an organization he bounded under certain rules and regulations. It is very rare that he could work according to his own wishes due to which stress emerge. So stress at work or in the organization is not an uncommon thing.

Work related stress is a major concern today, than it was two decades ago. This has become a major problem not only for individuals working within an organization but also for the organization itself. Organizational stress can produce strain which is detrimental for the human resources in the organization. It has negative economic implications such as poor quality of work, low productivity, absenteeism, etc. Role stress is considered very important because it has a negative impact on organizational outcomes. The stress arising due to person's role is termed as role stress (Pareek, 1993). Role is defined as, “a set of functions, which an individual performs
in response to the expectations of others as well as his own expectations” (Kahn et al., 1964).

Frew and Bruning (1987) identified six categories of stressors which serve as a basis of organizational stress-

- **Task demands:** They are related with different aspects of the job occupied by the employee. For example, task variety, physical working conditions, opportunity to take decisions, freedom to choose their own method of working etc.

- **Interpersonal demands:** They consist of poor relations with co-workers, family members, friends etc. Inadequate interpersonal relationship with other workers. Pressure from the superiors and subordinates.

- **Role demand:** When a person occupied a role in the organization then certain forces exerted on it from that role, it is called as role demand. Role demands are generally occur in the form of role conflict, role overload and role ambiguity. Organization structure: It includes job hierarchies, rules and regulations, company policy and lack of industrial democracy.

- **Organizational leadership:** Factors which comes out from the functioning of top authorities are included in it. Due to power and prestige from the superiors an unrealistic pressure arises among the employees. their working style create depression and anxiety in the workers.

- **Organization’s life stage:** It includes the establishment, growth, and maturity and decline of the organization. These things sometimes create problems for the workers. Establishment and decline stage are more stressful because establishment produces more excitement and uncertainty, whereas decline stage consists of downsizing, layoffs and different other types of uncertainties.
There are inherent problems in the performance of a role in an organization which give rise to role stress. Classical organizational structure and control system form a potent source of stress because they demand dependency, hamper initiative and creativity, in role performance. The concept of role and the two role systems—role space and role set have a built-in potential for conflict and stress. An organizational role refers to the position holds by an individual within the organization. Organizational roles are the typical roles for access control purpose. It includes professional roles, domain expert roles, and administrative roles. These types of roles provide a meaningful classification of people.

**Role space**—Role Space has three main variables:

- **Self,**
- The role under question, and
- The other roles one occupies.

Any conflict among these is referred to as role space conflict. These conflicts may take several forms such as:

- **Self-role distance:** This type of stress arises when the role which a person occupies goes against his/her self-concept. This is essentially a conflict arising out of mismatch between the person and the job. When a role occupant perceived that a conflict arises between the self-concept and the expectations from the role. For example an extrovert, who is fond of meeting people and being social, may develop a self-role distance if he accepts the role of an author in a newspaper agency.

- **Intra role conflict:** Since an individual learns to develop expectations as a result of his socializing and identification with significant others, it is quite likely that he sees certain incompatibility between the different expectations
(functions) of his role. For example, it is incompatible for a professor to teach students and doing research. May be they are not inherently conflicting, but the individual may perceive these as incompatible.

- **Role stagnation:** When an individual grows older he becomes experienced. With the advancement of individual, the role also changes. When the role changes the need for taking on a new role becomes crucial. Problem arises when an individual occupies a role for a longer period of time and then step-into another role in which he feels insecure. The new role demands something new due to which the individual comes under stress. It means this kind of stress is the result of the gap between the demand to outgrow a previous role and to occupy a new role effectively. It is the feeling of being stuck in the same role. The individual bound to think that there is no opportunity for one’s career progression. In fast expending organizations, which do not have any systematic strategy of human resource development, it is seen that managers are likely to come under the stress of role stagnation, when they are promoted.

- **Inter-role distance:** It is experienced when there is a conflict between organizational and non-organizational roles. It means this type of role stress arises when an individual occupies more than one role. For example, a chairman who is performing the role of a chairman of the department, taking classes of MA students, and handle the work of research scholars. The demands on his time by students and research scholars may be incompatible with the demands of meeting people in the chairman office. In our modern society such inter-role conflicts are quite common.
Role set

Role set is the role system within the organization of which roles are part and by which individual roles are defined. The role set conflicts arises due to the incompatibility among these expectations by the significant other (and by the individual himself). Role set conflicts take the forms of:

- **Role Ambiguity:** When there are doubts within the individual regarding the expectations that people have from the role then he comes under the stress of role ambiguity. It may be due to the lack of information available to the role occupant, or may be he does not fully understand the provided information. Role ambiguity may be in relation to activities, responsibilities, norms or general expectations. It may operate at three stages:
  
  (a) When the role sender holds his/her expectations about the role,
  
  (b) When he/she sends it, and
  
  (c) When the occupant receives those expectations.

  Generally, role ambiguity is experienced by the persons who occupy new roles in the organization, roles that are undergoing change, or process roles i.e. less clear and less concrete activities.

- **Role expectation conflict:** The role occupant experiences this type of stress when there are conflicting expectations or demands by different role senders (persons having expectations from the role). This type of stress is generated by different expectations by different significant persons about the same role, and the role occupant think as to whom to please. These conflicting expectations may be from the boss, subordinates, peers or clients.

- **Role overload:** The role occupant feels role overload when there are too many expectations from the significant others in his role set. It has been measured by
asking questions regarding the feelings of the people. For example, can you finish the work during the modified work day or can the amount of work you do may interfere with how well it is done. The chances of role overload is greater where the role occupants have lack of power, where there are large variations in the expected outputs, and when delegations or assistance cannot procure more time. There are two aspect of this type of stress: quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative aspect refers to having too much to do, while qualitative aspect refers to things being too difficult to do.

- **Role erosion:** When the role occupant feels that the functions he would like to perform are being done by some other role then the stress of role erosion emerges. It is the subjective feeling of the individual. He thought that some important expectations that he has from his role are shared by some other role within the role set. This also happen when the functions are performed by the role occupant but the credit goes to someone else. Another manifestation is in the form of underutilization in the role. Mostly it happens to those organizations which redesign their roles and create new roles. A number of studies show that in several such organizations the stress of role erosion is inevitable.

- **Resource inadequacy:** This type of stress is generated when the proper resources are not available for performing a role effectively. Some of the common resources are people, information, material, finance or facilities.

- **Personal inadequacy:** It happens when the role occupant feel that he does not have enough knowledge, skill or training to undertake a role effectively, or if he thought that he has not enough time to prepare the assigned task. Individuals who are assigned new roles without adequate preparations or
orientation are likely to experience feeling of personal inadequacy. It happens when the organizations do not impart periodic training to enable the employees to cope with the fast changes both within and outside the organization.

- **Role isolation:** This type of stress refers to the psychological distance between the role occupant’s role and other roles in the same role set. It is also defined as role distance which is different from inter-role distance, in the sense that while IRD refers to the distance among various roles occupied by the same individual, role isolation is characterized by feelings that others do not reach out easily. This indicates the absence of strong linkages of one’s role with other roles. When a role occupant feel that certain roles are psychologically closer to him, while others are at a great distance then the stress of role isolation comes up. The distance may be due to the frequency and ease of interaction. If the linkages are strong then the role isolation will be low and vice versa. Hence we can measure role isolation in terms of existing and desired linkages. The gap between them indicates the role isolation.

**Consequences of role stress:**

Organizational role stress has noted a number of dysfunctional outcomes resulting from stress, both physiological and psychological, which ultimately affect the functioning and effectiveness of the organization and its employees. Thus, the impact of work stressors not only assessed in terms of its effect on the organization, decreased productivity, and turnover and decreased job satisfaction, but also in terms of the emotional impact on the workers. Therefore, "burnout" is usually a consequence of long-term involvement in emotionally demanding situations and ineffective coping with long-term stress.
For health care professionals stress and burnout are important issues because they are considered as significant risks to health and well-being of physicians, and are also associated with reduced quality of health care, attrition, and reduced commitment to practice.

**Coping with role stress**

When an individual comes under stress, he tries to adopt ways of dealing or coping with it, because nobody wants to remain in a continual state of tension. The term coping has been used to indicate the ways of dealing with stress, and the effort to master harmful conditions, threat or challenges. Here, coping is used to deal with stress and distinguish between effective and ineffective coping.

Coping is primarily a psychological concept. There are different viewpoints of different researchers in relation to coping but they all share a common theme i.e., the struggle with external and internal demands, conflicts and distressing emotions. According to Burke and Wier (1980), coping process refers to “any attempt to deal with stressful situations when a person feels he must do something about, but which tax or exceeds his existing adaptation response patterns”.

Lazarus (1975) suggested two categories of coping that is direct action and palliative modes. Direct action includes the behaviour or actions which are performed by the organism when he is in a stressful situation. Palliative modes of coping refer to those thoughts and actions which purports to relieve the organism of any emotional impact of stress. He concluded that effectiveness of coping strategies depends on controllability of the situation. Roth and Cohen (1986) suggested that approach coping behaviour was associated with increased distress and with non-productive worry, while avoidance coping behaviour can interfere with appropriate action when there is the possibility of affecting the nature of threat.
Generally, effective coping strategies are approach strategies; they confront with the problem of stress as a challenge, and increase the capability of dealing with it. Ineffective strategies are escape or avoidance strategies, which reduce the feeling of stress. For example, denying the reality of stress, use of alcohol, drugs or other aids to escapism.

Approach or effective strategies include efforts to increase physical and mental readiness to cope (through physical exercises, yoga and meditation, diet management), creative diversions for emotional enrichment (music, art, theatre, etc), strategies of dealing with the basic problems causing stress, and collaborative work to solve such problems.

Mullen and Suls (1992) found the avoidance strategies to be effective when outcome measures are immediate or short term, whereas approach strategies were more effective when measures were long term.

It is necessary for both individual as well as for the organization to examine the strategy that they use for cope the stress. The absence of an appropriate coping strategy may lead ineffectiveness. The style or strategy of coping seems to require some physical efforts. Coping style or strategy can either be seen as a general trait (a disposition applicable to most situations), or a disposition applicable to specific stress situations. It has been observed that social and emotional support helps a person to deal with stress effectively. Those persons who have maintained close interpersonal relationship with friends and family members are able to use more approach strategies. Social support includes material support (providing resources) and emotional support includes (listening to the person and encouraging him).

Lazaras and Launlier (1978) suggested that coping is the “effort, both action-oriented and intra-psychic, to manage (i.e., to master, tolerate, reduce and minimize)
environmental and internal demands and conflicts among them which exceeds a person’s resources”.

McGrath (1976) pointed out that coping is an array of covert and overt behaviour patterns, which can help, prevent, alleviate or respond to stressful experiences. Coping is dependent on the individual’s perception of the environment. It is the process of gathering information, generating alternatives, weighing and then selecting alternatives, implementing or evolving strategies. Thus coping requires an analysis of one’s own needs as well as of the situation.

Basically people are divided into two groups to cope with their stress.

• Those who decide to suffer, deny experienced or avoidance strategies. It is termed as dysfunctional styles of coping with stress.

• Those who face the realities of stress consciously, and take some action to solve the problem either by themselves or with the help of other individuals. It is termed as functional style of dealing with stressful situations.

It is not necessary that people use any one among these two strategies; rather different people adopt different styles of coping. Same stressful situation is handling differently by different individuals. An issue that can be raised while discussing the effectiveness of various coping strategies is whether some ways of coping with stress are more effective than others. It depends upon the particular situation, the point of time (short or long run) and the levels (physiological, psychological or others) at which stress is being felt, i.e. what may be considered an optimal or a beneficial response in one situation at a particular time may be damaging (or ineffective) in some other situation or at a different time.

Generally, dysfunctional modes of coping may be damaging when they prevent essential direct action, but may be extremely useful in helping a person to
maintain a sense of well-being, integration or hope under conditions otherwise likely to lead to psychological disintegration.

Different approaches to the study of coping have been used in various investigations. Some have emphasized general coping traits, styles or dispositions, while others have preferred to study active, on-going coping strategies in particular stress situations. The former approach assumes that an individual will cope the same way in most of the stressful situations. A person’s coping style is typically assessed by personality tests. Whether the person actually behaves under stress as predicted by the tests depends largely on the adequacy of the personality assessed and many other internal and external factors that affect the person’s actions and reactions in any given situation.

In contrast to this approach, those who concentrate on active coping strategies prefer to observe an individual’s behaviour as it occurs in stressful situation and then proceed to infer the particular coping process implied by the behaviour.

Coping strategies can be conceptualized as a product of a combination of externality, internality and mode of coping.

Externality is the feeling that external factors are responsible for role stress, resulting in aggression towards, and blaming of, these external factors, it may also indicate the tendency to expect and get a solution for the stress from external sources. Externality may be high or low.

Internality is a kind of feeling in which the person perceive himself as responsible for the stress, and hence express aggression or blame himself. The person expects a solution for the stress for himself. Internality may be high or low. Coping may take the form of avoiding the situation (reactive strategy) or confronting and approaching the problem (proactive strategy). This is a mode of coping.
To summarize it can be said that stress is a normal part of life that can either help to learn and grow or it can causes significant problems. Stress releases powerful neurochemicals and hormones that prepare the person for action (to fight or flee). If one cannot take action, the stress response can create or worsen health problems. Prolonged, uninterrupted, unexpected, and unmanageable stresses are the most damaging types of stress. Stress can be managed by regular exercise, meditation or other relaxation techniques, structured time-outs, and learning new coping strategies. Most of the behaviours that increase in times of stress and maladaptive ways of coping with stress are drugs, pain medicines, alcohol, and smoking. These things worsen the stress and can make the person more reactive (sensitive) to further stress. While there are promising treatments for stress, the management of stress is mostly dependent on the willingness of a person to make the changes necessary for a healthy lifestyle.

**JOB SATISFACTION**

With the passage of time the life of the human beings become more and more complex. Their needs and requirements increased day by day. They want to satisfy their needs, but when these needs do not get fulfilled they become dissatisfied. Dissatisfied persons are likely to contribute less in comparison to those who are satisfied. To function successfully in the organization it is important to have a feeling of job satisfaction among the workers. Apart from managerial and technical aspects, employers can be considered as the backbones of any industrial development. To boost the satisfaction of the workers the management should provide good working conditions to the employees.

Organizations get success and peace only when the problem of satisfaction and dissatisfaction is accounted. It requires having social skills to solve the problem
of efficiency, absenteeism, labour turn over etc. Through scientific investigations these problems in the organizations can be solved.

Spector (1997) defines job satisfaction as an attitude reflecting how well people like or dislike their job. Job satisfaction describes how contented an individual is with his or her job. Job satisfaction is not the same as motivation, but it is linked with it. Job design aims to enhance job satisfaction and performance. Certain methods such as job rotation, job enlargement and job enrichment increase the feeling of job satisfaction. Other factors which influence the satisfaction include the management style and culture, employee involvement, empowerment and autonomous work groups.

Job satisfaction has been defined as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job; an affective reaction to one's job; and an attitude towards one's job. Weiss (2002) has argued that job satisfaction is an attitude but points out that researchers should clearly distinguish the objects of cognitive evaluation which are affect (emotion), beliefs and behaviours. The definition implies that we form attitudes towards our jobs by taking into account our feelings, our beliefs, and our behaviours.

It is a sense of inner fulfilment and pride achieved when performing a particular job. Job satisfaction occurs when an employee feels that he has accomplished the given task which has importance and value.

The most used research definition of job satisfaction is given by Locke (1976). According to him job satisfaction is "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences". In this definition he gives importance to both affect or feeling, and cognition or thinking. It means if we think about something then we have feelings for that. Conversely we can say if we
have feelings then we think about what we feel. Hence cognition and affect are interlinked with each other. Therefore when we evaluate the job then both thinking and feeling are involved.

Job satisfaction is generally perceived to be directly linked to productivity as well as to personal wellbeing. Job satisfaction means doing a job one enjoys, doing it well, and being suitably rewarded for one's efforts. Job satisfaction further implies enthusiasm and happiness with one's work. The Harvard Professional Group (1998) sees job satisfaction as the keying radiant that leads to recognition, income, promotion, and the achievement of other goals that lead to a general feeling of fulfilment.

One of the biggest achievements to the study of job satisfaction was the Hawthorne studies. These studies (1924-1933), primarily credited to Elton Mayo of the Harvard Business School. They sought to find the effects of various conditions on workers' productivity. Hawthorne Effect is the novel changes in work conditions to temporarily increase the productivity. Later it was found that this increase in productivity is not due to the new conditions, but because of the knowledge of being observed. This finding provided strong evidence that people work for purposes other than pay, which paved the way for researchers to investigate other factors in job satisfaction.

Scientific management i.e., Taylorism, also had a significant impact on the study of job satisfaction. Frederick Winslow Taylor's (1911) argued that there was a single best way to perform any given work task. He contributed to a change in industrial production philosophies, causing a shift from skilled labour and piecework towards the more modern approach of assembly lines and hourly wages. The use of scientific management by industries greatly increased productivity because workers
were forced to work at a faster pace. However, workers became exhausted and
dissatisfied, and hence the necessity to find the answers regarding job satisfaction
emerges. It should also be noted that the work of W.L. Bryan, Walter Dill Scott, and
Hugo Munsterberg set the tone for Taylor’s work.

According to some researchers Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory laid the
foundation for job satisfaction theory. In this theory he explains that people seek to
satisfy five specific needs in life – physiological needs, safety needs, social needs,
self-esteem needs, and self-actualization.

Models of job satisfaction:

Affect Theory: Edwin A. Locke proposed The Affect Theory (1976). It is the most
famous job satisfaction model. The purpose of this theory is that satisfaction is
determined by a discrepancy between what one wants in a job and what one has in a
job. The theory also states that how much one value a given facet of work (e.g. the
degree of autonomy in a position) and how satisfied or dissatisfied one becomes when
expectations are met or are not met. When a person values a particular facet of a job,
his satisfaction is greatly impacted both positively (when expectations are met) and
negatively (when expectations are not met). To illustrate, if Employee A values
autonomy in the workplace and Employee B is indifferent about autonomy, then
Employee A would be more satisfied in a position that offers a high degree of
autonomy and less satisfied in a position with little or no autonomy compared to
Employee B. This theory also states that too much of a particular facet will produce
stronger feelings of dissatisfaction the more a worker values that facet.

Dispositional Theory: Another important theory of job satisfaction is the
Dispositional Theory (template: Jakson, April, 2007). This theory suggested that
human being have innate dispositions that cause them to have tendencies toward a
certain level of satisfaction, regardless the job of the person. This approach became a notable explanation of job satisfaction in the light of evidence that job satisfaction tends to be stable over time and across careers and jobs. Research also indicates that identical twins have similar levels of job satisfaction.

A significant model that narrowed the scope of the Dispositional Theory was the Core Self-evaluations Model, proposed by Timothy A. Judge in 1998. He argued that there are four Core Self-evaluations that determine one's disposition towards job satisfaction: self-esteem, general self-efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism. This model states that higher levels of self-esteem i.e., the value one places on his/her self, and general self-efficacy i.e., the belief in one's own competence, lead to higher work satisfaction. Having an internal locus of control i.e., believing one has control over her/his own life, as opposed to outside forces having control, leads to higher job satisfaction. Finally, the lower levels of neuroticism lead to higher job satisfaction.

**Two-Factor Theory (Motivator-Hygiene Theory):** Two factor theory proposed by Frederick Herzberg (1968) it is also known as Motivator Hygiene Theory. This theory attempts to explain satisfaction and motivation in the workplace. According to this theory satisfaction and dissatisfaction are driven by different factors – motivation and hygiene factors, respectively. The motivation of an employee to work is continually related to job satisfaction of a subordinate. Motivation can be seen as an inner force that drives individuals to attain personal and organization goals. Motivating factors are those aspects of the job that enhance the workers to perform the given task, and provide them satisfaction, for example achievement in work, recognition, promotion opportunities. These motivating factors are considered to be intrinsic to the job. Hygiene factors include aspects of the working environment such as pay, company policies, supervisory practices, and other working conditions.
**Job Characteristics Model:** The Job Characteristics Model is proposed by Hackman & Oldman (1976). It is widely used to study how particular job characteristics impact on job outcomes, including job satisfaction. The model states that there are five core job characteristics: skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback. These characteristics impact three critical psychological states i.e., experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility for outcomes, and knowledge of the actual results. These psychological states in turn influencing work outcomes i.e., job satisfaction, absenteeism, work motivation, etc. These five core job characteristics can be combined to form a motivating potential score (MPS) for a job, which can be used as an index of how likely a job is to affect the attitude and behaviour of an employee.

**Superior-Subordinate Communication**

It has an important influence on job satisfaction in the workplace. The way in which subordinate perceive a supervisor’s behaviour can positively or negatively influence job satisfaction. Communication behaviour such as facial expression, eye contact, vocal expression, and body movement is crucial to the superior-subordinate relationship. Nonverbal messages play a central role in interpersonal interactions with respect to impression formation, deception, attraction, social influence, and emotional expression. Nonverbal communication from the supervisor helps to increase interpersonal involvement with their subordinates and it is impacting job satisfaction. The way in which supervisors communicate their subordinates may be more important than the verbal content. Individuals who dislike and think negatively about their supervisor are less willing to communicate and have low level of motivation to work where as individuals who like and think positively about their supervisor are more likely to communicate and are satisfied with their job and work environment.
The relationship of a subordinate with their supervisor is a very important aspect in the workplace. Therefore, a supervisor who uses nonverbal immediacy, friendliness, and open communication lines is more willing to receive positive feedback and high job satisfaction from a subordinate where as a supervisor who is antisocial, unfriendly, and unwilling to communicate will receive negative feedback and very low job satisfaction from their subordinate’s in the workplace.

Job satisfaction is the positive and negative feelings and attitudes one can hold about his jobs. The related factors on which job satisfaction depends are the sense of fulfilment one can get from his daily tasks. Personal factors such as age, health, length of job experience, emotional stability, social status, leisure activities, and family and other social relationships also affect job satisfaction. In other words it is an emotional response to a job situation. It is influenced by how well outcomes meet or exceed personal expectations.

Lack of job satisfaction is one of the main reasons of daily stress. Some major factors through which employees get satisfaction are:

- **Salary:** Different needs of an individual are fulfilled through the source of money. A person can live a quality life if he has enough money in his pocket. Mostly employers see pay as reflection of organization.

- **Amount of variety in the job:** With a good salary the type of work is also important to contribute to the job satisfaction. The variety and control over work method and work place are the important aspect of work itself. A moderate amount of variety in the job can produce the appropriate level of satisfaction. If the work consists less variety then it will become the reason of boredom and fatigue while too much variety in the job can produce stress and burnout.
Promotional Opportunity: Promotional opportunity is another factor that has an impact on job satisfaction. Jobs that are at upper level in the organization provide more freedom, more challenging work assignments and high salary to the workers.

Supervision: Supervisors who have a good interpersonal relationship with subordinates and who take a personal interest in them provide satisfaction to the employees. A supervision that allows the workers to take good decisions can also enhance the job satisfaction.

Fellow Workers: A friendly and co-operative work group is also a good source of job satisfaction. A good working group provides social support to the employees. A co-operative work group can share their problems with their co-workers.

Physical Work conditions: Good working conditions provide more comfort to the workers. The working conditions are important to employees because they can influence life outside of work.

The link between work approach and job satisfaction

There are three perspectives to approach the work. Basically all three perspectives are important for getting job satisfaction, but one is often the priority:

A job: If the worker approach work as a job, primarily he focus on the financial rewards. At that time he may not concern about the nature of the work rather he pays his attention towards the money. If a job with more pay comes in his way then he will likely to move on.

A career: If the worker approach work as a career, it shows that he is interested in advancement. He wanted to climb the career ladder as far as
possible or be among the most highly regarded professionals in his field. He 
imotivated by the status, prestige and power that comes with the job.

- **A calling:** If the workers approach his job as a calling, he focuses on the work itself. He works less for the financial gain or career advancement but he work for the fulfilment that the work brings.

So it is important to recognize the approach to work. One approach is not necessarily better than the others. But it is helpful to identified if we are unsatisfied with our job and are ready to move on. We should think about what originally drew us to our current job, and whether it may be a factor in our lack of job satisfaction.

Depending on the underlying cause of lack of job satisfaction, there may be several ways through which one can increase his job satisfaction.

- **Set new challenges:** If an employee stuck in a job because of lack of education or a downturn in the economy, it does not mean that his work has to become worthless. Try to create new challenges and do his best for the job he has.

- **Improve job skills:** Imagining yourself in your dream job, you might envision yourself as an excellent project manager — a confident communicator and a highly organized person.

- **Develop own project:** Take on a project that can motivate you and give you a sense of control. Start small, such as organizing a work-related celebration, before moving on to larger goals. Working on something you care about that can boost your confidence.

- **Mentor a co-worker:** Once you've mastered a job, you may find it becoming routine. Helping a new co-worker or an intern advance his or her skills can restore the challenge and the satisfaction you desire.
• **Beat the boredom:** Break up the monotony that is take advantage of the work breaks, such as read something, go for a walk, etc. Do cross-training that is if the work consists of repetitive tasks, such as entering data or working on an assembly line then talk with the boss about training for a different task to overcome the boredom.

• **Be positive:** Make positive thinking about the job. Change the attitude about the work to increase the job satisfaction. Stop negative thoughts. Pay attention to the messages you give to yourself. When you find yourself thinking that your job is terrible, stop the thought in it way.

   It is necessary to learn from the mistakes. Failure is one of the greatest learning tools, but many people take failure as the end of life. If somebody makes a mistake at work then learn from it and try to do the task again and again.

   Organizations can help to create job satisfaction by putting systems in place that will ensure that workers are challenged and then rewarded for being successful. Organizations that aspire to creating a work environment that enhances job satisfaction need to incorporate the following:

• Flexible work arrangements
• Training system and other professional growth opportunities
• Interesting work that consists variety and challenges
• Opportunities to use talents and creativity
• Opportunities to take responsibility and direct one's own work
• A stable and secure work environment that includes job security and continuity.

   Environments in which workers are supported by an accessible supervisor who provides timely feedback as well as congenial team members are include:
• Flexible benefits, such as child-care and exercise facilities
• Up-to-date technology
• Competitive salary and opportunities for promotion

Satisfaction and dissatisfaction varies from one worker to another. Apart from the factors mentioned above, job satisfaction is also influenced by the personal characteristics of the employees, the personal characteristics of the managers and the style of management, and the nature of the work itself. Managers who want to maintain job satisfaction in their teams they must try to understand the needs of each member of the work force. For example, when creating work teams, managers should take care that place people with similar backgrounds, experiences, or needs in the same workgroup. Also, managers can enhance job satisfaction by carefully matching workers abilities with the type of the work. For example, a person who is not able to pay attention to the details would hardly make a good inspector, and a worker who has shy nature unlikely to be a good salesperson. Try to match job tasks to the personalities of the employees.

Managers can also enhance the job satisfaction of workers by taking other deliberate steps such as job enrichment. Job enrichment usually includes increased responsibility, recognition, and opportunities for growth, learning, and achievement.

So, job satisfaction is a product of the events and conditions that people experience on their jobs. Brief (1998) wrote: "If a person's work is interesting, her pay is fair, her promotional opportunities are good, her supervisor is supportive, and her co-workers are friendly, then a situational approach leads one to predict she is satisfied with her job". It means if the pleasures is associated with the job of the worker then it will increase the level of job satisfaction.
Role Efficacy

The word 'role' for the first time is recorded in English in 1606. Generally it came from French where it means “a part one has to play”. Role can also be defined as a character or part played by a performer. A role is the characteristic and expected social behaviour of an individual, it is a function or position hold by an individual in different situations.

A role is a set of connected behaviours, rights and obligations as conceptualized by actors in a social situation. It is an expected behaviour for an individual, for his social status and for his social position. Social roles consist of the following factors about the social behaviour:

- People spend a large part of their lives in groups.
- Within these groups, they often take different positions.
- Each of these positions can be called a role, with a whole set of functions that are moulded by the expectations of others.
- Formalized expectations become norms when most of the people feel comfortable in providing punishments and rewards for the expected behaviour.
- Individuals are generally conformists, and insofar as that is true, they conform to roles.
- The anticipation of rewards and punishments inspire this conformity.

Banton (1965) has proposed the concept of basic, general and independent roles. Basic and general roles are related with each other. The term “Role Tree” used by Ruddock (1969) indicates a branching network concept. The trunk corresponds to the basic role, the main branches to the general roles, the secondary branches to the special roles and the leaves to the transient roles. Roles can be divided into two categories; one is achieved and the other is ascribed. An achieved role is a position
that a person assumes voluntarily. It reflects personal skills, abilities, and efforts. Roles are not forced upon the individual there is always a choice involved. An *ascribed role* is a position assigned to individuals or groups without regard for merit but because of certain traits beyond their control (Stark 2007).

Role development can be influenced by a number of additional factors, including social, genetic predisposition, cultural or situational.

- **Societal influence:** The roles of the individuals also based on the structure of the society, and the social situations they experience themselves. When parents enrol their children into some program then it will increase the chance that the children will follow that role in the future.

- **Genetic predisposition:** There are few roles which are genetically involved in the individual. For example, if we have leadership quality then we opt the role of a leader. Those with mental genius often take on roles devoted to education and knowledge. It does not indicate that people must choose only one role in his life, multiple roles can be taken on by single individual (e.g. David can be the captain of the Volleyball team and the editor of his school magazine).

- **Cultural influence:** Different cultures have different values on certain roles. It depends upon the lifestyle of the individual. For example, Indians are crazier for cricket in comparison to football.

- **Situational influence:** Roles can be created or altered according to the situation and also depend upon that how the person is put in outside his own influence.

Role theory is the sociological study of role development. It tries to explain the different forces that cause people to develop the expectations they have from their own and others' behaviours. According to sociologist Bruce Biddle (1986), the five major models of role theory include.
- Functional Role Theory - which examines role development as shared social norms for a given social position,
- Symbolic Interactionist Role Theory - which examines role development as the outcome of individual interpretation of responses to behaviour,
- Structural Role Theory - which emphasizes the influence of society rather than the individual in roles and utilizes mathematical models,
- Organizational Role Theory - which examines role development in organizations, and
- Cognitive Role Theory – it is summarized by Flynn and Lemay as "the relationship between expectations and behaviours.

Role is the position an individual holds in a social system. The concept of role is important for the integration of the individual with an organization. The organization has its own structure and goals. In the same way the individual has his personality and needs (motivations). All these aspects interact with each other and to some extent get integrated into a role. An organization can be defined as a system of roles. Generally there are two types of role system: the system of various roles that the individual carries and performs, and the system of various roles of which his role is a part. First one is called role space and the second one is called a role set. A person performs various roles that are centred around the self and they are at varying distances from the self (and from each other). These relationships define the role space. In the same way role set is the interrelationship between one role (called the focal role) among many others. As the concept of role is central to the concept of an organization, the concept of self is central to the concept of role.

The role of an individual in an organization is defined by the expectations of significant role senders in that organization, including the individual. The
expectations from the role by the individual himself are termed as "Reflexive Role Expectation (Kahn and Quinn 1970)."

Roles are also frequently interconnected in a role set, that complement of role-relationships in which persons are involved by virtue of occupying a particular social status (Merton 1957).

Nowadays role behaviour is a centre of attraction for many behavioural scientists. Kahn et al. (1964) suggested that role behaviour is usually role taking behaviour of the people in the organizational context. Generally organizational system reinforced such types of behaviours. Role behaviour in reaction to role prescription causes stress in the individual due to which absenteeism, indifference, sickness and sudden or slow decrease of productivity in the organization takes place. Different researches carried out on the varied nature of role stress in relation to various personal, group and organizational variables (Pestonjee, 1992). It has been observed that role stress increase the level of fatigue and tiredness and decrease the job satisfaction in the individual. It also reduces the capacity of the individual to utilize his personal and organizational resources. To handle this situation both the organizations as well as the individual keep the role occupant plan for his own role.

When an individual joins an organization and he has assigned some role then he wanted to be effective in performing that particular role. He not only tries to fulfil the expectations of others but he himself generates certain expectations from that role. In this process some individuals get benefit from the organizational resources as well as from their own. On the other hand there are few people who neither utilize the organizational resources nor their personal resources properly. They perceive a kind of inadequacy in both organizations as well as in personal resources. Due to the interactions of personality, role and environment, an employee either achieves full
satisfaction, partial satisfaction, no satisfaction or dissatisfaction. It is very rare to get full satisfaction. In his work he feels stress because the roles are conflicted with the needs, values or abilities.

Role conflict is a kind of social conflict that takes place when an individual is forced to take two different and incompatible roles at the same time. Sometimes individual surrounded in such types of situations where his sets of behaviour that characterize roles may lead to cognitive dissonance in the individual. For example, a woman may find conflict between her role as a wife, as a mother, and her role as an employee of a company when her family member demands for time and attention distract her from the needs of her employer. In the same way sometimes individual face such situations in which it becomes difficult for him to decide which role he should perform.

A person's performance in an organization depends on his own potential effectiveness, technical competence, managerial experience, etc. It is the combination of the individual and the role. A person has appropriate knowledge, technical competence and skills required for the role. The designing of the role is also important to make the performance effective. If an employee is not able to use his competence and if he continuously feels frustration in the role then his performance goes down.

The concept of role efficacy is not new one. The holy book "Bhagwad Geeta" discussed this concept which preaches the individual to feel pleasure in each and every process of work (karma) and not bother for results. In Indian context Uday Pareek (1974, 1980a, 1980b, 1986, 1987, and 1993) pioneered the concept of role efficacy.

Effectiveness of a person in a given role in an organization, therefore, may depend on his own potential effectiveness, the potential effectiveness of the role and
the organizational climate. Hence efficacy is the potential effectiveness. Personal efficacy means potential effectiveness of a person in personal and interpersonal situations. Role efficacy means the potential effectiveness of an individual occupying a particular role in an organization. Role efficacy can be seen as the psychological factor underlying role effectiveness. In short, role efficacy is potential effectiveness of a role. Role efficacy is the process of enriching the role occupied by the role occupant.

Aspects of Role Efficacy

Role efficacy has several aspects. The more these aspects are present in a role, the higher the efficacy of that role is likely to be. These aspects can be classified into three groups, or dimensions. One dimension of role efficacy is called "role making", contrasted with role taking. Role making is an active attitude towards the role (to define and make the role as one likes), whereas role taking is a passive attitude (mainly responding to others' expectations). The aspects in the second dimension are concerned with increasing the power of the role, making it more important. This can be called "role centring", which can be contrasted with "role entering" (accepting the role as given and reconciling oneself to its present importance or unimportance). The third dimension is called "role linking" (extending the relationship of the role with other roles and groups), contrasted with "role shrinking" (making the role narrow, confined to work-related expectations).

Dimensions 1: Role Making

• **Self-Role Integration:** This dimension measures the perception of the integration between the self and the role. Every person has his strengths - his experience, his technical training, the special skills he may have, and some
unique contribution he may be able to make. If the role provide full opportunity to use the special strengths which a person have then his role efficacy goes high. This is called self-role integration. The self of the person and the role get integrated through the possibility of a person's use of his special strengths in the role. Suppose a person in an organization is promoted to a responsible position. It makes him happy, but after passing few days on this position he found that he is not be able to use his skills of training, counselling and organizational diagnosis. Though he work very hard in this new role but his efficacy is not as high as it was in previous role. Later, when the role was redesigned to enable him to use his rare skills, his efficacy went up. We all want to use our strengths in a particular role so that we can demonstrate our effectiveness. Integration, therefore, contributes to high role efficacy. If there is a distance between the self and the role then the role efficacy is likely to go down.

**Proactivity:** This dimension measures the perception of taking the initiative. A person who occupies a role responds to various expectations people in the organization have from that role. This thing gives him satisfaction, and it also satisfies others in the organization. However, if he is also to take initiative in starting some activity, his efficacy will be higher. Responding to the expectations of others i.e. reactive behaviour helps a person to be effective to some extent, but taking the initiative rather than only responding to other's expectations i.e. proactivity contributes much more to efficacy. If a person wants to take initiative but not getting full opportunity to do so then his role efficacy goes down.
• **Creativity:** This dimension measures the perception that something new or innovative is being done by the role occupant. It is not only initiative which is important for efficacy. An opportunity to try new and unconventional ways of solving problems or an opportunity to be creative is equally important. Creativity and use of innovative ideas increase the role efficacy of the individual. It also improves the performance of the individual. If a person bounds to do routine task then it deteriorates its role efficacy. If the role does not allow him any time to be creative then his role efficacy is bound to be low.

• **Confrontation:** This dimension measures the perception about the capacity of the individual to solve the problems. In general, if people in an organization avoid problems, or shift the problems to some other people to solve them, their role efficacy will be low. The general tendency to confront the problems to find relevant solutions contributes to efficacy. When people facing interpersonal problems then they should talk about them and try to find out the solutions. This will increase their efficacy. Now if they either deny having such problems or refer them to their higher officers then it will decrease their efficacy.

Dimension 2: Role Centring

• **Centrality:** This dimension measures the perception of the importance of the role. If a person occupying a particular role in the organization generally feels that the role he/she occupies is central in the organization, his/her role efficacy is likely to be high. If people feel that their roles are not very important then their potential effectiveness will go down. For example, in large organizations, lowest level employees such as attendants had very high motivation when they
joined. However, after few months they realize that their role is not as much important as they thought. This thing deteriorates their effectiveness.

- **Influence:** This dimension measures the perception of the individual towards one's own capacity in making an impact on others. A related concept is that of influence or power. The more influence a person is able to exercise in the role, the higher the role efficacy is likely to be. One of the reasons is the opportunity to influence a large section of society. For example a gate-keeper in an organization was trained to screen visitors outside visiting hours. He used his own discretion in admitting them. Interviews with such employees showed that they were proud of their roles. One main reason for their higher motivation is the discretion given to the roles.

- **Personal growth:** This dimension measures the perception about opportunities to learn new things for personal growth. One factor which contributes effectively to role efficacy is the perception that the role provides the individual an opportunity to grow and develop. Many times it happen that people leaving one role and becoming effective in another one. This is due to the reason that they have more opportunity to grow in the second role. For example an executive despite of cut in his salary switch over to another position because this new role gives him more opportunity to grow. In many institutes of higher learning, the roles of the teaching staff pose problems of low efficacy. The main reason is the lack of opportunity for them to grow systematically in their roles. On the other hand institutes that are able to manage the growth of their employees in their roles will increase the efficacy of the roles, and in turn, obtain greater contribution from them.
Dimension 3: Role Linking

- **Inter-role Linkage:** This dimension measures the perception of interdependence with other roles. Linkage of one's role with other roles in the organization increases efficacy. If there is a joint effort in understanding problems, finding solutions, etc., the efficacy of the various roles involved is likely to be high. But, the presumption is that people know how to work effectively. Similarly, if a person is a member of a task group set up for a specific purpose, his efficacy, with other factors being common, is likely to be high. The feeling of isolation of a role (that a person works without any linkage with other roles) reduces role efficacy.

- **Helping Relationship:** This dimension measures the feeling of participant with regard to helping others and taking help from others. In addition to inter-role linkages, the opportunity for people to receive and give help also increases role efficacy. If persons performing a particular role feel that they can get help from some source in the organization whenever they have such a need, they are likely to have higher role efficacy. On the other hand, if there is a feeling that either no help is given when asked for, or that the respondents are hostile, role efficacy will be low. Helping relationship is of both kinds - feeling free to ask for help and expecting that help would be available when it is needed, as well as willingness to give help and respond to the needs of others.

- **Superordination:** This dimension measures the perception that something beyond the regular call of duty is being contributed to the larger society and the nation. A role may have linkages with systems, groups and entities beyond the organization. When a person performing a particular role feels that what he does as a part of his role is likely to be of value to a larger group, his efficacy
is likely to be high. The roles which give opportunities to role occupants to work for super ordinate goals have highest role efficacy. Super ordinate goals are goals of serving large groups with collaborative efforts. People at the top move towards public sector because they have the opportunity to work for larger goals, which is helpful for larger sections of society. Many employees accepted cuts in their salaries to move from the private to the public sector at the top level just because of superordination. Roles in which employees feel that what they are doing is helpful to the organizations, in which they work, have higher efficacy.

**Role Efficacy and Effectiveness**

Research shows that people who have high role efficacy experience less role stress, anxiety and work related tensions. They have confidence on their own strengths, they solve their problems by using more purposeful behaviour. They are active as well as interactive with people and environment. They have growth orientation, attitudinal commitment and positive approach behaviour. These types of people feel satisfaction with life, jobs and roles in the organizations.

Atmosphere which should be participative in nature, in which the employees get higher job satisfaction, contributes to high role efficacy. A climate which is promoting concern for excellence, use of expertise, and concern for the large issues also contributes to role efficacy. On the other side, a climate characterized by control and affiliation seems to lower role efficacy. An innovation-fostering climate was found to be a strong predictor of role efficacy.

It has also been reported that role efficacy is a strong moderator or mediating variable to enhance the organizational climate. Awareness with new knowledge and
technology is not only important for those who acquired higher position and have greater skills but it became a need of every employee irrespective of the position he acquired in the organization. Thus, it is the duty of the organization to provide better knowledge and training to their employees. The Role Efficacy Profiles may be used to identify aspects requiring strengthening. The concerned role occupants need to be encouraged to think how they themselves can raise the levels of their own role efficacy. This will help them to become proactive. Then the supervisors and higher levels in the organization can think of various ways of increasing role efficacy of key roles.

**Interpersonal Trust**

In our day to day life we encounter different situations that require interpersonal decisions. We are forced to rely on our beliefs to resolve this dilemma. An internal conflict between the hopes and fears bounds an individual to think about these decisions. Side by side the opposing forces push us toward and pull away from any particular decision. A sense of trust makes an individual confident to remove the anxieties and take action.

The concept of interdependence and risk comprise the functional core for the definitions of interpersonal trust. Interdependence refers to the extent to which a person’s outcomes in an interaction are determined by another person’s action. Hence an interdependent situation is one in which the other possesses some control over the outcomes. Since the other person not always considers the needs and concerns, hence the outcomes also creates an element of risk. The extent of risk is reflected in the subjective value or meaning of the outcome.
Deutsch (1958) stated that there is no possibility for "rational" individual behaviour in (interdependent situations) unless the conditions for mental trust exist. According to Killey (1979) the compatibility of people's preferences in the interaction is important because risk is always greater to the extent that the potential outcomes of those involved result in conflict of interests (i.e., are 'non-correspondent').

Trust alleviates fears of exploitation and minimizes the feelings of vulnerability to those who want an optimal solution to their problem. Among the early theorists Erikson (1950) and Bowlby (1973) consider trust as a chronic characteristic of personality. According to Erikson, trust is the resolution of an early inner conflict around dependency occurring during the infant's first year of life, a resolution determined in large part by the quality of the maternal relationship. In his "architectural" model, basic trust is the first building block in a hierarchical identity structure. It is the foundation on which the whole personality of an individual is constructed. He describes trust as the 'most fundamental prerequisite of vitality', and as a capacity for faith. Thus, from his point of view, a capacity to trust or not to trust develops very early in life and shapes all other aspects of the personality.

According to Bowlby the discussion of trust is based on a developmental model emphasizing the quality of care during early childhood. In his theory of attachment a sense of trust is derived from feelings of security. An infant attached to his primary care giver who consistently takes care of his needs. As the time passes out the child with his experience generates 'working models' or representation of self and others which incorporate this sense that others, generalized from the caregiver or 'trusted companion', are readily available and responsive to one's needs. These mental models are persisting throughout the life time relatively unchanged and influence the general orientation of an individual.
With respect to the definitions discussed earlier these perspectives suggested two meanings. First, the pattern of caregiver produces more general expectations regarding the willingness and ability of others to attend and satisfy one's needs. Second, these expectations not only endure in some form throughout the life, but also to play a role in determining further personality development so that the individual cope with the social world.

"People sense how we feel about them. If we want to change their attitudes toward us, change the negative attitudes we have toward them". To build a relationship it is required to build the trust. Trust is the expectancy of people that they can rely on the words one can use to speak. It is built through integrity and consistency in relationships. "Trust is a psychological state that manifests itself in the behaviours towards others, is based on the expectations made upon behaviours of these others, and on the perceived motives and intentions in situations entailing risk for the relationship with those others." This definition viewed trust as an attitude hold by an individual in relation to another individual or group of individuals and it is applicable with in the team contexts. Consistent with Mayer et al.'s (1995) integrated model of trust, this definition distinguishes between the psychological state, the expectations and the behaviours towards others, which are conceptualized as distinct but related components of trust. In addition, this conceptualization parallels other definitions of trust as a multidimensional or multifaceted construct (e.g., Smith & Barclay, 1997). Contrary to some other definitions (e.g., McAllister, 1995; Rousseau et al., 1998, etc.), this definition considers the behaviours of trust as components and not as an effect of trust itself. Here behaviour is an important component of trust, since it reflects the significance of the decision about trusting or not (Smith &
Barclay, 1997) by enabling individuals to act upon their own judgments and this can be done through the observation and interpretation of these behaviours.

Individuals learn about each other's motives and intentions, and are able to make inferences of trustworthiness. Therefore, here trust behaviours are considered as the components of trust together with propensity to trust and perceived trustworthiness. In this conceptualization trust can be defined as a multi-component construct composed of propensity to trust, perceived trustworthiness, and trust behaviours. Because trust is believed to vary with tasks, situations, and people (Hardy & Magrath, 1989), the trust components are conceptualized as having multiple dimensions whose nature and relative importance may vary with the context relationship.

Webster's Dictionary (1971) defined trust as an assured reliance on some person or things; a confidence dependent on character, ability, strength or truth of someone or something.

According to Solomon (1960), trust refers to expectations of benevolence, whereas suspicion refers to expectation of malevolence. Interpersonal trust at work has two dimensions: (a) faith in the trustworthy intentions of others, and (b) confidence in the ability of others (Cook and Wall, 1980).

According to Argyris (1965), organizational trust is a behaviour that induces members to take risks and experiment, and distrust as a behaviour that restricts and inhibits members from taking risks and experimenting.

R.S. Dwivedi (1983) in his trust based theory of management suggested that improvement in several performance measures – quality of goods and services produced morale and job satisfaction, reduction of restraining behaviour such as absenteeism, turnover, tardiness, indiscipline, unrest, etc., can be accomplished by
using trust as a basic input in structural and process designs, assimilation of conflicts and integration of goals in organizational settings.

Evidences in management literature indicate that trust facilitates organizational performance while distrust hampers it. According to Dwivedi (1983) “management by trust” is a dynamic system, based on definable, measurable, developable units of trusting behaviour, purporting to attain effective performance through optimization of organizational structure and process, assimilation of conflicts, and integration of goals. Trusting behaviour leads to optimization of organizational structure – classical, neo-classical, and modern – and of organizational processes – decision, communication, control, leadership and motivation. It assimilates conflicts in the organization by resolving them in a manner that leads to constructive, rather than destructive outcomes. It also leads to integration of individual, group and organizational goals by generating a perception among the participants that their own needs can be satisfied to the extent that they contribute to the attainment of organizational goals. Thus, the dynamic system of MBT involves six interdependent and interacting elements – trusting behaviour, effective performance, optimization of organizational processes, assimilation of conflicts, and integration of goals.

A number of researches demonstrated that interpersonal trust is crucial in organizational settings. To transfer the knowledge from one person to another it is important to maintain a good interpersonal relationship. There has been only limited systematic empirical work examining factors that promote a knowledge seekers trust in a knowledge source.
Assumptions underlying high and low inter-personal trust orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for</th>
<th>Trust orientation</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Most people are true to their words</td>
<td>Most people do not do what they say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Most people have a positive self image and try to live up to it</td>
<td>Most people are not what they pretend to be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>Most people are capable of developing true and intimate relationship</td>
<td>Most people show friendliness only when they have some self-interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>Most people think positively about others if they perceive others thinking them positively</td>
<td>Most people do not think positively about others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Most people are capable of enjoying other’s success, if it is not used against them</td>
<td>Most people do not feel happy when they see others flourishing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Components of trust behaviour

- **Propensity to trust**: It is the willingness to trust others. Rotter (1980) argues that different people have different propensity to trust on other individuals. One’s propensity to trust can be determined by life experiences, personality types, cultural background, education, and several other socio-economic factors (Mayer et al., 1995). In unfamiliar situations, particularly the influence of trusting dispositions grows (Rotter, 1980). Where as, in ongoing relationships such as in work teams propensity to trust should be viewed as a more situational specific trait, affected by the team members and situational factors (Mayer et al., 1995). For example, individuals may have different levels of trust in relation to other individuals, or even in relation to the same
individual but different situations (Mayer et al., 1995). Hence, only propensity to trust is not sufficient to explain variances in trust within teams, and therefore, it should be used in a more complete set of variables

- **Perceived trustworthiness**: It is the evaluation of the characteristics and actions of the trustee. Trustworthiness is the extent to which individuals expect other individuals to behave according to their implicit or explicit claims. This judgment has cognitive and emotional grounds and it is based on evaluations in relation to character, competence, motives, and intentions of the other person (McAllister, 1995). Cummings and Bromiley (1996) propose three dimensions on which trustworthiness with teams can be accessed:

1. The belief that another person or group makes good-faith efforts to behave in accordance with any commitments both explicit and implicit;
2. The belief that another person or group is honest in whatever negotiations preceded such commitments; and
3. The belief that another person or group does not take excessive advantage when the opportunity is available.

- **Trust behaviours.** It is the willingness to be vulnerable to other individuals whose actions one does not control. Although there are a number of behaviours that may be indicative of trust, among these the four categories have been consistently found, i.e., communication openness, acceptance of influence, forbearance from opportunism, and control reduction (Smith & Barclay, 1997).

These types of behaviours often occur simultaneously within work team, and one type of behaviour leads to another one. In this way, it looks more meaningful to consider these behaviours as complementary. According to Jones and George (1998),
trust behaviours correspond to positive actions towards individuals that jointly can be optimized throughout cooperative behaviours. Cooperative behaviours refer to the extent to which team members communicate openly about their work, accept the influence of others, and feel personally involved with the team. Monitoring behaviours refer to the extent to which team members feel a necessity to control other members’ work and be careful. This distinction has the purpose of pointing at the role of monitoring in trust. It is assumed that monitoring behaviour comes into play when trust is not present. For example, if a team member trusts the ability of his/her colleague to perform a good task then no monitoring behaviours is needed. Monitoring behaviours are usually seen as non-productive activities, since they increase costs, restrict change, and reduce cooperation.

Hence, the more team members will engage in cooperative behaviours the less they will engage in monitoring behaviours and vice versa (Inkpen & Currall, 1997, Leifer & Mills, 1996).

“The willingness to be vulnerable” from Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995), is one of the most cited definitions of trust and has played a central role in many conceptualizations, such as by Bromiley and Cummings (1995) and by Mishra (1996). In other definitions, different words have been used to propose the same meaning such as, the “willingness to rely on another” (Doney, Cannon, & Mullen, 1998), and the “intention to accept vulnerability” (Rousseau et al., 1998).

Some authors emphasize the expectations underlying the trust concept. For example, Elangovan and Shapiro (1998) assume that trust is a “set of optimistic expectations”, and for Lewicki and Bunker (1996) trust involves “positive expectations about others”. However, these expectations go beyond the characteristics or intentions of those involved, including also considerations about the situation and
the risks associated with acting on such expectations (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Some other authors have proposed that trust is a “risk taking behaviour” or the “willingness to engage such behaviour” (Cummings & Bromiley, 1996).

Trust involves simultaneously individual processes, group dynamics, and organizational or institutional contingencies (Rousseau, Stikin, Burt, & Carmerer, 1998). The acknowledgement that trust reflects a multitude of roles, functions, and levels of analysis has been a recent turning point for theory and research on this topic. Instead of accentuating the differences, researchers are starting to concentrate on common elements across perspectives in order to provide coherent knowledge with regard to trust (e.g., Costa, 2000; Hosmer, 1995; Rousseau et al., 1998). Traditional forms of management have been replaced by more collaborative approaches that emphasize coordination, sharing of responsibilities and the participation of the workers in the decision processes. New emphasis is given on interpersonal and group dynamics at the workplace, where trust is seen as one of the critical elements. If trust is absent, then nobody will take the risk, and hence they sacrifice the gains. So it requires collaboration and cooperation to increase the effectiveness. Understanding the role of trust at team level, and how it relates with performance effectiveness has become increasingly important.

**Interpersonal trust among co-workers:**

Here the focus is on whether a worker has confidence in the intention and/or capability of a manager or supervisor. In a work environment interpersonal trust, refers to the extent people ascribe good intentions and abilities among their peers. For example, a line worker might have confidence in the ability of a co-worker to perform a job safely and competently, but might be worry of telling him or her certain things because of a mistrust in the intentions of the person.
The success of a behaviour-based observation and feedback process requires a high degree of interpersonal trust among co-workers. It is not enough to believe the validity of the observations and feedback process but to trust the intentions of an observer is also very important. The person whose behaviour is being observed must believe that the information will be used only for personal protection against any injury and not for punishment. Hence a one-to-one behavioural feedback process begins with the coach asking for permission of co-worker to make the observations.

**Trust and team effectiveness**

Team effectiveness is often used to express multiple team outcomes. These can be grouped into three major categories:

- **Team performance**: It refers to the quantity and quality of team outputs;
- **Team members’ attitudes**: It refers the satisfaction, commitment, and stress of the team members; and
- **Behavioural team outcomes**: It refers to the level of absenteeism and turnover within the members of the teams.

Hence, researchers determine team effectiveness by considering dimensions of team performance and the attitude of team members. The dimensions of team effectiveness should measure the impact of the group experience on individual members, the output of the team, and the state of the group as a performing unit. The task performance can be evaluated from a management point of view. The performance of team members can be best understood by the task performs in relation to objectives. Moreover, perceived task performance has been found correlated with more objective measures and relationship continuity (Smith & Barclay, 1997).
Many researchers pointed out that satisfaction and commitment are the important dimensions of effectiveness predicted by trust. In the contexts of buying and selling relationships Smith and Barclay (1997) reveal that open communication and forbearance from opportunism lead to mutual satisfaction.

Work relationships characterized by trust enhance cooperation, reduce conflicts, increase the commitment to the organization and deteriorate the tendency to leave. Therefore, it can be expected that trust will have a positive effect on the satisfaction and the commitment of members to their own team. Poor effectiveness can be caused due to the amount of stress experienced within teams. Although the effect of trust on stress has not been fully explored, research on role ambiguity and role conflict in teams suggests that members enhance more monitoring behaviours in order to cope with these stressors (e.g., Fried, Ben-David, Tiegs, Avital, & Yeverechyahu, 1998). If monitoring behaviours are in fact negative indicators of trust, it is expected that the stress felt by team members might be related to the level of trust within the team. The relation between trust and high performance has been suggested by many authors (e.g., Bromiley & Cummings, 1995; Butler, 1991; McAllister, 1995). Teams which consists the members who have low levels of trust they have the tendency to share less information and ideas, are less personally involved, and impose controls when coordination is necessary.

There are few factors through which the trust among the members can be enhanced:

- **Effective Listening:** If you listen properly people will trust you. "You cannot establish trust if you cannot listen. A conversation is a relationship. Both speaker and listener play a significant role, they influence each other. Instead
of being a passive recipient, the listener has as much to do in shaping the conversation as the speaker”.

- **Managing Cultural Differences:** Cultural differences play an important role in the creation of trust, since trust is built in different ways, and means different things in different cultures.

- **Empathy:** Empathy is another important factor to build the trust. It allows to create bonds of trust, it gives insights into what others may be feel or think; it helps to understand how or why others are reacting to situations.

**Trust-based Working Relationships**

Trust has an important link for organizational success. "Trust elevates levels of commitment and sustains effort and performance without the need for management controls and close monitoring." Trust between a manager and an employee is based on the perception, the ability, benevolence, and integrity. Trust-based working relationships are an important source because trust is valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable, and often no substitutable.

It has been observed that satisfied employees are highly motivated, they have good morale at work, and they do their work in a more effective and efficient manner. Satisfied workers are also more concerned to continuous improvement and to quality of the organization. Process quality is therefore directly influenced by employee satisfaction. Process quality, in turn, determines quality costs and customer satisfaction. Therefore, it is crucial to identify the drivers of employee satisfaction, to monitor satisfaction continuously and to take the right measures to maximize satisfaction and loyalty.
Trust and Employee Satisfaction

Within the field of organizational studies trust is become a major research area. Disciplines such as organization science, sociology, and psychology, studied trust with a great concern and has focused on the individual level, group level, firm level and inter-firm level. Trust leads to more positive workplace attitudes (e.g. employee satisfaction and commitment), workplace behaviours (e.g. knowledge sharing, organizational citizenship behaviour) and performance outcomes (e.g. individual performance, group performance and business-unit performance). Hence, in workplace relationships when employees believe that their leaders and peers are trustworthy then they will feel safer and more positive about their managers and peers. In contrast, low levels of trust lead to psychologically distressing situations, because leaders or peers may have power over important aspects of one’s job. As a result, trust should have a strong and direct effect on employee satisfaction. Several studies on the manager–subordinate relationship have shown that trust is a major predictor of job satisfaction. Trust in the decision maker increased job satisfaction. Reciprocal trust between managers and salespeople increases job satisfaction of the subordinates. As the architecture of modern organizations has strongly moved towards team-based organizations in the last years – especially in Total Quality Management (Robbins, 2003) argue that not only trust in management but also trust in peers plays a major role in the formation of employee satisfaction. The three facets of trust mentioned above are also relevant for work teams. Trust in a team member reflects the expectation that the team member will act benevolently, it involves the willingness to be vulnerable and that the other team member may not fulfil the expectations and it involves dependency. Thus it is expected that employee
satisfaction in team-based organizations is strongly affected by trust in management and trust in peers.

Trust forms the foundation for effective communication, employee retention, and employee motivation and contribution of discretionary energy, the extra effort that people voluntarily invest in work. When trust exists in an organization or in a relationship, almost everything else becomes easier and more comfortable to achieve.

According to Dr. Duane C. Tway, Jr. in his 1993 dissertation, A Construct of Trust, "There exists today, no practical construct of Trust that allows us to design and implement organizational interventions to significantly increase trust levels between people. We all think we know what Trust is from our own experience, but we don't know much about how to improve it. Why? I believe it is because we have been taught to look at Trust as if it were a single entity."

Tway defines trust as, "the state of readiness for unguarded interaction with someone or something." He developed a model of trust that includes three components. He calls trust a construct because it is "constructed" of these three components: "the capacity for trusting, the perception of competence, and the perception of intentions." Thinking about trust as made up of the interaction and existence of these three components makes "trust" easier to understand.

The capacity for trusting means that your total life experiences have developed your current capacity and willingness to risk trusting others.

The perception of competence is made up of the perception of your ability and the ability of others. It is also depend upon with whom you work to perform competently and what is needed in your current situation. The perception of intentions, as defined by Tway, is your perception that the actions, words, direction,
mission, or decisions are motivated by mutually-serving rather than self-serving motives.

**Why Trust Is Critical in a Healthy Organization**

According to Tway, people have been interested in trust from the time of Aristotle. Additional research by Tway and others shows that trust is the basis for the environment you want to create in your work place. Trust is necessary for:

- Feeling able to rely upon a person,
- Cooperating with and experiencing teamwork with a group,
- Taking thoughtful risks, and
- Experiencing believable communication.

The best way to maintain trust in a work environment is to keep trust in the first place. The integrity of the leadership of the organization is critical. The truthfulness and transparency of the communication with staff is also a critical factor. The presence of a strong, unifying mission and vision can also promote a trusting environment.

Providing information about the rationale, background, and thought processes behind decisions is another important aspect of maintaining trust. People are more willing to trust their competence, contribution, and direction when they feel themselves as a part of a successful project or organization. Organizations which give priority to trust they take care of things which do not break trust. They have better communication; they provide good facilities to their customers and no one questions on small mistakes.
Role of supervisor and employee in building trust relationship

The following are ways to create and preserve a trusting work environment.

- Positive, trusting interpersonal relationships with people who are at the supervisory positions.
- Keep staff members truthfully informed. Provide as much information as soon as possible in any situation.
- Expect supervisors to act with integrity and keep commitments.
- Current behaviour and actions are perceived by employees as the basis for predicting future behaviour.
- Confront hard issues in a timely fashion. If an employee has excessive absences or spends work time by moving here and there then it is important to confront the employee about these issues so that other employees will watch and trust more.
- Maintain competence in supervisory and other work tasks. Listen with respect and full attention. Exhibit empathy and sensitivity to the needs of staff members.

The Human Resources professional has a special role in promoting trust. So the organizations should have line managers. The managers and supervisors should appropriately inform about all the factors described above in building trust relationships.

The management should also influence the power differentials within the organization by developing and publishing supportive, protective, honourable policies. The management should engage in trust building and team building activities only when there is a sincere desire in the organization to create a trusting, empowering, team-oriented work environment.
Trust is built and maintained by many small actions over time. According to Marsha Sinetar, “Trust is not a matter of technique, but of character; we are trusted because of our way of being, not because of our polished exteriors or our expertly crafted communications”. Trust is telling the truth, even when it is difficult, and being truthful, authentic, and trustworthy in the dealings with customers and staff.

According to George MacDonald “To be trusted is greater compliment than to be loved”. Mutual trust is the belief that we can rely on each other to achieve a common purpose. The key elements in building trust are:

1. Being honest and fair
2. Empathy
3. Sharing important information pertaining to oneself
4. Avoid using abusive words
5. Fulfilling promises

To build a relationship, the first prerequisite is to build trust. Empathy is one such thing that allows us to create bonds of trust. One should accept the responsibilities. When we accept responsibility, it represents our maturity. It is important to create a win-win situation which in turn results to generate happiness, prosperity, enjoyment and satisfaction. To build the trust first chooses what to say rather than say what to choose. A spoken word is like an arrow shot which cannot be retrieved. So we need to watch our words. Try to be a good listener. When we listen to others it shows we care for them and they feel important. Thus the person is motivated and is more receptive to our ideas. Sincere appreciation is a very good motivator as it fulfills human craving to feel important. Try to accept the mistakes immediately and willingly as mistakes are a part of our learning process. Try to avoid arguing. Arguing with someone is like fighting a losing battle.
Team Building and Interpersonal trust

To succeed in today’s competitive business environment, organizations need to capitalize on their work group diversity and address all issues related to work effectively. Understanding the interpersonal style of each other, is an important foundation for developing positive and productive relationships, and is largely measured by how one person’s behaviour is perceived by others. Teamwork is an important way to get things done in an environment that is more demanding and challenging. By working together toward team goals and sharing the contributions of each team member, it will be easier to achieve more in comparison to do it alone.

The management should try to discover why so many conflicts are destructive and how and why they result in failure. It is important to learn how to deal with a number of common responses to conflict. Develop new skills through participation in case studies, practical applications, simulations and group activities. Practice the skills which are needed to successfully manage and resolve the conflicts in the professional and personal relationships. The most important skill set that supports success is effective communication. We are always communicating – even not communicating sends a message to people.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Organizational role stress

Research in any area is conducted in order to make aware people with new knowledge. So it is not necessary that everybody would willingly believe on the whole research conducted by the researcher. Thus, to make the research more credible it is required to support the study with other works which have spoken about the same topic that the researcher have for his own research. Literature review provides guidance to the researcher. It can give an overview or act as a stepping stone. It also provides a solid background to the research investigation.

Here the topic of investigation is "impact of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on organizational role stress and job satisfaction of employees". With the help of literature review the researcher tried to find out about the findings of other researchers in relation to these variables.

Pandey (1998) explored the relationship between personality dimensions of individuals and their perceived organizational role stress. Findings revealed that psychoticism-reality and neuroticism-stability found positively associated with individual’s perceived organizational role stress, whereas extroversion and introversion found negatively associated with perceived organizational role stress.

Conley and Woosley (2000) conducted a study to examine the teacher role stress, higher order needs and work outcomes. Elementary and secondary teachers were taken as the sample of the study. Results suggested that role stresses related to individually- and organizationally- values outcomes among both elementary and secondary teachers.

Sayeed and Ahmad (2002) examined organizational role stress among executives of various industries. Results indicated that the executives of private sector
enterprises are suffering from higher level of organizational role stress as compared to public sector executives.

Chang and Hancock (2003) conducted a study on role stress and role ambiguity in new nursing graduates. The purpose of the study was to examine the scores, and changes in role stress 2-3 months after employment, and 11-12 months later in new graduate nurses. This study also investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and role stress. Factor analysis demonstrated that role ambiguity was the most salient feature of role stress in the first few months, while 10 months later; role over-load was the most important factor explaining variance in role stress scores over time. For the first survey, job satisfaction was significantly negatively correlated with role ambiguity and role stress. In the second survey there was still a significant negative correlation between role ambiguity and job satisfaction, but no significant correlation between role overload and job satisfaction.

Pattanayak (2003) conducted a study towards building a better HRD climate: a study on organizational role stress and quality of work life”. To survive and excel in the new economy, the HRD climate is a matter of serious concern in Indian public sector organizations. The sample consisted of 800 employees including executive and non-executive from old and new public sector organizations. The objectives were to discover the differences, if any, between the sub groups with regard to organizational role stress and perception of quality of work life. It also aimed to ascertain the relative importance of quality of work life variables in explaining organizational role stress. The findings revealed that there are significant differences between the executives of the old and new public sector organizations on a number of organization role stress as well as quality of work life dimensions.
Cardenas, et al. (2004) investigated antecedents and outcomes of time spent in one role while distracted or preoccupied by another role. Results indicated that work-role overload was positively related to work distraction experienced at home and, traditional gender role expectations were positively related to family distractions experienced at work. In terms of outcomes, work distraction at home was negatively related to job satisfaction. Results illustrate the importance of role quality and efficacy of alternative operationalization of role time in the effort to better understand the interference between work and family.

Ply (2005) examined the effect of organizational maturity, as defined by the software Capability Maturity Model (CMM) on seven variables: role conflict, role ambiguity, work overload, burnout, job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment and turnover intent. A path analysis was used to represent the partial correlation between the causal variables. The results revealed that the same path model fit both the low maturity (CMM1) organizations and higher maturity (CM level 3, 4 & 5) organizations. The correlation calculated in the path model was similar for both maturity levels.

Bolino and Turnely (2005) explores the relationship between a specific type of organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) – namely, individual initiative- and role overload, job stress, and work family conflict. Results indicated that higher levels of individual initiative (as assessed by the spouse or significant other) are associated with higher levels of employee role overload, job stress and work-family conflict. The findings also suggested that the relationship between individual initiative and work-family conflict is moderated by gender, such as that the relationship is stronger among women than among men.
Glazer (2005) examined the relationship between shift patterns and role stressors and strains as well as the extent to which situational variables mediate the relationship between shift patterns and strains. Results found that nurses working fixed day (vs. rotating) shifts reported less strain but more stressors. Individual and situational variables mediate the relationship between shift pattern and both affective commitment and intention to leave respectively. Younger age and higher role ambiguity might account for fully rotating shift nurses’ reports of intention to leave and being an older, full-time employee with little role conflict and ambiguity might explain why fixed day (vs. rotating) shift nurses report greater affective commitment.

Jaskyte (2005) conducted a study on the impact of organizational socialization tactics on role ambiguity and role conflict of newly hired social workers. The purpose was to identify tactics that human service organizations use for socializing newly hired social workers, and to assess the relationship between various socialization tactics and, the outcomes of role ambiguity and conflict. Result suggested that socialization tactics affect role ambiguity and conflict.

Culbreth, et al. (2005) investigated role stress among practicing school counsellors. Practicing school counsellor (N=512) were surveyed using the Role Questionnaire to determine levels of role conflict, role congruence, and role ambiguity. Results found that elementary school counsellors have low level of role conflict and role incongruence than high school counsellors.

Bryant and Constantine (2006) explored the relationship among multiple role balance, job satisfaction, and life-satisfaction in a sample of 133 women school counsellors. Findings revealed that multiple role balance and job satisfaction were each positively predictive of overall life satisfaction.
Lankau, et al. (2006) investigated the influence of two role stressors—role ambiguity and role conflict—on previously established relationship between mentoring activities—vocational support, and role modelling—and prominent job attitudes. Results showed that both role conflict and role ambiguity completely mediated the relationship between psychological support and role modelling with job attitudes. There was also support for role conflict as a partial mediator of the relationship between vocational support and job attitudes. Additional analysis revealed that psychosocial support served as a suppressor variable in this study.

Tankha (2006) conducted a study with the aim of investigating the effect of role stress in a sample of 120 nursing professionals of government and private hospitals. They were administered Organizational Role Stress Scale by Pareek (1981) in order to assess the level of stress experienced by them. The obtained results revealed that male nurses experienced significantly higher stress level as compared to females. Second, male nurses from private hospitals showed significantly higher level of stress levels than the government nurses on eight out of the ten dimensions of Organizational Role Stress Scale.

Khetarpal and Kochar (2006) attempted to provide a preventive and positive approach to women experiencing stress at work and at home. Those who have the Social Support of their family and friends are able to cope better with stress. To find out the level of role stress and to identify key role stressors, the OSI inventory was used. It was found that majority of women (40%) were under moderately low level of stress followed by 36% women who reported moderately high level of stress. Women experiencing very high or low stress are 12% in each case. The key stressors which affect maximum number of women are Poor Peer Relations, Intrinsic Impoverishment and Under-participation.
Lou, et al. (2007) conducted a study to understand the relationships between demographic data and the dimensions of role stress, organizational commitment, and intentions to quit among male nurses in southern Taiwan. Research also investigated the correlations with three dependent variables and identified best predictors of male nurse intentions to quit the nursing profession. A total of 91 male nurses volunteered to participate in this cross-sectional research. Findings pointed to patients, colleagues and society as the major sources of role stress for male nurses. These sources of stress, and the resultant intention to quit on the part of male nurses, are due in significant part to the widespread stereotyping of the profession of nursing as a "woman's occupation". Such stress pressures male nurses to consider quitting taking jobs in other professional fields. Role stress is correlated to intention to quit among male nurses. Role stress and years of service are highly relevant predictors of male nurse intention to quit and leave the nursing profession.

Ahmady (2007) conducted a study on Organizational role stress among medical school faculty members in Iran. The objectives of this study were to investigate and assess the level and source of role-related stress as well as dimensions of conflict among the faculty members of Iranian medical schools. Variables like the length of academic work, academic rank, employment position, and the departments of affiliation were also taken into consideration in order to determine potentially related factors. The findings show that role stress was experienced in high level among almost all faculty members. The major role- related stress and forms of conflict among faculty members were role overload, role expectation conflict, inter-role distance, resource inadequacy, role stagnation, and role isolation.

Ho, et al. (2009) investigated how role stress among nurses could affect their job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and whether the job rotation system
might encourage nurses to understand, relate to and share the vision of the organization, consequently increasing their job satisfaction and stimulating them to willingly remain in their jobs and commit themselves to the organization. The findings are as follows: job rotation among nurses could have an effect on their job satisfaction and organizational commitment, job satisfaction could have a positive effect on organizational commitment, and role stress among nurses could have a negative effect on their job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The findings suggest that reduction of role ambiguity in role stress has the best effect on enhancing nurses' organizational commitment.

From the review of literature it can be observed that organizational role stress is an important factor for the organizations. Many of the stressors are similar: workload, lack of resources, poor relationships with colleagues, and unrealistic expectations from managers.

**Job satisfaction**

Richardsen (1997) conducted a study on work experience and career and job satisfaction among professional and managerial women in Norway. Results indicate that work pressures were significantly related to satisfaction but not to perceived opportunities for career progress. The organizational supports were positively correlated with all the work outcomes, indicating that women were more satisfied with both career and job when organizational support were present, when combined with individual characteristics and work pressures in regression analysis, organizational support still made positive contributions to satisfaction at work.
Ting (1997) conducted a study on determinants of job satisfaction of federal government employees. The author proposed and assessed the argument that the job satisfaction of federal government employees is determined primarily by 3 sets of factors: job characteristics, organizational characteristics and individual characteristics. Findings suggested that job characteristics such as pay satisfaction, promotional opportunities, task clarity and significance, and skills utilization, as well as organizational characteristics such as organizational commitment and relationship with supervisors and co-workers have consistently significant effects on the job satisfaction of federal government employees.

Burke (1998) examined the relationship of perceived threats to job security, job satisfaction, and psychological mood among recent business school graduates. Anonymous questionnaire assess threats to security, danger signs, job insecurity, job satisfaction and psychological mood. Results show that perceived threats to job security had direct effects on job insecurity and job satisfaction and indirect effects on psychological mood through job insecurity and job satisfaction.

Raffaello and Maass (2002) examined the effects on satisfaction, stress symptoms, and company attachment. Two industries were compared on high noise levels. One of the two factories was subsequently moved to a new site with strongly reduced noise levels. They predicted that the reduction of noise in the experimental organization would lead to greater environmental satisfaction, greater job satisfaction, reduced stress symptoms, reduced difficulty of communication, a more positive company image and greater attachment to the company. No changes were expected in the control industry for any of these variables. Hence environmental conditions reliably affect not only the worker's physical and psychological well-being but also organizationally relevant variables such as image of and attachment to the company.
Bradley (2003) investigated the impact of perceived job autonomy on job satisfaction. After controlling for a wide range of personal and job-related variables, perceived job autonomy is found to be a highly significant determinant of five separate domains of job satisfaction – pay, fringe benefits, promotion prospects, job security and importance/challenge of work.

Huang, et al. (2003) conducted a study which evaluated the relationship between employment status i.e., part- and full-time, and job satisfaction, with the focus on the moderating roles of perceived injury risk and injury incidence. The results found that the level of job satisfaction for full-time workers was about the same regardless of the level of injury risk they perceived. In contrast, job satisfaction of part-time workers was significantly higher when they perceived low injury risk rather than higher injury risk. The findings also supported the potential adverse impact of injury incidence and injury risk on job satisfaction for both part and full-time workers. This study highlighted the importance of understanding both workplace safety and job satisfaction when attempting to understand the difference between part-time and full-time workers.

Stinglhamber (2004) conducted two studies to examine the linkages between favourable intrinsically satisfying (IS) and extrinsically satisfying (ES) job conditions, and perceived support form the organization (PSO) and the supervisors (PSS). Results of study one showed through a longitudinal design that controlling for PSS, both favourable IS and ES job conditions exerted a significant effect on PSO, while only favourable of IS job conditions contributed to PSS when the effects of PSO were controlled for. Results of study two showed that the organization’s discretionary control over IS job conditions moderated the relationship between IS job conditions
and PSO, while supervisor’s control over IS job conditions moderated the relationship between IS job conditions and PSS.

Judge (2004) investigated across-and within-individual relationships between mood and job satisfaction, and spill over in moods experienced at work and at home. Results revealed that job satisfaction affected positive mood after work and that the spill over of job satisfaction onto positive and negative mood was stronger for employees high in trait-positive and trait-negative affectively, respectively. Results also revealed that the effect of mood at work on job satisfaction weakened as the time interval between the measurements increased. Finally, positive (negative) moods at work affected positive (negative) moods experienced later at home.

Innstrand, et al. (2004) conducted a study to measure the mean differences of stress, burnout and job satisfaction after different intervention approaches were applied to staff in one of the municipalities. Staff in the other municipality acted as a control group. Using the pre-test score as the covariate, by analysis of covariance the findings reveal that the experimental group showed a significant reduction in stress and exhaustion, and a strong significant rise in job satisfaction after intervention.

Shimazu, et al. (2004) examined the effects of active coping on job satisfaction in the context of the job demands-control-support model. A sample of 867 employees of a large electrical company in Japan was used. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to examine whether effects of active coping on job satisfaction might depend on the extent of coping resources, such as job control or social support (supervisor and co-worker) Analysis showed that the effect of active coping on job satisfaction depends on the extent of co-workers’ support, not on job control and supervisors’ support.
Bauer (2004) conducted this study aimed at contributing to our understanding of the effects of High Performance Workplace Organizations (HPWOs) on worker’s job satisfaction. The estimation results show that a higher involvement of workers in HPWOs is associated with higher job satisfaction. This positive effect is dominated by the involvement of workers in flexible work systems, indicating that workers particularly value the opportunities associated with these systems, such as an increased autonomy over how to perform their tasks, and increased communication with co-workers. Being involved in team work and job rotations as well as supporting human resource practices appear to contribute relatively little to the increased job satisfaction from being involved in HPWOs.

Saari (2004) identified three major gaps between HR practice and the scientific research in the area of employee attitudes in general and the most focal employee attitude in particular—job satisfaction: (1) the causes of employee attitudes, (2) the results of positive or negative job satisfaction, and (3) how to measure and influence employee attitudes. The field of industrial/organizational psychology has a long, rich, and, at times, controversial history related to the study and understanding of employee attitudes and job satisfaction. Some of this research is very specific and aimed primarily at other researchers, while other publications provide practical guidance on understanding, measuring, and improving employee attitudes (e.g., Edwards & Fisher, 2004; Kraut, 1996). One likely future direction of employee attitude research will be to better understand the interplay between the person and the situation and the various internal and external factors that influence employee attitudes. In particular, a better understanding of the role of emotion, as well as broader environmental impacts, is needed and has been largely overlooked in past research. In addition, ongoing research will provide more in-depth understanding of
the effects of employee attitudes and job satisfaction on organizational measures, such as customer satisfaction and financial measures. Greater insights on the relationship between employee attitudes and business performance will assist HR professionals as they strive to enhance the essential people side of the business in a highly competitive, global arena.

Kim, et al. (2005) examined the relationship between employee service orientation (customer focus, organizational support, and service under pressure) and employees’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment and employees’ intention of leaving. The empirical results were as follows. First, the customer focus of employee was negatively associated with employees’ job satisfaction, but positively associated with their organizational commitment. Second, organizational support was positively associated with job satisfaction. Third, job satisfaction was positively associated with organizational commitment, but negatively associated with employees’ intention of leaving. Finally, organizational commitment was negatively associated with intention of leaving.

Falkum and Vaglum (2005) examined the associations between occupational stress and interpersonal problems in physicians. A nationwide representative sample of Norwegian physicians received the 64-item version of the inventory of interpersonal problems (IIP-64) and six instruments measuring occupational stress. Results indicated that the IIP-64 total score had a significant impact on job satisfaction, perceived unrealistic expectancies, communication with colleagues and nurses on stress form interaction with patients. Being overly sub-assertive was related to low job satisfaction. Being overly expressive was linked to the experience of unrealistic expectancies from others and lack of positive feedback, whereas overly competitive physicians with both colleagues and nurses.
Kim and Cunningham (2005) examined the effects of work experiences (i.e. job variety, job autonomy, and job feedback) and organizational support (i.e. affective and financial) on job satisfaction. Results revealed that work experiences and affective organizational support held significant, positive associations with job satisfaction. Further, the influence of work experiences on job satisfaction was qualified by a significant work experiences X financial organizational support interaction. Simple slope analysis showed that when work experiences were poor, coaches with high financial support were more satisfied than were coaches with low financial support; however, there were no differences in job satisfaction when work experiences were positive.

Noelker, et al. (2006) investigated the effects of person and facility characteristics, job-related and personal stressors, and social support in the workplace on nursing assistant (NA) satisfaction with supervision. Results show that personal stressors (family, financial, and health concerns) have the greatest impact on satisfaction with supervision. Positive support in the workplace attenuated the effects of job-related stressors on the outcome.

Williamson (2006) conducted a study whose purpose was to explore whether there was a relationship between the job satisfaction of the teachers and teacher’s sense of efficacy and social interest. This study also explored whether there was a relationship between job satisfaction and job condition (people on your present job, work on the present job, pay opportunity for promotion and supervision), age and years of experience, gender and size of school. Results found significant relationship between job satisfaction and teacher efficacy, social interest, and job conditions. Age and years of experience were not found to possess significant relationship with job
satisfaction, and differences were found between male and female teachers as well as between teachers in large and small schools.

Al-Hussami (2008) investigated the relationship of nurses' job satisfaction to organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, transactional leadership, transformational leadership, and level of education. They examined two distinct paths to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceived organizational support. The analytical procedure of multiple regression was utilized to determine the predicting strength among job satisfaction and the independent variables: organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, transactional and transformational leadership behaviour, and nurses' level of education. The researcher chose randomly four nursing homes from a total of 53 Medicare/Medicaid certified nursing homes located in Miami-Dade County. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient revealed that positive correlation existed between the dependent variable and the following independent variables. Of the five independent variables, a multiple regression analysis indicated that organizational support was most strongly related to job satisfaction.

Ahsan (2009) investigated the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. The determinants of job stress that have been examined under this study include, management role, relationship with others, workload pressure, homework interface, role ambiguity, and performance pressure. The sample consists of a public university academician from Klang Valley area in Malaysia. The results show there is a significant relationship between four of the constructs tested. The results also show that there is significant negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction.
Kakabadse and Worrall (2010) investigated the relationship between aspects of organizational structure and job satisfaction as experienced by personnel employed in nine social service departments. After a series of unstructured interviews from 28 respondents in one authority, interview schedules were used for three distinct groups of 603 respondents in nine organizations: those making executive decisions, those making supervisory assessments and those primarily concerned with client interaction. The best predictors of organizational structure were dimensions of centralization and formalization which related significantly but negatively to job satisfaction.

**Role efficacy**

Researches on personal profiles of the role efficacy have shown that persons with high role efficacy seem to rely on their own strengths to cope with problems. They are active and interact with people and the environment, and persist in solving problem mostly by themselves and sometimes by taking help of other people. They show positive and approach behaviour, and feel satisfied with life and with their jobs and roles in their organizations.

Regarding organizational aspects a participative climate, in which the employees get higher job satisfactions contributes to role efficacy. It seems that the climate promoting concern for excellence, use of expertise, and concern for the larger issues also contributes to role efficacy. On the other hand, a climate characterized by control and affiliation seems to lower employees' role efficacy.

Singh and Mohanty (1996) conducted a study on Role efficacy in relation to job anxiety and job status. Findings reveal significant negative relationship between role efficacy and job anxiety. Further, employees having low job anxiety showed
more role efficacy than the employees having more job anxiety whereas managers were found to differ significantly from supervisors with respect to their role efficacy. The main effect of job anxiety and job status as well as the interaction effect of job anxiety and job status were also found highly significant. It is concluded that job anxiety and job status affects role efficacy.

Pandey (1997) examined the relationship between role stress and role efficacy using a sample of personnel of Indian Railways. The findings of the study indicated that coefficients of correlation between the first dimensions of role efficacy namely, centrality and all the 10 dimensions of role stress were found to be negative. The second dimension of role efficacy i.e. integration was correlated negatively and significantly with all the dimension of role stress except role erosion. Creativity, the third dimension of role efficacy was found to have non-significant but positive correlations with all dimensions of role stress except role overload and self-role distance. The relationship of inter-role linkage with role stress was found to be negative in seven cases but was not statistically significant. A similar finding was reported by Sen (1982).

Bray, et al. (2002) conducted a study to measure role efficacy for interdependent functions and test its conceptual distinctiveness from other forms of efficacy within interdependent teams. Intercollegiate basketball players completed a role efficacy questionnaire on which they reported their confidence in capabilities to perform interdependent role functions within their team’s offensive and defensive systems. They also completed measures of task self-efficacy and collective efficacy. Consistent with predictions, role efficacy and task self-efficacy were moderately related. Role efficacy was also distinct from collective efficacy insofar as the latter perception showed evidence of a shared group perception, whereas role efficacy
showed individual-level variance only. Starting players reported greater role efficacy than non-starters, yet collective efficacy and task self-efficacy were the same regardless of starting status. Together, results supported the initial validity and conceptual distinctiveness of role efficacy within the interdependent sport team environment.

Bray and Brawley (2002) conducted the study to examine role clarity as a moderator of the role efficacy-role performance relationship. A secondary issue was to investigate the influence of role clarity on role efficacy and role performance. Role clarity moderated the prospective relationship between role efficacy and role performance effectiveness in the predicted direction for offensive role functions. Individuals who reported higher role clarity also reported higher role efficacy and performed better than those with lower role clarity.

Beauchamp, et al. (2004) conducted a study on relationship between role ambiguity and role efficacy in sport. Results shown that role ambiguity accounted for 20.70% of the total variance in role efficacy on offence and 22.45% on defence. For both offensive and defensive models, role ambiguity was able to explain individual- and group-level variances in role efficacy. Results highlight the explanatory value of examining nested data using multilevel frameworks when examining cognition, affect, and behaviour in interdependent environments such as sport teams.

Bray, et al. (2004) examine the relationship between role efficacy and role performance after controlling for the effects of task self-efficacy. Results showed task self-efficacy and role efficacy were positively related to role performance ratings. Hierarchical regression analyses revealed that role efficacy contributed significantly to the prediction of athletes' ratings of role performance after controlling for task self-
efficacy. Role efficacy also explained significant variation in the prediction of coach ratings; however, the effects were less dramatic and inconsistent.

Rao, et al. (2007) investigated role efficacy of Faculty Members in State Agricultural Universities. The research puts forth that education and designations have no relation with any dimension of role efficacy; age and experience have a positive correlation with proactivity; and the number of training programs attended has a positive correlation with confrontation.

Govender and Parumasur (2010) evaluated the roles and competencies that are critical consideration for management development. The aim of their study was to assess the extent to which the current management cadre in a public sector division possesses the eight managerial roles/competencies (mentor, facilitator, monitor, coordinator, director, producer, broker, innovator) needed for effective management with the aim of identifying areas for management development. They also find whether the managerial roles relate to each other. The results indicate that managers in this public sector division are fulfilling the managerial roles in varying degrees, though not optimally. They do not display optimal paradoxical capability and behaviour complexity. Furthermore, the eight roles/competencies are interconnected. Managerial level, age and race were found to influence the extent to which managers possess and display various competencies.

**Interpersonal Trust**

Zaheer, et al. (1998) investigated the role of trust in inter-firm exchange at two levels of analysis and assess its effects on negotiation costs, conflict, and ultimately performance. Propositions were tested with data from a sample of 107 buyer-supplier inter-firm relationships in the electrical equipment manufacturing industry using a
structural equation model. The results indicated that interpersonal and interorganizational trust are related but distinct constructs, and play different roles in affecting negotiation processes and exchange performance. Overall, the results show that trust in inter-organizational exchange relations clearly matters.

Driks (1999) conducted a study on the effects of interpersonal trust on work group performance. On the basis of his findings, it is suggested that trust may be best understood as a construct that influences group performance indirectly by channelling group members' energy toward reaching alternative goals.

Pillai, et al. (1999) tested a comprehensive model of relationship between transformational and transactional leadership, procedural and distributive justice, trust, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviours in two quantitative studies. Their results reveal that trust in a leader mediates the relationship between leader behaviour and job satisfaction.

Chen (1999) explored how temporary employees exchanged communication with supervisor, peers, and family and friends regarding positively job-related, negatively job-related, and non-job-related contents. They also examined roles of communication in coping with insecure job experiences. The results revealed that communication contents were differentially related to work anxiety and life satisfaction for temporary employees. It was found that work anxiety increased when employees engaged in communication pertaining to negative job-related contents. Furthermore, the positive relationship between life satisfaction and positive communication with co-workers was observed only for the temporary employees who also had a permanent job.

Waters (1999) conducted study on the relationship between resources and conditions in the work environment and job stress among 20 correctional treatment
staff members (mean age 35.5 years) from the same adult male correctional facility. Results revealed that those experiencing a higher quality of personal relationships and social support in the work environment reported fewer stressors at work.

Flaherty and Pappas (2000) study the salesperson–manager relationship and report that trust has a strong impact on job satisfaction.

Dirks and Ferrin (2001) explored two fundamentally different models that describe how trust might have positive effects on attitudes, perceptions, behaviours, and performance outcomes within organizational settings. They examined that trust results in direct effects on a variety of outcomes. Trust also facilitates or hinders (i.e., moderates) the effects of other determinants on attitudinal, perceptual, behavioural and performance outcomes via two distinct perceptual processes.

Aryee (2002) examined trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes. Data obtained from full-time employees of a public sector organization in India were used to test a social exchange model of employee work attitudes and behaviours. Results revealed that the three organizational justice dimensions -distributive, procedural and interactional, were related to trust in the organization. Interactional justice was related to trust in supervisor. The results further revealed that trust in organization partially mediated the relationship between distributive and procedural justice and the work attitudes of job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and organizational commitment but fully mediated the relationship between interactional justice and these work attitudes. In contrast, trust in supervisor fully mediated the relationship between interactional justice and the work behaviours of task performance and the individually- and organizationally- oriented dimensions of citizenship behaviour.
Aryee, Budhwar, and Chen (2002) pointed out that trust is an important variable that holds the interest for organizational researchers and is shown to foster organizational commitment and increase job satisfaction. The findings of this research indicated that ethical climate is an important antecedent of trust in supervisor and that the combined effect of trust and ethical climate positively affects salesperson job satisfaction and organizational commitment and lowers turnover intentions. Specifically, this study will show that trust in supervisor mediates the effect of ethical climate on turnover intention.

Goris, et al. (2003) report findings from an empirical study in two companies that provide justification for trust in superiors and influence on superiors as predictors of performance and satisfaction.

Brashear, et al. (2003) found that interpersonal trust is most strongly related to shared values and respect. In their empirical study, trust was directly related to job satisfaction and relationalism, and indirectly related to organizational commitment and turnover intention.

Kiffin-Petersen (2003) conducted a study on trust to advocate the inclusion of trust within future team effectiveness models, to clarify the conceptualization of trust in work teams, and to propose a model that clearly specifies the role of trust in team effectiveness. It was concluded that trust is a multi-dimensional construct that, in teams, is most correctly conceptualized as a personality composition variable or an emergent state that has both cognitive and affective dimensions, rather than a team process variable.

Ferres, et al. (2004) investigated the influence of co-worker trust on selected organizational perceptions and attitudes. Results provided empirical support for the fundamental role of co-worker trust. Co-worker trust was found to be a significant
predictor of perceived organizational support, lowered turnover intention, and greater affective commitment. From the results, it was suggested that there may be opportunities for organizations to improve individual and organizational effectiveness by engendering trust throughout peer levels.

According to Johnson and Grayson (2005) interpersonal trust in consumer-level service relationships has cognitive and affective dimensions. They examined the relative impact of service provider expertise, product performance, firm reputation, satisfaction, and similarity in influencing customer's perception of these dimensions of trust in a service provider. Using survey data from 349 customers of a firm of financial advisers in the United Kingdom, their results showed that cognitive and affective dimensions of trust can be empirically distinguished and have both common and unique antecedents. The results also provided further clarification concerning the relationship between trust and sales effectiveness.

Moye and Henkin (2006) explored association between employees' empowerment and interpersonal trust in managers. A sample of 2000 employees from manufacturing organizations in the USA was taken to conduct the study. Results indicated that employees who feel empowered in their work environment tend to have higher levels of interpersonal trust in their managers.

Lau and Tan (2006) hypothesized that the omission of procedural fairness as an intervening variable may be the reason for the failure of prior research to account for most of the effects between budgetary participation and job tension. The results, based on a sample of 152 managers, support the expectation that procedural fairness and interpersonal trust jointly are able to explain a substantial portion of the effects of the relationship between budgetary participation and job tension.
Ding, Ng and Cai (2007) identified and validated factors as well as the underlying personal constructs that influence architects' interpersonal trust and willingness to share their knowledge in project design teams in China. The results of triangulation data analysis show that there are four factors affecting both interpersonal trust and willingness to share knowledge, i.e. team member's attitude towards work, team member's ability with regard to work, team member's personality and team member's social interaction. Contrary to previous findings, interpersonal trust is not identified as an individual factor influencing willingness to share knowledge.

Massey and Kyriazis (2007) tested a model that examined interpersonal trust between marketing managers and research and development managers during new product development projects. Three communication dimensions - frequency, quality, and bi-directionality were used to predict cognition-based trust, and affect-based trust. Findings revealed that both trust dimensions strongly influenced the effectiveness of marketing / research and development relationships during new product development, with cognition-based trust having the strongest impact. The results also revealed that the most powerful effect was from communication quality to cognition-based trust. The direct effects of the three communication behaviours on relationship effectiveness were modest, suggesting that their relationship building effects are largely indirect.

Tokuda, et al. (2008) conducted a study on interpersonal trust and quality-of-life in Japan. The findings revealed that people with a greater sense of interpersonal trust are more likely to report that they have greater quality-of-life in all domains, including physical, psychological, and environmental quality-of-life, than people with lower trust.

Srivastava (2008) examined the effect of two constituents of work environment - physical and psychosocial on employees' job satisfaction and
performance, and organizational effectiveness. The analyses revealed that participants who perceived their work environment as to be adequate and favourable scored comparatively higher on the measures of job satisfaction, performance, and perceived organizational effectiveness. The results also specified that psycho-social environment in work-place exert more impact on employees’ job behaviour and organizational effectiveness than the physical environment does.

Gill (2008) examined the effects of trust on employees’ job satisfaction and dedication. Employees from hospitality industry were interviewed to examine if employee trust in a hospitality manager improves job satisfaction and dedication. Degree of employee job satisfaction and dedication was related to degree of employee trust in a hospitality manager.

Pettijohn, et al. (2008) developed a conceptual framework that relates role-modelling behaviour of sales managers to a set of key outcome variables and assesses the validity of the framework using a cross-sectional sample of salespeople and sales managers drawn from a variety of business-to-business sales organizations. Findings indicated that salespeople’s perceptions of their managers’ role-modelling behaviour relate positively to trust in the sales manager and relate indirectly, through trust, to both job satisfaction and overall performance of salespeople.

Chughtai (2008) conducted a study whose main objective was to highlight the vital role that both state trust (trust in top management, trust in immediate supervisor and trust in co-workers) and trait trust or trust propensity play in the advancement of employee work engagement. The study posited that the relationship between trust and work engagement is mutually reinforcing and leads to an upward spiral effect. That is, high levels of state and trait trust boost work engagement, which in turn augments both forms of trust and so on.
Mulki, et al. (2008) examined the effect of workplace isolation on trust in supervisors and co-workers. Pharmaceutical salespeople were taken as the sample of the study. The results revealed that perceptions of workplace isolation negatively affect trust in supervisors and co-workers and that the relationship between trust and organizational commitment is mediated by satisfaction with supervisor and co-workers.

Mortenson (2009) examined how social skills and interpersonal trust facilitate the support-seeking process in two different cultures, namely, those of China and the United States. They examined the connections between social skill, interpersonal trust, the perceived appropriateness of seeking support, and the likelihood of displaying emotional distress to friends. Results indicated both similarities and differences between Americans and Chinese in terms of support seeking. Across both cultural groups, interpersonal trust was associated with appropriate help seeking, which, in turn, predicted the likelihood of showing emotional distress to friends.

Leat and El-kot (2009) investigated the relationships between interpersonal trust, job satisfaction, intrinsic motivation and job-related tension in this non-Western context. The findings indicated that employees were satisfied, intrinsically motivated, trust their peers and managers and suffer from relatively low levels of job tension. The significant predictors of job satisfaction are intrinsic motivation, confidence in the competence of management and the lack of work-related tension.

Thomas, et al. (2009) conducted a study that specified the linkages among trust, quality of information, quantity of information, openness and outcomes such as employee involvement. The results indicated that quality of information predicted trust of one's co-workers and supervisors while adequacy of information predicted one's trust of top management. Trust of co-workers, supervisors and top management
influenced the perception of organization openness while in turn influenced employees rating of their own level of involvement in the organization's goals.

Semercioz, et al. (2010) examined the effect of empowerment, participation and feedback as antecedents of interpersonal trust and organizational commitment as consequences of interpersonal trust. Data were collected from 186 participants comprising professional, administrative and supportive staff working in one municipality of Istanbul government. Results indicated that interpersonal trust is vital to positive outcomes such as organizational commitment and productivity.

Simmons (2010) conducted a study on interpersonal citizenship behaviour (ICB). In this study the big attitudes he looked at were organizational commitment (the extent they like working for the organization), job satisfaction (with pay, promotion, supervision, co-workers, and the work itself), and trust in the immediate supervisor. The personality traits he looked at were core-self evaluation (locus of control, self esteem, self-efficacy, emotional stability) and secure attachment (how well people can work autonomously and with others). The only significant predictors of ICB were satisfaction with the supervisor and satisfaction with co-workers. Employee personality was not a direct and significant predictor of employee performance. The very important job attitude, trust and commitment also did not affect performance. These interpersonal connections facilitate the employees' ability to do their jobs.

Frye (2010) presented quantitative and qualitative data on issues related to hospital nurses' trust in management and supervisors and its relationship to job satisfaction. Treatment by management, fairness of policies and safety of the workplace were related to nurses' trust in management. Treatment by supervisors and
fairness of policies were related to trust in supervisors. Trust in both management and supervision was related to nurses’ job satisfaction.

Paulineann (2010) examined the relationship between the leader as the knowledge builder, trust in the leader and in the team, knowledge sharing and team performance. Data was collected from 34 engineering project teams and 18 managers in a large automotive organization. The results indicated that by building the team’s expertise, leaders enhance team members’ willingness to rely on and disclose information in the team, which in turn increases team knowledge sharing. Team knowledge sharing significantly predicted leaders’ and managers’ ratings of team performance.

Elmagri and Eaton (2011) conducted a study to identify a list of the factors of interpersonal conflict which occurs between two or more individuals within any organization. The factors which were identified from the data can be divided into two main categories: firstly, personal factors like: individual differences; threats to status; lack of trust; and incivility. Secondly, organizational factors as: limited resources; unfair treatment; role ambiguity; role incompatibility; organizational change; contradiction of goals; information deficiency and environmental stress. The findings of the study suggested that by using these factors managers can enhance the value of their organizations as well the performance of the employees in the organization.

Downey (2011) conducted a study to assess the reliability of a new measure of emotional intelligence (EI), the Workplace Culture version of the Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test (SUEIT) which was designed to measure EI at a group level. They also investigated the pre-conditions required for the formation of an emotionally intelligent group culture. Specifically, the study proposed that team leader trustworthiness at the leader / member dyad level was required for the
formation of an emotionally intelligent culture at the group level. Results of the study showed that the Workplace Culture SUEIT was reliable and predicted job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Furthermore, trustworthiness of the team leader was found to be significantly correlated to dimensions of group level EI, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. It was concluded that there is a significant relationship between group level emotional intelligence and leader / member trust.
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Methodology

In social sciences research attempts are made to find out some solutions pertaining to social problems of different nature. The basic idea behind conducting any scientific research is to evaluate the after effects of certain variables in search of some alternative courses of action to improve the decision-making ability and to add something in the existing body of knowledge. Research in any discipline is a ceaseless effort and is conducted for many reasons. Some researches are of exploratory nature in which attempts are made to probe something to add to the existing knowledge concerning to certain phenomenon.

According to Kothari (1985), “research design can be conducted as a blueprint for the collection, analysis and interpretation of data”.

Edward (1968) pointed out that “in research we do not haphazardly make assumption of any kinds but rather our attention is directed towards those observations that we believe to be relevant to the question we formulated and the objective of research as recognized by all sciences, is to use observations as a basis of answering the question of one’s interest.

Main Objective of the Study

The main objective of the present study is to see the “impact of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on organizational role stress and job satisfaction of employees”.

In this study role efficacy and interpersonal trust are considered as independent variables and organizational role stress and job satisfaction as dependent variables. Role efficacy is the potential effectiveness of an individual occupying a particular role in an organization. It is the combination of the individual and the role. An efficient employee must have appropriate knowledge, technical competence, skills
required for the role and a good inter-personal trust with other employees in the organization. Role efficacy and interpersonal trust are important terms in the context of an organization.

In the present study an attempt is made to find out the impact of various dimensions of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on various dimensions of organizational role stress and job satisfaction.

In the light of available literature reviewed in the foregoing pages, related directly or indirectly with the proposed study, the following null hypotheses are formulated.

\( H_0_1 \) Centrality- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

\( H_0_2 \) Integration- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

\( H_0_3 \) Proactivity- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

\( H_0_4 \) Creativity- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

\( H_0_5 \) Inter-role linkage- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

\( H_0_6 \) Helping relationship- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

\( H_0_7 \) Superordination- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

\( H_0_8 \) Influence- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.
Ho9  Growth- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho10 Confrontation- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho11 Role efficacy will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho12 Maintenance- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho13 Security- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho14 Intimacy- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho15 Regard- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho16 Success- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho17 Interpersonal trust will not influence organizational role stress as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho18 Centrality- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho19 Integration- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho20 Proactivity- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.
$H_{o1}$ Creativity- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{o2}$ Inter-role linkage- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{o3}$ Helping relationship- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{o4}$ Superordination- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{o5}$ Influence- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{o6}$ Growth- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{o7}$ Confrontation- a dimension of role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{o8}$ Role efficacy will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{o9}$ Maintenance- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{o10}$ Security- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{o11}$ Intimacy- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

$H_{o12}$ Regard- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.
Ho\textsubscript{33} Success- a dimension of interpersonal trust will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho\textsubscript{34} Interpersonal trust will not influence job satisfaction as a whole or its any dimension.

Ho\textsubscript{35} Hierarchy wise there is no significant difference within the group of employees of government insurance companies.

Ho\textsubscript{36} Hierarchy wise there is no significant difference within the group of employees of private insurance companies.

**Sample:**

To conduct the quantitative research a sample is needed. In quantitative research, it is believed that if this sample is chosen carefully using the correct procedure, it is then possible to generalize the results to the whole of the research population. Sampling is that part of statistical practice concerned with the selection of an unbiased or random subset of individual observations within a population of individuals intended to yield some knowledge about the population of concern, especially for the purposes of making predictions based on statistical inference. Sampling is an important aspect of data collection. The information gathered systematically is analyzed for the purpose of interpretation and drawing meaningful conclusions.

Mohsin (1984) contended that “sample is a small part of the total existing events, objects or the information”. Kerlinger (1983) stated that “sample is a portion of population or universe as to be representative of that population or universe”.

Thus, sample is a process of drawing a small portion of population representing the characteristics of the entire population.

The Purposive sampling technique was used to select the sample for the present study because it fulfilled the requirement of the investigation. The research topic of
present study warranted to select the samples from the population entrusted with
certain work responsibilities directed to achieve the stipulated organizational goals.
Therefore, sample of present study was taken from Government and Private Insurance
Companies. The total sample was consisted of 400 employees selected from different
insurance companies. 200 employees were selected from government sector whereas
other 200 employees from private sector. The age range of the sample was 25 to 55
years. The sample was comprised of 4 categories of employees- Branch Managers,
Administrative Officers, Assistants, and Clerical Staff from government sector
whereas Branch Managers, Sales Managers, Operational Staff and Agents from
private sector. The employees were selected from the government and private
insurance companies of Aligarh district and near by cities of Aligarh.

Perhaps there is no single psychological test which can tell us about all the
aspects of behaviours. Since human being is a composite of numerous behavioural
patterns so, for measuring each behavioural aspect an independent psychological test
is used. The questionnaire method is one of the important psychological test which
has been used in the present investigation as it is most convenient to administer. A
questionnaire contains numerous statements and respondents are required to answer
each statement according to the instructions given to them. A comprehensive detail of
the measures used in the present investigation is as follows-
Break-up of the sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Group (Government/Private)</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Officers/Sales Managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistants/Operational Staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical staff/Agents</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A)- The Role Efficacy Scale (RE Scale):

Role efficacy scale developed by Udai Pareek is a structured instrument consisting of twenty triads of statements (appendix- I). A respondent marks the one statement in each triad that describes his role most accurately. The three alternatives are pre-weighted. There are two statements for each dimension of role efficacy and the scoring pattern followed is +2, +1 or -1. The scale consisted of 10 dimensions:

1. Centrality,
2. Integration,
3. Proactivity,
4. Creativity,
5. Inter-role linkage,
6. Helping relationship,
7. Superordination,
8. Influence,
9. Growth,
10. Confrontation.

Sen (1982) reported a retest reliability of 0.68 significant at 0.001 levels. This shows the high stability of the scale. Sen has also reported high internal consistency, indicated by significant correlation values among the items.

Sayeed (1985) reported item-total correlation for twenty RES items for a total sample of 658 managers, and for eleven organizations separately. For the total sample the total correlation for the entire sample was -0.36, with an alpha coefficient of 0.80. The alpha for the mean corrected item-total correlation of the eleven organizations ranged from 0.71 to 0.85. These results show internal homogeneity of the scale. This, however, is only one dimension of the validity of the scale.

(B)- The Inter-personal Trust Scale (IPT Scale):

Interpersonal trust scale is developed and standardized by S.C.Gupta and Vinita Mathur is designed to measure the inter-personal orientation. There are 20 items in the scale (Appendix-II). It consists of one item for each stage of Assumption-Perception- Behavior- Feedback cycle for five types of need-oriented human interactions. The items are so framed that agreement with them indicates low-trust orientation.

The IPT Scale is self-administering. No time limit is imposed but the entire questionnaire can be completed in about ten minutes. The response on each item is to be given on a 4-point scale, where:

1 stands for “Totally disagree”
2 stands for “Somewhat agree”
3 stands for “Agree to a large extent”,
4 stands for “Totally agree”.
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Scoring is thus convenient and fast, require no special material. Scores (1, 2, 3 or 4) are summed up to find out the total score. The net score is then calculated by subtracting 20 from the total score. The net score can range from 0 to 60.

The total agreement with any item indicates low-trust orientation, while the total disagreement with any item indicates high-trust orientation. Thus, the lower the net score, the higher is the trust-orientation.

The split-half reliability of the scale was found to be 0.91 which is significant at 0.001 level.

(C)- Organizational Role Stress Scale (ORS Scale):

Organizational role stress scale is developed by Udai Pareek (1983a, 1983c) was used in the present study. It is a five-point scale indicating how true a particular statement is for the role. There are 50 items in this scale (Appendix- III). The score of each role stress may range between 0 to 20 and the total organizational role stress score may vary between 0 to 200. The rating of the respondents may be added row-wise to give the scores on the 10 role stress dimensions:

1. Self-role distance (SRD),
2. Inter-role distance (IRD),
3. Role stagnation (RS),
4. Role isolation (RI),
5. Role ambiguity (RA),
6. Role expectation conflict (REC),
7. Role overload (RO),
8. Role erosion (RE),
9. Resource inadequacy (RIn),
10. Personal inadequacy (PI).
(D)- Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (JSQ):

Job satisfaction questionnaire is developed by Shailendra Singh. It consisted 20 facets (Appendix- IV). The range of scores on JSQ is 20-100. The higher the total score the more will be the satisfaction of the employee. Its standardized alpha reliability is 0.96. It is a five point scale where,

1 stands for “very dissatisfied”,
2 stands for “dissatisfied”,
3 stands for “neutral”,
4 stands for “satisfied”,
5 stands for “very satisfied”.

Biographical Information Blank (BIB):

For recording background information of respondents BIB was prepared that includes information regarding age, sex, income, qualification, role of the employee, name of the organization, experience on the present job, total job experience.

Data Collection Procedures: The data was collected from 400 employees working in insurance companies. 200 employees were working in government sector whereas the remaining 200 were working in private sector. During the process of data collection the above mentioned scales were distributed among 470 employees, out of them 430 employees returned the questionnaires that were completed in every respect, 40 questionnaires were incomplete so these were rejected. Thus remaining 400 employees constituted as the sample of the present study. Proper instructions were given to the employees to obtain adequate responses. The researcher assured all the respondent that complete confidentiality of their responses be maintained and it will be used for research purpose only. The respondents were requested to read each
statement carefully and give response on each and every item. It was also mentioned that there is no right or wrong answer.

**Statistical Analysis:**

Data were analyzed by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16.0. The analysis was carried out in three phases.

In the first phase t-test was used to investigate the mean difference between various categories of employees of government and private insurance companies on different dimensions of role efficacy, interpersonal trust, organizational role stress and job satisfaction.

In the second phase stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to assess the relationship of both the independent variables (role efficacy and interpersonal trust) simultaneously with one dependent variable among four categories of government and private insurance companies. Since stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to find out how role efficacy and interpersonal trust affect the organizational role stress and job satisfaction of employees hence the correlational design was used.

Since there are more than two groups hence in the third phase one way ANOVA with Tukey Post Hoc was applied to see the hierarchy wise difference with in the group of employees. The significance of difference was calculated to see whether the groups of employees are differing on all the variables i.e. role efficacy, interpersonal trust, organizational role stress and job satisfaction.
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Results and Discussion

The aim of the present research is to see the impact of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on organizational role stress and job satisfaction. The data is analyzed in three phases.

Results of t-test

In the first phase of the study the results are analyzed by means of t-test. Here t-test is applied to see whether the employees of government and private insurance companies differ in terms of their overall organizational role stress, job satisfaction, role efficacy and interpersonal trust. The representative sample selected is the employees of insurance companies of government and private sector. The sample is further divided into four levels that is, branch managers, administrative officers, assistants, and clerical staff from government sector, and branch managers, sales managers, operational staff, and agents from private sector.

Table-4.1
Showing the scores of branch managers on organizational role stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIn</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall ORS</td>
<td>54.18</td>
<td>56.66</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level
Table 4.1 presents the scores of branch managers on various dimensions of organizational role stress. From the ten dimensions the managers differ significantly only on role overload. On other nine dimensions they do not differ significantly. The high mean score (5.46) of private managers on role overload indicated that they suffer more stress on this dimension. Since in private sectors there are high expectations from the branch managers hence most of the time they feel this kind of stress. The top most authorities expected that the branch managers must complete the assigned task with in the given time. The dead line causes the stress of role overload. Though the other dimension are not showing a significant difference between two groups but the mean values suggested that the employees of private insurance companies have more stress in comparison to their counterparts.

The overall role stress (56.66) is high among private managers. The reason behind their stress is that, the company expected much from them both in terms of quality and quantity. From the t-value it is clear that the difference is significant at 0.01 level.

The executives of private sector enterprises are suffering from higher levels of organizational role stress as compared to their public sector counterparts (Sayeed and Ahmad, 2002)
Table 4.2

Showing scores of government and private administrative officers and sales managers on organizational role stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI In</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall ORS</td>
<td>49.56</td>
<td>54.58</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level
*significant at 0.05 level
From table 4.2 it can be observed that the administrative officers and sales managers of government and private sector differ significantly on role overload, role ambiguity, and resource inadequacy. Both the groups do not show a significant difference on remaining seven dimensions of role stress scale. From the mean values of role overload it can be observed that the sales managers of private insurance companies have high stress level in comparison to their counterparts. Their mean scores are 6.06 as compared to 4.62 for government administrative officers. They experience stress from both qualitative and quantitative types of role overload. Qualitative aspect refers to things being too difficult to do while quantitative aspect refers to having too much to do. The sales managers from private sector also have the stress of role ambiguity. Role ambiguity as the lack of clear, consistent information that is associated with a person’s position (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964). Generally, role ambiguity is experienced by the persons who occupy new roles in the organization. Since the sales managers of private sector do not stick to the same role for a longer period of time, hence sometimes it happens that they feel difficulty in understanding the assigned role therefore they show high mean score on this dimension of role stress.

“Resource inadequacy” is another dimension on which both the groups differ significantly, but from the mean scores it is clear that the administrative officers of government sector have more stress on this dimension in comparison to the sales managers of private insurance companies. This type of stress occurs when proper resources are not available to perform the role effectively, such as finance, material, information etc. Government administrative officers do not have adequate resources to achieve the targets of the company so they experience stress associated with resource inadequacy.
A t-value of 4.98 described a significant difference. From the overall mean scores (49.56, 54.58) it can be suggested that the sales managers of private sector face more organizational role stress in comparison to their counterparts.
Table-4.3

Showing scores of government and private assistants and operational staff on organizational role stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIn</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall ORS</td>
<td>54.52</td>
<td>59.54</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level
*significant at 0.05 level
From table 4.3 it can be observed that both the groups differ significantly on two dimensions: role overload and self-role distance of role stress scale. The operational staffs of private sector are showing high mean values on these dimensions. Since operational staff are at the third level of the hierarchy hence they have pressure from their top managers, hence they have more stress of role overload in comparison to their counterparts. The stress of self-role distance arises when the role goes against the self concept of the employee. At the time of joining the insurance organization the operational staff have certain expectations from their roles but when they realize that after some time the role does not fulfil those expectations then they come under the stress of self-role distance. In government sector this type of problem is not at much extent because employees have a great feeling of job security due to which they accept the role as it is and they also not attach many expectations from their assigned roles.

The remaining eight dimensions are not showing a significant difference between two groups. But from mean values it can be observed that the employees of private sector are facing more stress. The overall mean scores (54.52, 59.54) are also showing that operational staff of private sector are under more stress in comparison to their counterparts. From t-value it can be observed that the two groups differ significantly.
Table-4.4

Showing scores of government and private clerical staff and agents on organizational role stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIn</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall ORS</td>
<td>52.44</td>
<td>57.20</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level
*significant at 0.05 level
Table 4.4 is showing the scores of clerical staff and agents on various dimensions of organizational role stress scale. From ten dimensions only three: role overload, role isolation and role ambiguity, are showing a significant difference between the two groups. From the mean values (6.12, 5.78, 5.96) it is clear that the agents of private sector have more stress on these dimensions in comparison to the clerical staff of government sector. Since the agents are at the bottom of the hierarchy hence they come across various stresses to achieve something worth while. The major stress which agents of private sector face is of role overload that is too much to do, then, role isolation that is a psychological distance between the role occupant’s role and other roles in the same role set and lastly the stress of role ambiguity that is less clear and less concrete activities.

Although other dimensions are not significant but their higher mean values explain that the agents of private sector are under more stress. The overall t-value is showing significance at 0.01 level. The overall mean scores (52.44, 57.20) are also showing that agents are under more stress in comparison to the clerical staff. It may be due to the reason that the government clerical staff do not work under much pressure from their superiors. They do not have a dead line to complete their task; they do not have as much work load as their private counterparts have.
Table-4.5

Showing scores of branch managers on job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facets</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical work conditions</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your immediate boss</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of responsibility you are given</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your rate of pay</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your hours of work</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of variety in your job</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power and prestige in the job</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>82.30</td>
<td>79.70</td>
<td>3.406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level
*significant at 0.05 level
The above table-4.5 is presenting the job satisfaction level of branch managers of government and private insurance companies. The first two facets which are showing a significant difference are: physical work conditions and your immediate boss. From the mean score of 4.20 it can be observed that the managers of government sector are not much satisfied with their physical work conditions but a mean score of 4.26 is showing that they feel satisfaction with their immediate boss. In the same way managers of private sector are satisfied with their physical work conditions but are dissatisfied with their immediate boss.

The next two facets which are showing a significant difference are: the amount of responsibility and your rate of pay. The mean scores (4.10, 3.98) on both the facets reveal that the managers of government sector are more satisfied in comparison to their counterparts. In private sectors the amount of responsibility is much more due to which managers do not get time for their other work hence they feel less satisfaction on this facet of job satisfaction scale. They also show less satisfaction in terms of their rate of pay. Since government employees get different benefits from the company which is absent in private sector due to which these managers are less satisfied on this facet. The average earnings are higher in the public sector in comparison to the private sector (Papapetrou 2006).

"Your hours of work and amount of variety in your job" are next two facets on which both the groups differs significantly. A mean score of 3.86 of government sector managers is showing a satisfaction on "your hours of work" while managers of private group do not feel satisfaction. In private sectors the working hours are bit more in comparison to the government sector due to which the employees get exhausted and feel dissatisfaction on this facet. But from the mean score of 3.90 it is clear that the managers of private sector are satisfied on "amount of variety in your
job”. The managers of both the sectors also show a significant difference on “power and prestige in the job and opportunity to make decisions”. On both the facets employees of government sector are more satisfied in comparison to their counterparts. Since the society appreciates those persons who have government job due to which these employees have a sense of power and prestige. In the same way they also feel satisfaction on “opportunity to make decisions” because they decide things on their own hence they take full benefit from it.

From the overall mean values (82.30, 79.70) it is clear that the branch manager of government sector are much satisfied with their jobs in comparison to their counterparts.
### Table-4.6

Showing scores of government and private administrative officers and sales managers on job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facets</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical work conditions</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your fellow workers</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your job security</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>77.60</td>
<td>71.64</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level
*significant at 0.05 level
Table 4.6 explains the scores of administrative officers and sales managers on various facets of job satisfaction scale. “Physical work conditions” and “your fellow workers” are showing a significant difference between two groups. On physical work conditions the sales managers of private sector are showing high mean score (4.44) while on your fellow workers administrative officers of government sector are having high mean scores (4.30). Since in private organizations the sales managers generally get better facilities of physical work conditions hence they are satisfied on this facet. The other facet is “your fellow workers” on which the administrative officers of government sector are showing high mean score. Since in government sectors administrative officers do not have much work loads due to which they get time to talk with their colleagues and hence they feel satisfaction on this facet of job satisfaction scale.

“Your job security” is another facet on which the administrative officers and sales managers differ significantly. From the mean score (4.42) it can be observed that the administrative officers of government sector have more satisfaction from their job security. The job security is a very important factor for creating job satisfaction. Since the jobs of private employees are not secure hence they generally do not show satisfaction on this facet of job satisfaction.

On remaining seventeen facets the administrative officers and sales managers do not show a significant difference, but from mean values it can be observed that on few facets such as “freedom to choose your own method of working” and “opportunity to help others with personal problems at work” etc. the administrative officers of government sector are showing high satisfaction.
From the overall mean scores (77.60, 71.64) it is very clear that the administrative officers of government sector are more satisfied in comparison to their private counterparts.
Table-4.7
showing scores of government and private assistants and operational staff on job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facets</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical work conditions</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The freedom to choose your own method of working</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your immediate boss</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your rate of pay</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your chance of promotion</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way your firm is managed</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your job security</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to make decisions</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to achieve something worth while</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>73.10</td>
<td>70.44</td>
<td>2.652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level
*significant at 0.05 level
From table-4.7 it can be observed that the assistants and operational staff are showing a significant difference on first two facets of job satisfaction scale that is physical work conditions and freedom to choose your own method of working. On both the facets the employees of private sector are showing more satisfaction in comparison to their counterparts. Generally it is observed that private sectors provide more suitable working conditions to their employees, they maintain a better working environment in comparison to the government sectors. To enhance the productivity, the organization adopts this policy so that more and more customer attract towards their organization. The other reason behind providing a better work environment is that they do not want any kind of absenteeism among employees due to health problem. The next two facets which are showing a significant difference are: your immediate boss and your rate of pay. These two facets are also important factor in contributing job satisfaction. If the boss is effective in performing his role then the workers under him also become effective, so it make a great impact on the satisfaction of the employees. Rate of pay is another facet which is influential in creating job satisfaction. The private employees get more salary in comparison to their counterparts but then too they are not satisfied on this facet, because their requirements are more in comparison to the government employees.

Both the groups also differ significantly on “your chance of promotion and the way your firm is managed”. The mean scores explain that the employees of private sector are more satisfied from their chance of promotion. Since in government sectors the employees do not face much competition and they also have permanent jobs hence their chance of promotion are not as high as in private sector. In private sectors the organizations have a tough competition with other organizations. The employees do not stuck to one job they try hard to promote their self. The last three facets which are
showing a significant difference are: your job security, opportunity to make decisions and opportunity to achieve something worthwhile. Job security is a major factor which contributes job satisfaction. In private sectors employees have very less job security hence they show less satisfaction on this facet in comparison to their counterparts. It is the policy of the private organizations that they do not provide job security to their employees because due to fear of losing the job the employees do their work effectively with which the productivity of the organization increases. From the overall mean scores it can be observed that the assistants are more satisfied in comparison to the operational staff.
Table-4.8

Showing scores of government and private clerical staff and agents on job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facets</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical work conditions</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recognition you get from good work</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial relations with management and workers</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your rate of pay</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your chance of promotion</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way your firm is managed</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attention paid to the suggestions you make</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your hours of work</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of variety in your job</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your job security</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to help others with personal problems at work</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power and prestige in the job</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>69.54</td>
<td>62.30</td>
<td>3.412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level
*significant at 0.05 level
From the table 4.8 it can be observed that the two groups differ significantly on "physical work conditions and the recognition you get from good work". On both the facets the employees of government sector show a bit high mean values in comparison to the employees of private sector. Since the agents work on certain targets and when they achieve that target then only they get recognition from the company. The same is with the employees of government sector at this level but their targets are not as tough as their counterparts have.

"Industrial relations with management and workers" and "your rate of pay" are the next facets on which the employees are showing a significant difference. Industrial relations are better among private sectors while rate of pay are better in private sector. To maintain a good reputation in the market the organizations try to make better relations with other organization. The employees of private sector found well behaved in comparison to their counterparts. Both the groups also differ significantly on "your chance of promotion and the attention paid to the suggestion you make". At this level the employees of government sector have more chance of promotion in comparison to their counterparts, because they do not face as much difficulty in achieving their targets as their counterparts have.

On the other hand the employees of private sector show high mean scores on "the attention paid to the suggestion you make" in comparison to the employees of government sector. The next facets "your hours of work and amount of variety in your job" are showing a significant difference among two groups. Working hours as well as variety in the job both are more in private sector. To maximize the productivity of the organization the working hours should be settled more from the government sector. The private organizations try to compete at world level hence they provide variety in the job but side by side they also set long working hours for their
employees. Hence the employees of private sector do not show satisfaction from their working hours. The other two facets on which the two groups differ significantly are “your job security and the opportunity to help others with personal problems at work”. The satisfaction level on both the facets is high among government sector. Since the fear of job security is not in these employees hence they get time to help others in their working hours. They easily do their personal work in the working hours whereas the same is not the case with the employees of private sector. They do not get the time easily during their working hours because they have pressure from their top authorities.

The last facet which shows a significant difference is “power and prestige in the job”. The employees of government sector are showing higher mean value in comparison to the employees of private sector. In general a greater value is given to the government jobs because there are more facilities in these jobs which are not present in private jobs. Hence those employees who work under government set ups feel more prestigious in comparison to those who work under private organizations. The overall job satisfaction is more among government employees and it is showing a significant difference at 0.01 level.
Table-4.9

Showing scores of branch managers on role efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-role linkage</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping relationship</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superordination</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall role efficacy</td>
<td>31.38</td>
<td>33.06</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level
*significant at 0.05 level
Table 4.9 is showing the scores of branch managers on various dimensions of role efficacy scale. Among ten dimensions only four: creativity, inter-role linkage, helping relationship and growth are showing a significant difference. Creativity and inter-role linkage are significant at 0.01 level. Higher mean values of private branch managers on creativity and inter-role linkage reflects that they are more creative and have more capacity to link their role with other’s role. Branch managers of private sector are more creative not only to get a good job but also to retain it. To achieve the targets of the organization they seek the co-operation of other employees so they make their role linked with other’s role.

The next two dimensions which are showing significant difference are helping relationship, and growth. The private mangers scored 3.68 and 3.52 mean values on these dimensions respectively. The private managers scored higher mean values in comparison to their counterparts. The higher mean scores indicated that they are more effective in providing and seeking help to their subordinates. They try to participate in training programs and workshops for personal growth. The remaining six dimensions which are non significant are centrality, integration, proactivity, superordination, influence and confrontation. The non significant difference on these dimensions indicated that the employees of both the sector are more or less having equal efficacy on these dimensions to perform the assigned role.

The overall mean score of government branch managers is 31.38 whereas the overall mean score of private managers is 33.06. So from the overall mean scores it is clear that the managers of private sector are more efficient in comparison to their counterparts. Since branch managers are at the top on the hierarchy hence they need to be more effective in performing their role. They need to be more effective for the reason that they have time pressure and they have to achieve the goal with in the
stipulated time period and the market competition is very tough with other companies hence the private managers trying to perform their role in an effective manner. Career success includes using one’s skills and abilities to face expanded challenges or having greater responsibilities and increased autonomy in one’s chosen profession (Solberg et al., 1998).
### Table 4.10

**Showing scores of government and private administrative officers and sales managers on role efficacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-role linkage</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping relationship</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superordination</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall role efficacy</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level**
From table-4.10 it is clear that among the ten dimensions of role efficacy eight are showing a significant difference while two are non-significant. All the eight dimensions are significant at 0.01 level. The mean scores of centrality, integration, and proactivity are much higher in sales managers. The high scores indicated that they are more efficient in performing their role in comparison to their counterparts. Managers in the public sector division are fulfilling the managerial roles in varying degrees, though not optimally (Govender and Parumasur, 2010). In private sectors the employees need more efficiency to perform their role. They need special skills to compete with other employees. Since the sales managers are at the second level in the hierarchy hence they need to take new initiatives to reach at the top position. The private employees are also high in providing help to others. They also try to perform something beyond their regular call of duty and hence they show high score on superordination. Influence, growth, and confrontation are also showing a significant difference. On influence the mean value of administrative officers is 3.32. It is higher in comparison to the mean value of sales managers. Since the government jobs are permanent hence those who work under government sector they make an impact on others.

The sales managers are showing high mean scores (3.18, 3.62) on growth and confrontation. Since the sales managers are not having permanent job hence they have to deal with problems of their roles more effectively and this leads to their personal growth. Creativity and inter-role linkage are the dimensions which are not showing a significant difference. The overall role efficacy of sales managers is higher with the mean score of 3.62 in comparison to the administrative officers. The role of an individual in an organization is defined by the expectations of significant role senders in that organization, including the individual. Since in private sectors the superiors
have more expectations from their sales managers hence they have to fulfil these expectations by making their role more effective.
Table-4.11

Showing scores of government and private assistants and operational staff on role efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-role linkage</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping relationship</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superordination</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall role efficacy</td>
<td>20.14</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level
*significant at 0.05 level
It is clear from Table 4.11 that among all the dimensions of role efficacy seven are showing a significant difference, while the rest three are non-significant. Integration, proactivity, and creativity are showing significant difference. Integration and proactivity are significant at 0.01 level while creativity is significant at 0.05 level. From the higher mean scores, it is clear that employees of the private sector are more efficient on these dimensions in comparison to their counterparts. The employees of the private sector work under the pressure of their superiors hence they need to perform their role more effectively to overcome the pressure. They integrate their self with their role. They use special skill to perform their task effectively. Superordination, influence, growth, and confrontation are also showing a significant difference. Operational staff scored high mean values (2.68, 2.84, 2.82 and 2.80) on all the four dimensions. The roles which give opportunities to role occupants to work for subordinate goals have the highest role efficacy. Since there is a lot of competition in the market hence the employees need to be more effective to reach their goals. They also need to make a good impact on others so that they may attract the customers. Their higher mean scores on growth and confrontation indicated that they solve their problems by their own for their personal growth.

The overall role efficacy of operational staff is high (26.72) in comparison to the assistants. Since assistants are not work under much pressure from their superiors hence they feel relax about their jobs. They have permanent jobs due to which they do not want to make extra efforts. They are free from the pressure of job insecurity hence they accept the role as it is.
### Table-4.12

**Showing scores of government and private clerical staff and agents on role efficacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-role linkage</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping relationship</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superordination</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall role efficacy</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level**
The above table-4.12 represents the significance of difference between the clerical staff of government sector and agents of private sector on various dimensions of role efficacy. The t-value of all the dimensions is significant at 0.01 level. The first three dimensions which are showing significant difference are: centrality, integration, and proactivity. Agents of private companies scored 3.10; 3.04; 3.08 mean values on these dimensions which are higher than the mean scores of government clerical staff. The higher mean scores indicated that agents are more efficient in performing their roles as compared to their counterparts. Centrality in the private sector makes the work more systematic and because of it the agents are able to integrate with other roles more effectively and this helps them to behave in a proactive manner.

The agents also showed higher mean values on creativity, inter-role linkage, and helping relationship. It means they can take initiatives by their own. They have the capacity to beat the boredom by making their roles creative. They solve their problems by taking help from their colleagues.

"Superordination, influence, growth, and confrontation" are also showing higher mean scores among agents. From the higher mean values it can be concluded that agents have the opportunity to contribute to the organization as well as to the society from their assigned role. They also contribute to some decisions hence they have higher mean value on influence. The agents not only perform their role for their own growth but they also try to solve the problems of their colleagues. Hence they are showing higher mean value on confrontation.

The overall mean score of agents is 31.20 while clerical staff of government sector scored a mean value of 20.30. Therefore it is clear that agents are more effective in performing their role in comparison to the clerical staff.
Table-4.13
Scores of branch managers (Gvt. & Pvt.) on interpersonal trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall interpersonal trust</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>49.24</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level
*significant at 0.05 level
From the table-4.13 it can be observed that the branch managers of government and private insurance companies differ significantly on four dimensions of interpersonal trust scale. They show a significant difference on maintenance, and security at 0.01 level. From the mean scores of 10.32 and 9.46 it is clear that the branch managers of private sector are having high trust level on these dimensions that is they are true to their words and want to make a positive self image in front of their subordinates. Intimacy and success are the other two dimensions which are showing a significant difference at 0.01 level. An intimate relationship is a particularly close interpersonal relationship which can be defined by these characteristics: enduring behavioural interdependence, repeated interactions, emotional attachment, and need fulfilment. The private managers are showing high scores on these dimensions so they are able to develop an intimate relationship with their subordinates.

Regard is the dimension on which the two groups do not differ significantly. From the overall mean scores (39.32, 49.24) it can be observed that private managers have scored higher in comparison to the branch managers of government sector. Private sector managers have to depend on their colleagues to achieve the targets, so they have high interpersonal trust. Low mean score of government branch managers is an indicative of their low interpersonal trust, because they achieve their targets independently without any interpersonal contact.
Table-4.14
Showing scores of government and private administrative officers and sales managers on interpersonal trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal</td>
<td>38.72</td>
<td>48.34</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level
From table-4.14 it can be observed that the administrative officers of government sector and sales managers of private sector differ significantly on all dimensions of interpersonal trust scale. The sales managers show high scores (9.86 and 9.24) on maintenance and security. It means the sales managers are true to their words and they also have a positive self image. They are also high trust level on intimacy, regard, and success (9.20, 8.94, and 11.10). The t-value on overall interpersonal trust scale is significant at 0.01 level. From the overall mean scores (38.72, 48.34) it is very clear that the sales managers of private insurance companies are having high trust level. The reason behind their high trust is that they live in a competitive world. There are a number of insurance companies with which they have a high competition. They try to attract the customers with their trusting behaviour. The sales managers are at the second level in the hierarchy and to reach at the top they have to show a trusting behaviour with their superiors as well as with their subordinates.
Table-4.15

Showing scores of government and private assistants and operational staff on interpersonal trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall interpersonal trust</td>
<td>48.04</td>
<td>51.88</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level
The above table-4.15 is showing the scores of assistants from government insurance companies and operational staff from private insurance companies. It can be observed that both the groups of employees differ significantly only on two dimensions of interpersonal trust scale. While the other three that is; maintenance, security, and success, are not showing a significant difference. Intimacy and regard are differing significantly. On both the dimensions the operational staff is having high mean values (10.18, 10.24). Since operational staff is at the third level of the hierarchy hence they need to work hard to reach at the top. They have an intimate relationship with the customers because they in-depth knowledge of all policies, so that they can provide information to the customers about pros and cons of different policies. They judge the behaviour of the customer and then try to make positive image of the company.

From the overall mean scores (48.04, 51.88) it can be observed that operational staff of private sector have high trust level in comparison to their counterparts. Because the employees of operational staff of the private insurance companies have to achieve the high target with the stipulated time period so they to develop more interpersonal trust in comparison to their counterparts.
Table-4.16
Showing scores of government and private clerical staff and agents on interpersonal trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>46.58</td>
<td>50.10</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at 0.01 level  
*significant at 0.05 level
The table-4.16 is showing the scores on various dimensions of interpersonal trust scale among clerical staff from government sector and agents from private sector. It can be observed that from five dimension both the group differ significantly on three while two dimensions are non significant. Security and regard are significant at 0.01 level while intimacy is significant at 0.05 level. The mean scores (9.32, 9.26) on these dimensions suggested that private employees have high trust level in comparison to the employees of government insurance companies. Since agents are at the bottom of the hierarchy hence their path of struggle is very long. While the clerical staff of government sector do not have much tension about this thing. They have a set target and when they approach to it their jobs become permanent. The agents of private sector need to struggle a lot to get a some what permanent position.

From the overall mean scores (46.58, 50.10) it is clear that the agents of private sector have high trust level in comparison to their counterparts. The t-value is 5.12 which is showing a significant difference. Since the jobs of private employees are risky that is they take risks to start something new and then only they get the reward from that risk. Hence they manage a good interpersonal trust with their customers and co employees. They consider the benefits of customers and try to show them some fruitful policies so that the customer can easily attract towards the company. They make a positive self image and try to live up to it. They also make their thinking positive so that a better interpersonal relation should be developed with their co workers and with the customers.
Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis

In the second phase stepwise multiple regression analysis was applied to find out the significant predictors of organizational role stress and job satisfaction among the group of employees taken from the government and private insurance companies.

To see the impact of various dimensions of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on various dimensions of organizational role stress and job satisfaction on the employees of government and privately managed insurance companies, the step wise multiple regression was applied to analyze the data. Here role efficacy and interpersonal trust were taken as the independent variables while organizational role stress and job satisfaction were taken as the dependent variables.

Table-4.17
Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis: For the prediction of organizational role stress (DV). Branch Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$\beta$-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>IRL, Superordination</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Centrality, IRL,</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td>Regard, IRL, Growth</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>IRL, Confrontation, Intimacy</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIn</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From table-4.17 it can be observed that ‘confrontation’, ‘inter-role linkage’, ‘superordination’, ‘centrality’, ‘growth’, and ‘proactivity’ (dimensions of role efficacy) and ‘regard’, and ‘intimacy’, (dimension of interpersonal trust) are the significant predictors of various dimensions of organizational role stress.

Criterion variable ‘role stagnation’, has 8.6% of variance from the predictor variable ‘confrontation’ (F=5.620; p< 0.05) on the branch managers of government sector. It can be seen that confrontation influences role stagnation negatively (β= -0.324; p<0.05). The negative beta value shows an inverse relation between the predictor and the criterion variable. It means when the government managers efficacy of problem solving goes down the level of stress on the dimension of role stagnation increases. Since the government employees remain on the same role for the longer period of time so they become habitual for doing the same kind of work and when they shift to some new role they face the problem in adopting that role. Hence for government sector the null hypothesis Ho10 is rejected. The same criterion variable is not having any impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on the branch managers of private sector. So for the employees of private sector the null hypotheses Ho1 to Ho17 are accepted.

Branch managers of government sector are not showing any impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on role expectation conflict. Therefore on the employees of government sector the null hypotheses Ho1 to Ho17 are accepted. On private managers the criterion variable ‘role expectation conflict’ has 7.5% of variance from the predictor variable ‘centrality’. Centrality influence the criterion variable negatively (β= -0.30; p<0.05). The negative value indicated that managers in private sector not realize that their role is important for the organization and hence have low efficacy on this dimension. If they perceive their roles important
then they may not come under the stress of role expectation conflict. When the employee joins any organization he has certain expectations from that role but when the role goes against his expectations then he come under the conflict of role expectation. Therefore the null hypothesis H01 is rejected for the employees of private sector.

The next criterion variable ‘role overload’ has 23.9% of variance from the predictor variable ‘inter-role linkage and Superordination’ on government managers (F=8.715; p<0.01). Inter-role linkage influences role overload negatively while Superordination influences positively. The negative beta value on inter-role linkage show an inverse correlation between the predictor and criterion variables, that is, when the managers have weak linkages between their roles and other’s role then the stress of role overload increases. The positive beta value on superordination indicated that when managers wanted to progress on higher levels then they need a quality in their work and hence the work load increases, which results the stress of role overload. Hence the null hypotheses Ho5 and Ho7 are rejected for branch managers of government sector. The private managers have no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on this criterion variable, so the null hypotheses H01 to Ho17 are accepted.

‘Role isolation’ is the next criterion variable having 19.8% of variance with predictor variables ‘centrality’ and ‘inter-role linkage’ on government managers (F=7.041; p<0.01). Both centrality and inter-role linkage influences role isolation negatively (β= -0.441; p<0.01), (β= -0.325; p<0.05). The negative values show that the managers of government sector face much problem of role isolation because they consider that their roles in the organization are of little importance and because of this they do not try to make a link between their roles with others’ roles and hence their
efficacy on these dimensions goes down which result an increase in the role isolation stress. Hence for the government branch managers the null hypotheses Ho1 and Ho5 are rejected. On the other hand private managers have 22.2% of variance on this dimension of role stress from the predictor variables ‘regard, inter-role linkage’, and ‘growth’. Regard and inter-role linkage influence the criterion variable positively (β= 0.39; p<0.01) while growth influence negatively (β= -0.30; p<0.05). The positive values indicated that private managers get much respect from their subordinates but side by side the distance between their roles and other’s role also increase so they feel this type of role stress. The negative beta value on growth indicated an inverse relation between the predictor and criterion variables. Since growth is a dimension of interpersonal trust and having negative value on it suggested that these managers do not think positively about others and hence the stress of role isolation increases. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho15, Ho5 and Ho9 are rejected here.

“Self-role distance” is the next criterion variable having no impact among branch managers of government sector from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Hence the null hypotheses Ho1 to Ho17 are accepted. The same criterion variable has 5.9% of variance from the predictor variable “creativity” on private managers (F= 4.08; p<0.05). Creativity influence the self-role distance negatively (β= -0.28; p<0.05). The negative value indicated that the managers’ way of solving problem through unconventional ways goes down which affect their efficacy on this dimension so the stress of self-role distance increases. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho4 is rejected.

The next criterion variable ‘role ambiguity’ has 28.4% of variance from the predictor variables ‘inter-role linkage, growth, confrontation and intimacy’ on government branch managers (F= 5.861; p<0.01). Inter-role linkage, confrontation
and intimacy influences role ambiguity negatively while growth influence role ambiguity positively. The negative value of inter-role linkage, confrontation, and intimacy suggested inverse correlation with role ambiguity. It means if government managers do not try to make their roles linked with others' roles, and if they shift their problems on others and not solve it by their own, and if they receive less friendly behaviour from others then the stress of role ambiguity goes up. On the other hand the positive beta value of growth showing direct correlation with role ambiguity. It means as their role grow up they encounter different problems and hence the stress of role ambiguity arises. Hence the null hypotheses Ho5, Ho9, Ho10 and Ho14 are rejected. There is no impact on this criterion variable from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among branch managers of private sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho1 to Ho17 are accepted.

'Resource inadequacy' is the next criterion variable having a variance of 6.8% from the predictor variable ‘intimacy’ among government manages (F=4.579; p<0.05). Intimacy influences resource inadequacy negatively (β= -0.295; p<0.05). The negative beta value of intimacy is showing an inverse relation with this dimension of role stress. It means if government managers do not show a friendly behaviour with their subordinates then they may not get proper resources such as proper information, material, finance or facilities and hence come under this type of stress. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho14 is rejected for the branch managers of government sector. On the other hand private managers have 10.1% of variance from the predictor variable ‘proactivity’ on this dimension of role stress. Proactivity influences resource inadequacy negatively (β= -0.34; p<0.05). The negative value indicated that if proactivity decreases the stress of resource inadequacy increases. It
means if private managers do not take appropriate initiatives then they face the problem of resource inadequacy. Hence the null hypothesis Ho3 is rejected.
Table 4.18
Stepwise multiple regression analysis: For the prediction of job satisfaction (DV). Branch Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$\beta$-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facet-1</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-4</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Confrontation, Success</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-5</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td>Regard, Superordination</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-6</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td>Maintenance, IRL</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-8</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Superordination, Growth</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-10</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-12</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td>Security, Integration, Superordination, Maintenance</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-13</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-14</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-15</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td>Maintenance, Influence, Regard, Security</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-16</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-17</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-18</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td>Maintenance, HR</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-19</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td>Superordination</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-20</td>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From table-4.18 it can be observed that 'confrontation', 'creativity', 'superordination', 'inter-role linkage', 'growth', 'integration', 'proactivity', 'helping-relationship', and 'influence' (dimensions of role efficacy) and 'maintenance', 'success', 'regard', 'intimacy', and 'security' (dimensions of interpersonal trust) are found significant predictors of various facets of job satisfaction.

Among government managers 'physical work condition' has 7.7% of variance from the predictor variable 'maintenance'. Maintenance influences physical work conditions positively ($\beta = 0.310; \ p<0.05$). Since maintenance is the dimension of interpersonal trust and its positive value indicated high trust orientation that is most people are true to their words. It means if maintenance will increase among the managers then it will increase the physical work conditions which help them to increase their job satisfaction. Hence the null hypothesis $H_{29}$ is rejected. The same criterion variable has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy among private branch managers. Most of the time it has been observed that private companies take care about the physical environment of their employees due to this reason they found satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction. Hence the null hypotheses $H_{18}$ to $H_{34}$ are accepted.

The next facet 'the recognition you get from good work' has 12.2% of variance among managers of government sector from the predictor variables 'confrontation', and 'success'. Confrontation influences the criterion variable negatively ($\beta = -0.307; \ p<0.05$), while success influence it positively ($\beta = 0.271; \ p<0.05$). The negative value indicated an inverse relation. It means if the managers confront the problems again and again then it will decrease their job satisfaction. The positive value of success indicated that they are capable of enjoying other's success and hence have high job satisfaction. Therefore the null hypotheses $H_{27}$ and $H_{33}$
are rejected. On the other hand the same facet has 6.4% of variance from the predictor variable ‘creativity’ among private branch managers. Creativity influence the criterion variable positively ($\beta = 0.288; \ p<0.05$). The positive value indicated that the private branch managers believe that in their role they are able to use their creativity and do something new and for this they get proper recognition from the organization. Hence the null hypothesis Ho21 is rejected.

The next facet ‘your immediate boss’ has 14.3% of variance from the predictor variable ‘success’. Success influences criterion variable negatively ($\beta = 0.401; \ p<0.01$). As success is the dimension of trust so its negative value indicated low trust. It means the managers of government sector not feel happy when they see their immediate boss flourishing. So this may decrease their job satisfaction. Hence the null hypothesis Ho33 is rejected. On the private managers the same facet has 19.5% of variance from the predictor variables ‘regard’ and ‘Superordination’. Regard influence the criterion variable positively ($\beta = 0.39; \ p<0.01$) while Superordination influence negatively ($\beta = -0.36; \ p<0.01$). The positive value of regard refers high trust orientation, that is, if they perceive others thinking about them positively then they also think positive about them. So if they have high trust with their immediate boss then they feel satisfied with their job. On the other hand superordination showing negative value, it means they want progress on a higher level but they may not get full support from their boss so this thing decrease their job satisfaction. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho32 and Ho24 are rejected.

The next facet ‘amount of responsibility you are given’ has no impact on branch managers of government sector from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 22.1% of variance from the predictor variables ‘maintenance’ and ‘inter-role
linkage' among private managers (F = 7.95; p<0.01). Both the predictors influence the criterion variable negatively. Negative value of maintenance indicated low trust orientation. It means if the level of trust goes down then the amount of responsibility increases. When the amount of responsibility arises the level of job satisfaction goes down. Inter-role linkage also shows negative value. It means they face some problem in linking their role with other's role and hence the amount of responsibility goes high and it results low job satisfaction. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho29 and Ho22 are rejected.

‘Industrial relations with management and workers’ is the next facet having a variance of 17.5% from the predictor variables ‘superordination’ and ‘growth’ among government managers (F=6.194; p<0.01). Superordination influences this facet negatively (β=-0.319; p<0.05), while growth influence positively (β=0.310; p<0.05). The negative value of superordination indicated that the government managers may not get full opportunity to do something beyond the regular call of duty so that they can contribute to the larger society and the nation. This thing affects industrial relations with management and workers and hence job satisfaction goes down. Growth showing positive relation with this facet of job satisfaction, it means the roles of government managers provide them the opportunity to grow professionally as well as personally. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho24 and Ho26 are rejected. On the other hand there is no impact of any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among managers of private companies on this facet of job satisfaction. Managers believe that high ethical standards are vital for building long-term relationships and customer loyalty (Johnson and Marshall 2003). There is also an increased awareness that unethical behaviours, even when they are legal, can damage a firm's image and reputation, resulting in customer defections, lost employee morale, and employee
turnover (Thomas, Schermerhorn, and Dienhart 2004). Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted.

The next facet ‘your chance of promotion’ has a variance of 18.3% from the predictor variable ‘intimacy’ on government managers. The predictor variable influences the criterion variable negatively ($\beta = -0.441; p<0.01$). Negative value of intimacy show low trust orientation, it means the managers show friendliness only when they have some self-interest, that is, they show intimacy when they have chances of promotion. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho31 is rejected. The same facet has 10.5% of variance from the predictor variable ‘confrontation’ on private branch managers. Confrontation influence the criterion variable positively ($\beta = 0.35; p<0.05$). The positive value indicated that private branch managers help their subordinate to find the solution of their problems, this tendency enhances their chance of promotion. Hence the null hypothesis Ho27 is rejected.

Among branch managers of government sector the facet ‘the attention paid to suggestions you make’ has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 27.3% of variance from the predictor variables ‘security’, ‘integration’, ‘superordination’, and ‘maintenance’ on private branch managers ($F=5.59; p<0.01$). All the predictors influence the criterion variable positively. Integration and superordination are the dimensions of role efficacy and the positive value on these dimensions showing high efficacy. While security and maintenance are the dimensions of trust and positive value showing high trust. Since the private managers have high efficacy and high trust that is why they get attention to the suggestions which they make and hence they have high job satisfaction on this facet of job.
satisfaction scale. Hence the null hypotheses Ho30, Ho19, Ho24 and Ho29 are rejected.

‘Your hours of work’ is the next facet having no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among managers of government insurance companies. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 8.5% of variance from the predictor variable ‘confrontation’ among private managers (\(F= 5.53; p<0.05\)). Confrontation influence the criterion variable positively (\(\beta= 0.32; p<0.05\)). The positive value indicated that private managers have the efficacy to confront the problems and to solve them in different ways and hence they manage their work hours due to which they have satisfaction on this facet of job satisfaction scale. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho27 is rejected.

‘The amount of variety in your job’ is the next facet having a variance of 8.3% from the predictor variable ‘proactivity’ on government branch managers. The facet has a negative influence with proactivity (\(\beta= -0.319; p<0.05\)). The negative value of proactivity showing low effectiveness in taking initiatives and hence have found less amount of variety in their job. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho20 is rejected. Whereas there is no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on this facet of job satisfaction scale among private branch managers. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted.

The next facet ‘your job security’ has 13% of variance from the predictor variable ‘helping relationship’ on government managers (\(F=8.304; p<0.01\)). Helping relationship influences the criterion variable positively (\(\beta= 0.384; p<0.01\)). The positive value showing a direct relation that is the more they become helping the higher will be the chances of their job security. Though in government sectors employees generally may not have the fear of job security but then too if they
maintain a helping behavior then they will become more satisfied with their job. Hence the null hypothesis Ho23 is rejected. The same facet has 34% of variance from the predictor variables ‘maintenance’, ‘influence’, ‘regard’, and ‘security’ on private managers (F= 7.32; p<0.01). All the four predictors influence the criterion variable positively. Since maintenance, regard, and security are the dimensions of trust hence positive values on these dimensions showing a direct relation with this facet of job satisfaction. But the values are below 0.6 hence they show a weak strength with this facet. It means they need to improve their interpersonal trust to maintain their job security. Influence is the dimension of role efficacy and it also has positive value showing that it has direct relation with this facet of job satisfaction. It also has a beta value less than 0.6 so it also has weak strength. It means the private managers need to become more effective to maintain their job security. Hence the null hypotheses Ho29, Ho25, Ho32 and Ho30 are rejected.

The next facet ‘opportunity to help others with personal problems at work’ has 8.6% of variance from the predictor variable ‘integration’ on government branch managers (F=5.610; p<0.05). Integration influences the criterion variable positively (β= 0.323; p<0.05). The positive beta value of integration is showing a direct relation with this facet of job satisfaction. It means the role give them the opportunity to get some time to help others at working hours and this thing helps them to make them satisfied. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho19 is rejected. On the other hand there is no impact of any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on this facet of job satisfaction among managers of private managers. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted.

‘Chance to learn new things’ is the next facet having a variance of 7.9% from the predictor variable ‘success’ on government managers (F=5.190; p<0.05). Success
influences the criterion variable positively ($\beta = 0.312; \ p<0.05$). Success is the dimension of trust and its positive value indicated that managers are capable of enjoying other’s success, if it is not used against them. The beta value is showing that they need to improve their interpersonal trust so that they may get the chance to learn something new and hence achieve satisfaction on this facet of job satisfaction scale. Therefore the null hypothesis $Ho33$ is rejected. On the other hand there is no impact of any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on this facet of job satisfaction among private branch managers. Hence the null hypotheses $Ho18$ to $Ho34$ are accepted.

The next facet ‘power and prestige in the job’ has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among branch managers of government sector. Hence the null hypotheses $Ho18$ to $Ho34$ are accepted. The same facet has 19.4% of variance from the predictor variables ‘maintenance’ and ‘helping relationship’ on private branch managers ($F = 6.90; \ p<0.01$). Both the predictors influence this facet negatively ($\beta = -0.37; \ p<0.01$); ($\beta = -0.32; \ p<0.05$). Since ‘maintenance’ is the dimension of trust and ‘helping relationship’ is the dimension of role efficacy so negative beta value on both the dimensions showing an inverse correlation. It means they do not do what they say and their role will not get them the opportunity to receive help and give help to others and hence their level of job satisfaction goes down on this facet of job satisfaction scale. Therefore the null hypotheses $Ho29$ and $Ho23$ are rejected.

The next facet ‘opportunity to make decisions’ has 8.3% of variance from the predictor variable ‘creativity’ on government managers ($F=5.457; \ p<0.05$). Creativity influences this facet positively ($\beta = 0.319; \ p<0.05$). Positive beta value indicated a direct relation with this facet of job satisfaction. It means the role gives them the
opportunity to make their task creative and hence they get the opportunity to make decisions which improve their job satisfaction. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho21 is rejected. The facet has 9.3% of variance from the predictor variable ‘Superordination’ on private managers (F= 6.02; p<0.05). Superordination influence the criterion variable negatively (β= -0.33; p<0.05). Since superordination is the dimension of role efficacy and negative beta value indicated an inverse relation with this facet of job satisfaction. It means the role do not give them the opportunity to do something beyond the regular call of duty so that they contributed to the larger society and the nation. Hence the level of job satisfaction goes down on this facet of job satisfaction. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho24 is rejected.

“Opportunity to achieve something worth while” is the next facet having no influence among managers of government insurance companies from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 10.8% of variance from the predictor variable ‘success’ on private managers (F=6.94; p=.01). Success influence this facet negatively (β= -0.35; p=0.01). The negative beta value indicated inverse relation. It means if the trust level on the dimension of success goes down then the level of job satisfaction also decreases. Trust is another variable that holds the interest for organizational researchers and is shown to foster organizational commitment and increase job satisfaction (Aryee, Budhwar, and Chen 2002). Specifically, this study will show that trust in supervisor mediates the effect of ethical climate on turnover intention. Hence the null hypothesis Ho33 is rejected.
Table-4.19

Stepwise multiple regression analysis: For the prediction of organizational role stress (DV). Administrative officers and sales managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>β-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I RD</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Growth, Centrality</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Superordination</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Success, IRL</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Superordination, Growth</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Success, Regard, Intimacy</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Confrontation, Success, Creativity</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Success, Regard, Centrality</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Superordination, Intimacy</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI n</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table-4.19 is describing that ‘influence’, ‘growth’, ‘centrality’, ‘superordination’, ‘inter-role linkage’, ‘confrontation’, and ‘creativity’ (dimensions of role efficacy) and ‘success’, ‘maintenance’, ‘regard’, and ‘intimacy’ (dimensions of interpersonal trust) are found significant predictors of various dimensions of organizational role stress.

The criterion variable ‘inter-role distance’ does not have any impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among the administrative officers of government sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho1 to Ho17 are accepted. On the other hand the same criterion variable has 7.9% of variance from the predictor variable ‘influence’ among sales managers of private sector. The predictor variable influence the criterion variable negatively ($\beta = -0.31; p<.05$). The negative value indicated an inverse correlation between the predictor and criterion variable. It means the administrative officers of private sector make an impact on others due to which they are able to manage their stress of inter-role distance. Inter-role distance is the conflict between organizational and non organizational roles. Government employees do not have this type of stress while private sector employees are facing this stress. It is due to the reason that government employees get time to manage their organizational and non organizational roles which private employees not get very easily and hence have this kind of stress. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho8 is rejected.

‘Role stagnation’ is the next criterion variable having no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among government administrative officers. Hence the null hypotheses Ho1 to Ho17 are accepted. The same criterion variable has 21.6% of variance from the predictor variables ‘growth’ and ‘centrality’ among the sales managers of private sectors. Growth has positive impact while
centrality has negative impact on role stagnation. Role stagnation is a kind of stress which arises when the employees becomes unable to fulfil the demands of new role. The sales managers of private sector come under this kind of stress due to low efficacy of growth and centrality. If they feel their role important in the organization then they may not come under this kind of stress. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho9 and Ho1 are rejected.

The next criterion variable ‘role expectation conflict’ has 11.2% of variance from the predictor variable ‘superordination’ (F= 7.20; p=0.01) among the administrative officers of government sector. Superordination influences the criterion variable positively. It means if the employees performing a particular role feels that what he does as a part of his role is likely to be of value to a larger group, his efficacy is likely to be high. The roles which give opportunities to role occupants to work for super ordinate goals have highest role efficacy. Super ordinate goals are goals of serving large groups with collaborative efforts. People at the top, move towards public sector because they have the opportunity to work for larger goals, which is helpful for larger sections of society. Many employees accepted cuts in their salaries to move from the private to the public sector at the top level just because of superordination. With this they come under the stress of role expectation conflict because other people in the organization made high expectations with them. Hence the null hypothesis Ho7 is rejected. The same criterion variable has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on the sales managers of private sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho1 to Ho17 are accepted.

‘Role erosion’ is the next criterion variable and it is having 8.2% of variance from the predictor variable ‘success’ among the administrative officers of government sector. Success influence role erosion positively. Since success is the dimension of
trust and its positive relation with this dimension of organizational role stress indicated that employees of government sector enjoying other's success, if it is not used against them but if it is used against them then they come under the stress of role erosion. That is when the functions are performed by the role occupant but the credit goes to someone else. Mostly it happens to those organizations which redesign their roles and create new roles. Hence the null hypothesis Ho16 is rejected. On the other hand the same criterion variable having 13.6% of variance from the predictor variable 'success' and 'inter-role linkage' among the sales managers of private sector. Success influences the criterion variable positively while inter-role linkage influence it negatively. The negative beta value is showing an inverse relation. It means if the employees become effective in maintaining a linkage between their role and other's role then the stress level on the dimension of role erosion goes down. Therefore the null hypotheses H16 and Ho5 are rejected.

The next criterion variable 'role overload' has 16.7% of variance from the predictor variables 'superordination' and 'growth' among administrative officers of government sector. Both the predictors influence the criterion variable positively. It means when the employees try to make their role effective by doing something beyond the regular call of duty so that they can contributed to the larger society and the nation then they come under the stress of role overload. Therefore the null hypotheses H07 and Ho9 are rejected. The same criterion variable has 8.1% of variance from the predictor variable 'maintenance' among sales managers of private sector. Maintenance influence the criterion variable positively ($\beta=0.31; p<0.05$). Since the beta value is less than 0.6 hence it is showing a weak positive correlation with the criterion variable. It means employees do not have high trust orientation on
maintenance so they come under the stress of role overload. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho12 is rejected.

‘Role isolation’ is the next criterion variable having 26% of variance from the predictor variables ‘success’, ‘regard’ and ‘intimacy’ (F= 6.73; p<0.01) among administrative officers of government sector. All the three predictors influence the criterion variable positively. Since all the three predictors having beta value less than 0.6 it means they are having low trust orientation. Due to low trust orientation the role occupant feel that certain roles are psychologically closer to him, while others are at a great distance and hence the stress of role isolation comes up. The distance may be due to the frequency and ease of interaction. Hence the null hypotheses HO16, Ho15 and Ho14 are rejected. Among private sector sales managers the same criterion variable has 22.7% of variance from the predictor variables ‘confrontation’, ‘success’ and ‘creativity’. Confrontation influences the criterion variable positively while success and creativity influence it negatively. Positive value showing a direct correlation but the strength is weak (β=0.27; p<0.05). It means employees are trying to confront the problems but not very efficiently and hence facing the stress of role isolation. Success is the dimension of interpersonal trust which is showing an inverse relation with the criterion variable. It means if the trust level increases the level of stress goes down. Hence the null hypotheses Ho10, Ho16 and Ho4 are rejected.

The next criterion variable ‘personal inadequacy’ has 20.8% of variance from the criterion variables ‘success’, ‘regard’, and ‘centrality’ among government administrative officers. All the three predictors are showing a positive relation with the criterion variable. The beta value is showing a weak strength between the criterion and predictor variable due to which the stress of personal inadequacy increases. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho16, Ho15 and Ho1 are rejected. The same criterion
variable has 8.3% of variance from the predictor variable ‘security’ among sales managers of private sector. Security influences the criterion variable negatively. The negative value is showing an inverse correlation between the two variables. Since the private sector employees have a feeling of insecurity towards their job hence sometimes they come under the stress of personal inadequacy. Hence the null hypothesis Ho13 is rejected.

‘Self-role distance’ is the next criterion variable and it has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among government administrative officers. Hence the null hypotheses Ho1 to Ho17 are accepted. The same criterion variable has 11.6% of variance from the predictor variables ‘superordination’, and ‘intimacy’ (F=4.05; p=.05) on the sales managers of private sector. Superordination has negative relation while intimacy has positive relation with self-role distance. Self-role distance is the stress arises when the role goes against the self concept of the role occupant. In private sectors, employees may not have full opportunity to do something beyond their regular call of duty, hence on this dimension of role efficacy they may not find themselves very effective due to which they feel the stress of self-role distance. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho7 and Ho14 are rejected.

The next criterion variable ‘role ambiguity’ has 6.8% of variance from the predictor variable ‘confrontation’ among government administrative officers (F=4.56; p<0.05). Confrontation influence the criterion variable positively (β=.29; p<0.05). Confrontation is the capacity of individual to solve the problems. Though there is a positive correlation between the predictor and criterion variable but the beta value is not much high which indicate that employees of government sector are not much effective in solving the problems so they come under the stress of role ambiguity.
Therefore the null hypothesis Ho10 is rejected. The same criterion variable has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on the sales managers of private sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho1 to Ho17 are accepted.

‘Resource inadequacy’ is the next criterion variable, having 13.9% of variance from the predictor variable ‘confrontation’ among administrative officers of government sector. Confrontation influence the criterion variable negatively ($\beta = -0.39; p<0.01$). Negative value indicated an inverse relation. Employees of government sector may not have very effective in confronting the different problems due to which they feel the stress of resource inadequacy. If the employees of government sector become effective in confronting the problems then they try to manage their role according to the available resources and hence they feel less stress. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho10 is rejected. The same criterion variable has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among sales managers of private sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho1 to Ho17 are accepted.
| Table-4.20  
| ---  
| **Stepwise multiple regression analysis: For the prediction of job satisfaction (DV). Administrative officers and sales managers**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Criterion</strong></th>
<th><strong>Group</strong></th>
<th><strong>Predictors</strong></th>
<th><strong>R²</strong></th>
<th><strong>F</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sig.</strong></th>
<th><strong>β-value</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sig.</strong></th>
<th><strong>P-value</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sig.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-1</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Security, Integration</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Security, Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-3</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-4</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-5</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Integration, Security</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Integration, Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-6</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Influence, IRL</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Influence, IRL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-7</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-8</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-9</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Influence, Centrality, Proactivity</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-10</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-13</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-14</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-15</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-16</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Influence, Superordination</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Influence, Superordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-17</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-18</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>6.116</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-19</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facet-20</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>HR, Growth, Superordination</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>HR, Growth</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table-4.20 is showing that ‘integration’, ‘growth’, confrontation’, ‘helping relationship’, ‘influence’, ‘inter-role linkage’, ‘proactivity’, ‘centrality’, ‘creativity’ and ‘superordination’ (dimensions of role efficacy) and ‘security’, ‘success’, and ‘maintenance’ (dimensions of interpersonal trust) are found significant predictors of various facets of job satisfaction.

It can be observed that ‘physical work conditions’ among administrative officers of government sector has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same criterion variable has 14.6% of variance among sales managers of private insurance companies from the predictor variables ‘security’ and ‘integration’. Both the variables have positive relation with the criterion variable. Integration is the dimension of role efficacy and security is the dimension of interpersonal trust and a positive value of both the variables showing that they have direct relation with the criterion variable. It means the level of satisfaction increases if the employees of private sector use their special skills and strengths, and if they have positive self image and try to live up to it. Studies showed that an ethical climate is a critical determinant for salespersons’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Babin, Boles, and Robin 2000; Valentine and Barnett 2003). Therefore the null hypotheses H30 and Ho19 are rejected.

The next facet ‘your fellow workers’ has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among administrative officers of government sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same criterion variable has 6.3% of variance from the predictor variable ‘growth’ among sales managers of private sector. Growth is the dimension of role efficacy and it has negative relation with the criterion variable. In private sectors, employees face too
much competition and they always try to learn something new for personal growth due to which they do not get much time to interact with their fellow workers. Whereas in government sector, employees get enough time to interact with their fellow workers and hence they do not face this problem. When employees receive a sense of satisfaction from their jobs, they show a favourable attitude toward their workplace and respond with increased commitment to the organization (Raabe and Beehr 2003; Ramaswami and Singh 2003). Hence the null hypothesis $H_0^{26}$ is rejected.

'The recognition you get from good work' is the next facet having 14.1% of variance from the predictor variable ‘confrontation’ among administrative officers of government sector. Confrontation has negative relation with the criterion variable. Confrontation refers to the capacity of individual to solve the problem. As government employees do not have much pressure from their superiors so they have less importance for getting recognition from good work and due to which they may not have much capacity to solve the problems. Therefore the null hypothesis $H_0^{27}$ is rejected. The same facet has 6.5% of variance from the predictor variable ‘helping relationship’ among sales managers of private sector. Helping relationship has positive relation with the criterion variable. It measures the feeling of participant with regard to helping others and taking help from others. Hence the null hypothesis $H_0^{23}$ is rejected.

The next facet ‘your immediate boss’ has 16.8% of variance from the predictor variables ‘integration’, and ‘security’ among administrative officers of government sector. Both the predictors have positive relation with the criterion variable. Trust reflects the amount of confidence they have about the integrity and fairness of their leader. When salespeople trust their supervisors, it creates positive feelings toward their supervisor and their job (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Rich
Hence the null hypotheses Ho19 and Ho30 are rejected. The same facet has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among sales managers of private sector. Since the employees of government sector have a positive self image in the society due to which they have high job satisfaction where as the same thing is not present in much extent among private sector employees due to which they have less satisfaction. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted.

'Amount of responsibility you are given' has 12.7% of variance from the predictor variables 'influence', and 'inter-role linkage' among the administrative officers of government sector. Influence showing negative relation while inter-role linkage has positive relation with the criterion variable. Influence refers to one's own capacity in making an impact on others. Administrative officers of government sector are not much satisfied on this dimension because they do not have much power in their hands but they become satisfied if they link their role with other's role in the organization. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho25 and Ho22 are rejected. The same criterion variable has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on sales managers of private sector.

'Opportunity to use your abilities' does not have any influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on administrative officers of government sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 9.6% of variance from the predictor variable 'success' among sales managers of private sector. Success is the dimension of interpersonal trust and it is showing a positive relation with this facet of job satisfaction. Employees of private sectors have much opportunity to use their special skill due to which they feel much satisfied. On the other hand they enjoy the success of others if it is not used against
them due to which they are much satisfied in comparison to their counterparts. Salespeople believe that representing an ethical company provides them with a competitive edge because customers value integrity and the ethical reputation of a company and incorporate them in their buying decisions (Gilbert 2003). Therefore the null hypothesis Ho33 is rejected.

The next facet of job satisfaction 'industrial relation with management and workers' has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on the administrative officers of government sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same criterion variable has 6% of variance from the predictor variable 'proactivity' among sales managers of private sector. Proactivity shows a negative relation with this facet. Proactivity is the dimension of role efficacy and the negative value refers an inverse relation with the criterion variable. It means the employees of private sector are not much efficient in taking some initiatives due to which they are not much satisfied with their job on this facet of job satisfaction. Hence the null hypothesis Ho20 is rejected.

'Your rate of pay' is the next facet of job satisfaction having 10.5% of variance (F= 6.73; p=0.01) from the predictor variable 'proactivity' among administrative officers of government sector. Proactivity shows a positive relation with this facet of job satisfaction. It means administrative officers of government sector are capable of taking initiatives in starting some activity. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho20 is rejected. The same facet has 23.8% of variance among sales managers of private sector from the predictor variables 'influence', 'centrality', and 'proactivity'. Influence and centrality shows a positive relation while proactivity has negative relation with the criterion variable. It means they are efficient enough in making an impact on others and they also feel positive about their prescribe role but
they do not get much opportunity in taking initiatives. Hence the null hypotheses Ho25, Ho18 and Ho20 are rejected.

The next facet 'your chance of promotion' has 8.2% of variance among administrative officers of government sector from the predictor variable 'creativity'. Creativity influence this facet of job satisfaction positively ($\beta = 0.31; p<0.05$). Chance of promotion is a bit more in government sectors in comparison to the private sectors. Due to the creative nature the employees of government sector have more chances of promotion in comparison to their counterparts. Therefore they are much satisfied in comparison to the employees of private sector. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho21 is rejected. The same criterion variable has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on the sales managers of private sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted.

The next facet of job satisfaction 'your hours of work' has no influence among administrative officers of government sector from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 7.2% of variance from the predictor variable 'proactivity' among sales managers of private sector. Proactivity shows a negative relation with the criterion variable. It means these employees are not much efficient in taking initiatives in starting some activity due to which they need much time to complete their task hence their hours of work are more in comparison to their counterparts. Therefore they are not much satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction. Hence the null hypothesis Ho20 is rejected.

'The amount of variety in your job' has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among the administrative officers of government sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 8%
of variance from the predictor variable ‘growth’ among the sales managers of private sector. Growth influences the criterion variable negatively. The negative relation shows that the role is not provide full opportunity to grow and develop that is why they are not much satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction. Hence the null hypothesis Ho26 is rejected.

The next facet of job satisfaction ‘your job security’ has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy among government sector administrative officers. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 10.3% of variance from the predictor variable ‘maintenance’ among sales managers of private sector. Maintenance influences the criterion variable negatively. Employees of government sector do not face the problem of job security whereas the employees of private sector face this problem most of the time. Hence they feel less satisfied on this dimension of job satisfaction. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho29 is rejected.

‘Opportunity to help others with personal problems at work’ is the next facet having 14.8% of variance from the predictor variables ‘influence’, and ‘superordination’ among the administrative officers of government sector. Both the predictors have positive relation with this facet of job satisfaction. Hence the null hypotheses Ho25 and Ho24 are rejected. The same facet has 7% of variance from the predictor variable ‘success’ among sales managers of private sector. Success influences the criterion variable positively. In both the sectors employees have the opportunity to help others with personal problems at work but government sector employees are efficient in making an impact on others as well as they want to do something beyond their regular call of duty, that is, they have high role efficacy whereas employees of private sector have high level of trust, that is, they are capable
of enjoying other's success, if it is not used against them. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho33 is rejected.

The next facet of job satisfaction 'chance to learn new things' has 16% of variance from the predictor variable 'proactivity' (F= 10.32; p<0.01) among administrative officers of government sector. Proactivity influences this facet negatively. Hence the null hypothesis Ho20 is rejected. The same facet has 6.1% of variance from the predictor variable 'superordination' (F= 4.20; p<0.05) among sales managers of private sector. Superordination influences this facet positively. Employees of private sectors have much opportunity to learn new things because the organizations impart time to time trainings for the employees where as the employees of government sector do not receive these kinds of programs in their organizations hence they are less satisfied in comparison to the employees of private sector on this facet of job satisfaction. Hence the null hypothesis 24 is rejected for the operational staff of private sector.

'Power and prestige in the job' is the next criterion variable having 9.5% of variance from the predictor variable 'growth' among administrative officers of government sector. Growth influence this facet of job satisfaction negatively (β= -0.33; p=.01). Hence the null hypothesis Ho26 is rejected. The same facet has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among sales managers of private sector. Employees of government sector have permanent jobs so they have high standard in the society which is not found in the employees of private sector. But the employees of government sector have not much opportunity to use their special skills and strength hence they are not found much satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted for the operational staff.
The next facet of job satisfaction 'opportunity to make decisions' has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among administrative officers of government sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 15.3% of variance from the predictor variable 'maintenance' \((F = 9.83; \ p < 0.01)\) among sales managers of private sector. Maintenance shows positive relation with the criterion variable \((\beta = 0.42; \ p < 0.01)\). Positive value indicated a direct relation with the criterion variable. It means if employees improve their trust level then they may get the chance of decision making which will increase their satisfaction level. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho29 is rejected.

'Opportunity to achieve something worth while' is showing 18.5% of variance from the predictor variables 'helping relationship', 'growth', and 'superordination' on administrative officers of government sector. Helping relationship and superordination influences negatively while growth has positive relation with the criterion variable. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho23, Ho26 and Ho24 are rejected. The same facet has 18.3% of variance from the predictor variables 'helping relationship', and 'growth' among the sales managers of private sector. Helping relationship influences positively while growth has negative relation with the criterion variable. It can be observed that in both the sectors helping relationship and growth influence the criterion variable but in an opposite direction. It means in government sector employees neither give help nor receive help from others to achieve something worth while whereas in private sector employees have helping nature they make their task easy by giving help and receiving help from others. On the other hand government employees have the opportunity to use their skills to do their task for their personal growth but the employees of private sector not have much freedom to use
their special strength to perform their task. It is due to the reason that government sector employees do not have much pressure from their superiors whereas private sector employees have much boundation from their superiors. Churchill, Neil, and Orville (1976) study found that more than 40 percent of the variation in total job satisfaction among salespeople is explained by climates that include company policies and practices as well as supervisory behaviour. Hence the null hypotheses Ho23 and Ho26 are rejected.
Table-4.21

Stepwise multiple regression analysis: For the prediction of organizational role stress (DV). Assistants and operational staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$B$-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>IRL, Integration</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Maintenance, IRL</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Intimacy, IRL, Creativity, Integration</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIn</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From table 4.21 it can be observed that 'inter-role linkage', 'integration', 'creativity', and 'integration' (dimensions of role efficacy) and 'maintenance', 'intimacy', 'regard', and 'security' (dimensions of interpersonal trust) are found significant predictors of various dimensions of organizational role stress.

Among assistants of government sector the criterion variable 'role expectation conflict' has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Therefore the previously formulated null hypotheses Ho1 to Ho17 are accepted. Among operational staff of private sector the same criterion variable has 32.5% of variance from the predictor variables 'inter-role linkage', and 'integration' (F= 12.8; p=.00). Inter-role linkage influences negatively while integration has positive relation with the criterion variable. Assistants of private sector are not much efficient in making a linkage between their role and others' roles, hence they face the problem of role expectation conflict. To relieve this stress they try to integrate their self and the role. Hence the null hypotheses Ho5 and Ho2 are rejected for the operational staff of private sector.

The next criterion variable 'role overload' among government sector assistants has 6.3% of variance from the predictor variable 'inter-role linkage'. Inter-role linkage has negative relation with the criterion variable 'role overload' (β= .28; p<0.05). Hence the null hypothesis Ho5 is rejected. The same criterion variable has 32.5% of variance among operational staff of private sector from the predictor variables 'maintenance' and, 'inter-role linkage'. Both maintenance and Inter-role linkage has positive relation with the criterion variable. Hence the null hypotheses Ho12 and Ho5 are rejected. From the above mentioned values it can be observed that the employees of government sector face much problem of role overload in comparison to the private sector employees. The reason behind this stress is that they
do not have a proper linkage between their own roles with other roles in the organization. The employees of operational staff of private sector has a moderate level of trust on this dimension (maintenance) and they also have an average level of efficacy to perform their role so they may not feel the stress of role overload.

‘Role Isolation’ is the next criterion variable which has 6.3% of variance among assistants of government sector from the predictor variable ‘intimacy’. Intimacy influences the criterion variable positively. Hence the null hypothesis Ho14 is rejected. The same criterion variable has 6.1% of variance among operational staff of private sector from the predictor variable ‘regard’. Regard influences the criterion variable negatively. Hence for the operational staff null hypothesis Ho15 is rejected. Both intimacy and regard are the dimensions of trust but positive value show high trust while negative value refers to low trust level. It means the employees of government sector are capable of developing true and intimate relationship which their counterparts cannot. That is why they face the stress of role isolation.

The next criterion variable ‘personal inadequacy’ has 7% of variance among assistants of government sector from the predictor variable ‘creativity’. Creativity influences the criterion variable positively. The positive relation indicated that the employees try to do something new but they may not get proper trainings to improve their skills so it is a kind of personal inadequacy which bound them to do the routine task and hence they face this kind of stress. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho4 is rejected. The same criterion variable has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among operational staff of private sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho1 to Ho17 are accepted.

‘Self-role distance’ is the next criterion variable which has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among the assistants of
government sector. Hence the null hypotheses $H_0$ to $H_{17}$ are accepted for this dimension of organizational role stress. The same criterion variable has 14.5% of variance among operational staff of private sector from the predictor variable ‘regard’. Regard influences the criterion variable negatively. Since regard is the dimension of trust and its negative value indicated low trust level it means the employees of private sector face the problem of self-role distance because they do not think positively about others. Therefore the null hypothesis $H_{15}$ is rejected.

The next criterion variable ‘role ambiguity’ has no influence among assistants of government sector from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Hence the null hypotheses $H_0$ to $H_{17}$ are accepted. The same criterion variable has 39.7% of variance among operational staff of private sector from the predictor variables ‘intimacy’, ‘inter-role linkage’, ‘creativity’, and ‘integration’. All the four variables have negative relation with the criterion variable. Intimacy is the dimension of trust while inter-role linkage, creativity, and integration are the dimensions of role efficacy. The negative values of all the four dimensions indicated that they neither have high trust nor high efficacy on these dimensions due to which they come under the stress of role ambiguity. Role ambiguity is a kind of stress arises when there are doubts with in the individual regarding the expectations that people have from the role. Government employees do not have this stress because they do not have many expectations from their roles, they only need government job because there is job security in it. Hence the null hypotheses $H_{14}$, $H_{5}$, $H_{4}$ and $H_{2}$ are rejected.

‘Resource inadequacy’ is the next criterion variable which has no influence among assistants of government sector from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Therefore the null hypotheses $H_0$ to $H_{17}$ are accepted. The same criterion variable has 6.1% of variance among operational staff of private sector from
the predictor variable ‘security’ (F= 4.61; p<0.05). Security has negative relation with the criterion variable. Since security is the dimension of trust and its negative value indicated an inverse relation that is the less they have trust level the more they have stress of resource inadequacy. Resource inadequacy is a kind of stress generated when proper resources are not available to perform the assigned role. This stress is not found in government sector employees because they are very much depend on their superiors and if their superiors are not manage the required resources then they themselves responsible for that. Hence the null hypothesis Ho13 is rejected.
### Table 4.22
Stepwise multiple regression analysis: For the prediction of job satisfaction (DV). Assistants and operational staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$\beta$-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facet-2</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-3</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Maintenance, Confrontation, HR</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-5</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-6</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-7</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-8</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Security, Creativity</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-9</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-10</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-11</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Integration, Creativity</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>6.009</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-,31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-13</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-14</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-15</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-16</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-17</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Influence, Success</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4.22 is suggested that 'confrontation', 'helping relationship', 'centrality', 'creativity', 'integration', 'growth', 'proactivity', and 'influence' (dimensions of role efficacy) 'success', 'maintenance', 'regard', and 'security' (dimensions of interpersonal trust) are found significant predictors of various facets of job satisfaction.

It can be observed that the facet 'the freedom to choose your own method of working' has 7.7% of variance among assistants of government sector from the predictor variable 'success' (F= 5.06; p<0.05). Success influences this facet positively (β=0.30; p<0.05). Since success is the dimension of trust and its positive value indicated high trust level, it means employees of government sector are satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction because they are capable of enjoying other's success, if it is not used against them. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho33 is rejected. The same facet has no influence among operational staff of private sector from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted.

The next facet 'your fellow workers' has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among assistants of government sector. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 32.6% of variance among operational staff of private sector from the predictor variables 'maintenance', 'confrontation', and 'helping relationship'. Maintenance and helping relationship has positive while confrontation has negative relation with this facet of job satisfaction. Maintenance refers that employees are true to their words and helping relationship refers that when the employees need help they take help from others and if other need help they give them help. So due to positive value on these dimensions they feel
satisfaction on this facet of job satisfaction. On the other hand they have negative value on confrontation. Confrontation is the dimension of role efficacy and it refers the perception about the capacity of the individual to solve the problems. Its negative value indicated that operational staff of private sector is not much efficient in solving the problems of their fellow workers. Hence the null hypotheses Ho29, Ho27 and Ho23 are rejected.

'Your immediate boss' is the next facet which has 7.7% of variance among assistants of government sector from the predictor variable 'centrality'. Centrality has positive relation with this facet of job satisfaction. Centrality is the dimension or role efficacy and its positive value indicated that the employees of government sector feel their role important in the organization. Hence the null hypothesis Ho18 is rejected. The same facet has 11.8% of variance among operational staff of private sector from the predictor variable 'regard'. Regard influences this facet negatively (β= -0.36; p<0.01). Regard is the dimension of trust and its negative value indicated that assistants of private sector do not think positively about their immediate boss. Hence they are not satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho32 is rejected.

The next facet 'amount of responsibility you are given' has no influence among assistants of government sector from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 11.9% of variance among operational staff of private sector from the predictor variable 'proactivity'. Proactivity influences this facet positively. Proactivity is the dimension of role efficacy and its positive value indicated that the assistants are
efficient enough to fulfil their responsibilities and hence they are satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction. So the null hypothesis H20 is rejected.

‘Opportunity to use your abilities’ is the next facet which has no influence among assistants of government sector from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 7\% of variance among operational staff of private sector from the predictor variable ‘regard’. Regard influences this facet negatively (β=-.028; p<0.05). Regard is the dimension of trust and its negative value indicated that the employees do not think positively about their superiors because they do not give them the full opportunity to use their abilities. Hence the null hypothesis Ho32 is rejected for this facet of job satisfaction on the operational staff.

The next facet of job satisfaction ‘industrial relations with management and workers’ has 18.6\% of variance among assistants of government sector from the predictor variables ‘security’, and ‘creativity’. Both the predictors have positive relation with this facet of job satisfaction. Security is the dimension of trust and creativity is the dimension of role efficacy and their positive values indicated a direct relation, that is, if the employees have high trust level as well as high efficacy then they can easily maintain a good relation with management and workers in the organization. Hence the null hypotheses Ho30 and Ho21 are rejected. The same criterion variable has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on the operational staff of private sector. So the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted.

‘Your rate of pay’ is the next criterion variable and it has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on the assistants of government
sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 10% of variance among operational staff of private sector from the predictor variable ‘integration’. Integration influences this facet negatively. Negative value indicated that employees are not much satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction. Though the employees of private sector have high rate of pay in comparison to the employees of private sector but their requirements are much more in comparison to government employees due to which they are not much satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction. So the null hypothesis Ho19 is rejected.

‘Your chance of promotion’ is the next facet which has 6% of variance among assistants of government sector from the predictor variable ‘growth’. Growth influences this facet negatively. Negative value indicated that the assistants are not satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction. Since in government sectors employees get promotion after a long period so they have less chance for personal growth. They stuck to the same role for very long period and hence they are not satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction. Hence the null hypothesis Ho26 is rejected. The same facet has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on the operational staff of private sector from any predictor variable. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted.

The next facet ‘the way your firm is managed’ has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among assistants of government sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 18.9% of variance among operational staff of private sector from the predictor variables ‘integration’, and ‘creativity’. Integration influences this facet positively while creativity influences negatively. The positive value of integration indicated that
the role is designed according to their skills so they are satisfied with this facet but on the other hand the negative value of creativity indicated that they may not get full opportunity to do something new or innovative so they are less satisfied with this facet of job satisfaction. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho19 and Ho21 are rejected.

Among assistants of government sector the next facet ‘the amount of variety in your job’ has 13.6% from the predictor variable ‘proactivity’. Proactivity influences this facet positively. The positive value indicated that the roles give them the opportunity to take initiatives and hence they are satisfied with this facet of job satisfaction. So for this facet of job satisfaction the null hypothesis Ho20 is rejected. The same facet has no influence among assistants of private sector from any predictor variable. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted for this facet of job satisfaction on the operational staff of private sector.

The next facet ‘your job security’ has 7.3% of variance from the predictor variable ‘regard’ on the assistants of government sector. Regard influences this facet positively ($\beta = 0.30; p<0.05$). Since in our society the importance of government job is much more in comparison to the private jobs, hence the employees of government sector are satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction. Hence the null hypothesis Ho32 is rejected. The same facet has 8.9% of variance among operational staff of private sector from the predictor variable ‘inter-role linkage’. Inter-role linkage has positive relation with this facet of job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.32; p<0.05$). Positive value indicated that employees of private sector make them satisfied on this facet by making a linkage between their role and other roles. Since the job security in private sectors is not as much as in government sectors hence the employees try to find different ways to secure their jobs. So the null hypothesis Ho22 is rejected.
“Opportunity to help others with personal problems at work” is the next criterion variable and it has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on the assistants of government sector. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 22.2% of variance from the predictor variable ‘integration’ on the operational staff of private sector. Integration has positive relation with this facet of job satisfaction. Positive value indicated a direct relation. It means the employees try to integrate their role in such a manner that gives them the opportunity to get time to solve the problems of their colleagues. So the null hypothesis Ho19 is rejected.

‘Chance to learn new things’ is the next facet which has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among assistants of government sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 21.4% of variance among operational staff of private sector from the predictor variable ‘centrality’. Centrality shows positive relation with this facet of job satisfaction. Centrality is the dimension of role efficacy and its positive value indicated that the employees think their role important in the organization hence they try to improve it by learning something new. Hence they are satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction. So the null hypothesis Ho18 is rejected.

The next facet ‘opportunity to make decisions’ has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among assistants of government sector. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 15.6% of variance among operational staff of private sector from the predictor variables ‘influence’, and ‘success’. Influence has positive while success has negative relation with this facet of job satisfaction. Positive value of influence indicated that
the employees are efficient enough to make an impact on others hence they feel satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction. Since success is the dimension of trust and its negative value indicated low level of trust, hence this dimension make a negative impact on this facet of job satisfaction. Hence the null hypotheses Ho25 and Ho33 are rejected.
**Table-4.23**

Stepwise multiple regression analysis: For the prediction of organizational role stress (DV). Clerical staff and agents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>B-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IRD</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Intimacy, Growth</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>5.003</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Superordination</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RS</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Creativity, Intimacy</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Integration, Growth</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REC</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Maintenance, Superordination</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RO</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PI</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SRD</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RA</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Regard, Maintenance</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIn</strong></td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From table 4.23 it can be observed that 'growth', 'superordination', 'creativity', 'integration', and 'proactivity' (dimensions of role efficacy) and 'intimacy', 'regard', 'maintenance', 'security', and 'success' (dimensions of interpersonal trust) are found significant predictors of various dimensions of organizational role stress.

The criterion variable 'inter-role distance' has 14.3% of variance among clerical staff of government sector from the predictor variables 'intimacy', and 'growth'. Intimacy is showing positive relation while growth is showing negative relation with the criterion variable. The positive value of intimacy indicated that the clerical staff is not under the stress of inter-role distance because they are capable of developing true relationship with others. The negative value of growth indicated that they have less chances of personal growth due to which the stress of inter-role distance occurs. Hence the null hypotheses Ho14 and Ho9 are rejected. The same criterion variable has 16.1% of variance among the agents of private sector from the predictor variable 'superordination'. Superordination is showing negative relation with the criterion variable. It means the employees come under the stress of inter-role distance because they do not get enough time to do something beyond their regular call of duty. Hence the null hypothesis Ho7 is rejected.

The next criterion variable 'role stagnation' has 18.1% of variance among clerical staff of government sector from the predictor variables 'creativity', and 'intimacy'. Creativity is showing negative relation while intimacy is showing positive relation with the criterion variable. Since creativity is the dimension of role efficacy and its negative value indicated that the employees are less creative in handling their role. They need to change with the change in the technology. Hence they come under the stress of role stagnation. Hence the null hypotheses Ho4 and Ho14 are rejected.
The same criterion variable has 18.8% of variance among agents of private sector from the predictor variables ‘integration’, and ‘growth’. Integration has negative relation while growth has positive relation with the criterion variable. The negative value on integration indicated that the efficacy to make the self and the role integrated is not much effective due to which the stress arises. The positive value of growth indicated that employees need to grow according to the growing society hence they try to deal the stress of role stagnation by learning something new. So the null hypotheses Ho2 and Ho9 are rejected.

Among the clerical staff and agents of government and private insurance companies ‘role expectation conflict’ is the next criterion variable. Regard is the predictor variable showing 7.8% of variance on this criterion variable among government employees. Regard is the dimension of interpersonal trust and its negative value on this dimension indicated that they come under the stress of role expectation conflict because they do not think positively about others. Hence the null hypothesis Ho15 is rejected. Maintenance and superordination are showing 12.8% of variance on this criterion variable among employees of private sector. Maintenance is the dimension of interpersonal trust and its positive value indicated that they are true to their words. On the other hand superordination influences the criterion variable negatively. It means the efficacy is not up to the proper extent due to which the level of stress goes up. The roles which give opportunities to role occupants to work for super ordinate goals have highest role efficacy. It means the employees of private sector do not get the opportunity to work for larger goals. Hence the null hypotheses Ho12 and Ho7 are rejected.

Among clerical staff ‘Role overload’ is the next criterion variable having 8.7% of variance from the predictor variable ‘creativity’. Creativity influences role overload
negatively. Negative value indicated an inverse relation; it means the stress of role overload is due to the reason that they do not attempt their task creatively. Hence the null hypothesis Ho4 is rejected. The same criterion variable has 7.2% of variance from the predictor variable ‘growth’ among agents. Growth is showing a positive relation with the criterion variable. Positive value indicated a direct relation with the criterion variable. It means the agents try to learn some thing new to release their role overloads hence they do not feel stressed on this dimension. Hence the null hypothesis Ho9 is rejected.

‘Personal inadequacy’ is the next criterion variable having no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among clerical staff of government sector. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho1 to Ho17 are accepted. The same criterion variable has 9.9% of variance among agents of private sector from the predictor variable ‘security’. Security influences the criterion variable negatively. Since security is the dimension of interpersonal trust and its negative value indicated an inverse relation, it means the level of stress on this dimension arises because the employees are not what they pretend to be. Hence the null hypothesis Ho13 is rejected.

The next criterion variable ‘self-role distance’ has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among clerical staff of government sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho1 to Ho17 are accepted. The same criterion variable has 6.7% of variance from the predictor variable ‘proactivity’ among agents. Proactivity influences the criterion variable negatively. Since proactivity is the dimension of role efficacy and its negative value indicated an inverse relation with the criterion variable. The stress of self-role distance arises because the agents are
ineffective in taking initiatives to start some new activity. So the previously formulated null hypothesis Ho3 is rejected.

'Role ambiguity' is the next criterion variable having no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among clerical staff. So the null hypotheses Ho1 to Ho17 are accepted. The same criterion variable has 17% of variance among agents from the predictor variables 'regard', and 'maintenance'. Regard influences the criterion variable positively and maintenance influences negatively. From the beta values (0.36 and -0.28) it can be observed that they need to improve their trust level to overcome their stress of role ambiguity. When there are doubts with in the individual regarding the expectations that people have from the role then he comes under the stress of role ambiguity. It may be due to the lack of information available to the role occupant, or may be he does not fully understand the provided information. Hence the null hypotheses Ho15 and Ho12 are accepted.

The next criterion variable 'resource inadequacy' has 11% of variance from the predictor variable 'regard' among clerical staff. Regard influences the criterion variable negatively. Since regard is the dimension of interpersonal trust and its negative value indicated low trust level. Hence the null hypothesis Ho15 is rejected. The same criterion variable has 8.8% of variance among agents from the predictor variable 'success'. Success influences the criterion variable positively. The positive value indicated a direct relation with the criterion variable. It means the employees of private sector not come under the stress of resource inadequacy because they try to manage it by enhancing their trust level. Hence the null hypothesis Ho16 is rejected.
Table-4.24
Stepwise multiple regression analysis: For the prediction of job satisfaction (DV).
Clerical staff and agents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>B-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facet-1</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-2</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Confrontation, HR</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>IRL, HR</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-3</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>IRL, Regard</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Integration, Superord. IRL, Proactivity</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-7</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-8</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-9</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Regard, Centrality</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-10</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-11</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>IRL, Creativity</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-12</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>IRL, Regard</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-13</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-14</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Centrality, Success</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Integration, IRL</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-15</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Superordinatio</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-16</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Centrality, Maintenance, Success</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-17</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-19</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Superordinatio</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt.</td>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facet-20</td>
<td>Gvt.</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Physical work conditions’ is the first facet among clerical staff and it is having 6.6% of variance from the predictor variable ‘regard’. Regard influences the criterion variable negatively. Since regard is the dimension of interpersonal trust and its negative value indicates an inverse relation with this facet of job satisfaction. Hence the null hypothesis Ho32 is rejected. The same criterion variable has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on the agents of private sector. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted.

The next facet is ‘the freedom to choose your own method of working’ and it has 14.7% of variance among clerical staff from the predictor variables ‘confrontation’, and ‘helping relationship’. Both the predictors are showing positive relation with this facet of job satisfaction. Since confrontation and helping relationship are the dimensions of role efficacy and their positive value indicated that the employees are efficient enough to solve their problems by their own hence their superiors give them the opportunity to choose their own method of work. Hence the null hypotheses Ho27 and Ho23 are rejected. The same facet has 16.8% of variance among agents from the predictor variables ‘inter-role linkage’, and ‘helping relationship’. Both the predictors are showing positive relation with this facet of job satisfaction. It means private employees are also efficient enough due to which they get the opportunity to choose their own method of work. So the null hypotheses Ho22 and Ho23 are rejected.
Among clerical staff of government insurance companies there is no impact on "your fellow workers" from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 23.3% of variance among agents from the predictor variables 'inter-role linkage', and 'regard'. Inter-role linkage is showing the positive relation while regard is showing the negative relation with this facet of job satisfaction. Inter-role linkage is the dimension of role efficacy and its positive value indicated that workers get satisfaction by linking their roles with others' roles. Hence the null hypotheses Ho22 and Ho32 are rejected.

'The recognition you get from good work' is the next facet having 6% of variance among clerical staff from the predictor variable 'influence'. Influence is showing negative relation with this facet (β=-0.28; p=0.04<0.05). It means the workers are not efficient in making an impact on their boss hence they do not get enough recognition by doing good work. Hence the null hypothesis Ho25 is rejected. The same facet has 28.6% of variance among agents from the predictor variables 'integration', 'superordination', 'inter-role linkage', and 'proactivity'. Integration, inter-role linkage, and proactivity are showing negative relation while superordination is showing the positive relation with this facet of job satisfaction. Employees show less satisfaction on this facet because they are not much efficient in starting some new activity; they are less effective in integrating their self and their roles. Hence the null hypotheses Ho19, Ho24, Ho22 and Ho20 are rejected.

The next facet is 'opportunity to use tour abilities' has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among clerical staff of government sector. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 6.7% of variance from the predictor variable 'regard' among employees of private sector. Regard influences this facet positively (β=0.29; p=0.03>0.05). It means the
employees are satisfied with the opportunity they get to use their abilities. The reason behind it is that the employees think positively about others due to which their interpersonal trust goes up and hence the level of satisfaction also increases. So the null hypothesis Ho32 is rejected.

Among clerical staff ‘industrial relation with management and workers’ has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 10% of variance from the predictor variable ‘integration’ among agents. Integration influences this facet positively. Positive value indicated that as the efficacy to integrate the role and the self increases the level of satisfaction on this facet also increases. Hence the null hypothesis Ho19 is rejected.

The next facet is ‘your rate of pay’ has no influence from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust on clerical staff. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 16.6% of variance from the predictor variables ‘regard’, and ‘centrality’ on the agents of private sector. Both the predictors are showing negative relation with this facet of job satisfaction. Regard is the dimension of trust and centrality is the dimension of role efficacy and their negative values indicated that the employees are not satisfied with their rate of pay. Since the salaries of agents are not fix, it is based on the number of insurances they made with in a month hence they do not feel satisfied with their rate of pay. So the null hypotheses Ho32 and Ho18 are rejected.

‘Your chance of promotion’ is the next facet having 9% of variance from the predictor variable ‘inter-role linkage’ among clerical staff. Inter-role linkage influences this facet positively (β=0.33; p=0.01). Since clerical staff is the lowest level in the hierarchy and their chance of promotions are very low. But if they make
their role effective such as making their role linked with other roles then they get the chance of promotion. Hence the null hypothesis Ho22 is rejected. The same facet has 14.1% of variance among agents from the predictor variable ‘integration’. Integration influences this facet negatively. In private sectors the chances of promotion are very rare. Employees get promotion after struggling a lot. So they need to integrate their self with their role to get the promotion. So the null hypothesis Ho19 is rejected.

Among clerical staff the facet ‘the way your firm is managed’ has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 16% of variance among agents from the predictor variables ‘inter-role linkage’, and ‘creativity’. Both the predictors are showing positive relation with this facet of job satisfaction. In private sectors the management give importance to the working set up, hence they maintain it through connectivity and creativity. Hence the null hypotheses Ho22 and Ho21 are rejected.

‘The attention paid to the suggestions you made’ is the next facet having 6.3% of variance among employees of clerical staff from the predictor variable ‘intimacy’. Intimacy is showing a negative relation with this facet ($\beta = -0.28; p<0.05$). Intimacy is the dimension of trust and negative value is showing low trust level. So the employees are not satisfied on this facet because they are not trusted by their superiors. Hence the null hypothesis Ho31 is rejected. The same facet has 23.1% of variance among employees of private insurance companies from the predictor variables “inter-role linkage, and regard”. Inter-role linkage is the dimension of role efficacy and showing positive beta value, while regard is the dimension of trust and showing negative beta value. It means if role efficacy increases the satisfaction also increases but if trust
level goes down then the level of satisfaction also goes down. So the null hypotheses Ho22 and Ho32 are rejected.

Among clerical staff the facet ‘your hours of work’ has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 13% of variance among private employees from the predictor variable ‘integration’. Integration influences this facet negatively ($\beta=-0.38; p=0.006<0.05$). Since in private sectors there are excessive working hours, hence they get exhausted due to which they feel dissatisfied on this facet of job satisfaction scale. So the null hypothesis Ho19 is rejected.

‘The amount of variety in your job’ is the next facet having 14.1% of variance among clerical staff from the predictor variables ‘centrality’, and ‘success’. Centrality is the dimension of role efficacy and its negative value indicated low efficacy, while success is the dimension of trust and its positive value indicated high trust level. Employees in clerical staff are at the low level so may be they do not think their role very important in the organization due to which they do not find a variety in their job and hence feel less satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho18 and Ho33 are rejected. The same facet has 16.6% of variance among agents from the predictor variables ‘integration’, and ‘inter-role linkage’. Both the predictors are the dimension of role efficacy and are showing negative relation with this facet, it means lack of efficacy causes dissatisfaction in the employees. Hence the null hypotheses Ho19 and Ho22 are rejected.

The next facet ‘your job security’ has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among clerical staff. Therefore the null hypotheses Ho18 and Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 5.9% of variance among agent from the predictor variable ‘proactivity’. Proactivity is showing positive relation with this
facet of job satisfaction ($\beta=0.28; p=0.04<0.05$). Since job insecurity is one of the major problems in private sector. All the time a fear of insecurity roaming around the employees, so they try to release this stress by doing something new and innovative by their own. Hence the null hypothesis Ho20 is rejected.

Among both the sector’s employees the next facet is ‘opportunity to help others with personal problems at work’. ‘Superordination’ is the predictor variable showing an impact on this facet among clerical staff. Hence the null hypothesis Ho24 is rejected. ‘Centrality’, ‘maintenance’, and ‘success’ are the predictor variables showing an impact on this facet of job satisfaction among agents. So the null hypotheses Ho18, Ho29 and Ho33 are rejected. Government employees have 6.1% of variance from the predictor while private employees have 22.3% of variance from the predictors. From the percentage of variance it can be observed that private employees are more influenced in comparison to their counterparts. This is due to the reason that the private employees are busier, they have much work loads and hence they do not get much time to help others with personal problems at work.

‘Chance to learn new things’ is the next facet having no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among clerical staff. Hence the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 11.2% of variance among agents from the predictor variable ‘integration’. Integration is showing negative relation with this facet ($\beta=-0.36; p=0.01$). It means the employees need to integrate their role with their self concept to learn something new. If they do so then they may get satisfaction on this facet of job satisfaction. Therefore the null hypothesis Ho19 is rejected.

‘Opportunity to make decisions’ is the next facet and it has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among clerical staff. Hence the
null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted. The same facet has 15.5% of variance from the predictor variables ‘superordination’, and ‘regard’ among agents. Both the predictors are showing negative relation with this facet. It means employees are not satisfied on this facet of job satisfaction. To get the opportunity in the process of decision making they need to do something beyond their regular call of duty and they also need to think positive about their superiors. So the null hypotheses Ho24 and Ho32 are rejected.

The last facet of this table is ‘opportunity to achieve something worth while’ and it has 6.4% of variance among clerical staff from the predictor variable ‘success’. Hence the null hypothesis Ho33 is rejected. The same facet has no impact from any dimension of role efficacy and interpersonal trust among agents. It is due to the reason that the employees of government sector feel them secure, they give importance to the government jobs in comparison to private one. Hence when they appoint as a government employee they feel that they achieve something worth while which is absent among private employees. So the null hypotheses Ho18 to Ho34 are accepted.
Results of One Way ANOVA

In the third phase of the study one way ANOVA with Tukey Post Hock was applied to analyze the data to see whether hierarchy wise there is a significant difference within the group of employees from both government and private insurance companies. The group of government sector is divided into four levels i.e. branch managers, administrative officers, assistants and clerical staff. In the same way the employees of private sector are further divided into four sub groups i.e. branch managers, sales managers, operational staff and agents.

Table-4.25
One way ANOVA for the group of employees working in government insurance companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sources of variable</th>
<th>Sum of square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Efficacy</td>
<td>Between group</td>
<td>1102.13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>367.37</td>
<td>49.78</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within group</td>
<td>1446.42</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2548.55</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Trust</td>
<td>Between group</td>
<td>3498.49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1166.16</td>
<td>128.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within group</td>
<td>1783.06</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5281.55</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Role Stress</td>
<td>Between group</td>
<td>771.37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>257.12</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within group</td>
<td>6478.50</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>33.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7249.87</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Between group</td>
<td>4592.93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1530.97</td>
<td>168.44</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within group</td>
<td>1781.42</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6374.35</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From table-4.25 it can be observed that $F=49.78$ and $p<0.05$, hence there is a significant difference between the branch managers, administrative officers, assistants and clerical staff in terms of their role efficacy. The sample also differ significantly in terms of their interpersonal trust ($F=128.18; p<0.05$). It is also shown in the above table that the employees of government insurance companies differ significantly in terms of their organizational role stress ($F=7.77; p<0.05$). From the values ($F=168.44; p<0.05$) it is clear that there is a significant difference between the four levels of employees in terms of their job satisfaction.

Therefore the previously formulated null hypothesis $Ho35$ is rejected.
Table 4.26
Descriptive statistics for the employees working in government insurance companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Efficacy</td>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative officers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.14</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Trust</td>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.24</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative officers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48.34</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51.78</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.10</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>49.86</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Role Stress</td>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56.66</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative officers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54.58</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59.54</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57.20</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>79.70</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative officers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76.64</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70.44</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62.30</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>72.27</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table-4.26 is showing the descriptive statistics that is the mean scores and SD of branch managers, administrative officers, assistants, and clerical staff of government insurance companies in terms of their role efficacy, interpersonal trust, organizational role stress, and job satisfaction.

The administrative officers are showing high mean scores (23.76) on the variable role efficacy, they are most effective in performing their role. Assistants are having highest mean scores on interpersonal trust (51.78). Assistants are showing high mean value (59.54) in terms of their organizational role stress. In the last the branch managers are found most satisfied in terms of their job satisfaction, (mean=79.70).
Table-4.27(a)

Tukey Post Hoc of ANOVA for Multiple Comparisons on organizational role stress for four levels of government sector employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(I) Levels</th>
<th>(J) Levels</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Role Stress</td>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>Administrative officers</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative officers</td>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed from table-4.27(a) that the branch managers differ significantly with the administrative officers (p<0.05) on the variable organizational role stress. The mean difference is 4.62. Administrative officers differ significantly with the assistants (p<0.05). They are showing a mean difference of 4.96 on the variable organizational role stress.
### Table-4.27(b)

Tukey Post Hoc of ANOVA for Multiple Comparisons on job satisfaction for four levels of government sector employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(I) Levels</th>
<th>(J) Levels</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>Administrative officers</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical staff</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative officers</td>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical staff</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>Clerical staff</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table-4.27(d) it is clear that the branch managers are significantly different from the administrative officers, assistants, and clerical staff in terms of their job satisfaction (p<0.05). It is also shown in the above table that the administrative officers are differing significantly with the assistants and the clerks. Assistants are showing significant mean difference (MD=3.56; p<0.05) with the clerical staff in terms of their job satisfaction.
Table-4.27(c)

Tukey Post Hoc of ANOVA for Multiple Comparisons on role efficacy for four levels of government sector employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(I) Levels</th>
<th>(J) Levels</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Efficacy</td>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>Administrative officers</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical staff</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative officers</td>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical staff</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table-4.27(c) the branch managers differ significantly from administrative officers, assistants, and clerks in terms of their role efficacy. After branch managers the administrative officers exist in the hierarchy and they are showing significant difference with the assistants (p<0.05). Assistants are at the third position and they are showing a significant difference with the clerical staff in terms of their role efficacy.
Table-4.27(d)

Tukey Post Hoc of ANOVA for Multiple Comparisons on interpersonal trust for four levels of government sector employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(I) Levels</th>
<th>(J) Levels</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal trust</td>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clerical staff</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative officers</td>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical staff</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.27(d) is showing the multiple comparisons of branch managers, administrative officers, assistants, and clerical staff in terms of their interpersonal trust. Branch managers are not showing significant difference with the administrative officers, but are differ significantly with assistants and clerical staff in terms of their interpersonal trust (p=0.00<0.05). It is also shown in the table that administrative officers differ significantly with assistants and clerical staff (p=0.00<0.05). The assistants are not showing significant difference with the clerical staff in terms of their interpersonal trust.
Table-4.28

One way ANOVA for the group of employees working in private insurance companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sources of variable</th>
<th>Sum of square</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Efficacy</td>
<td>Between group</td>
<td>436.34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>145.44</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within group</td>
<td>2614.04</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3050.38</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Trust</td>
<td>Between group</td>
<td>321.93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>107.31</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within group</td>
<td>2273.42</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2595.35</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Role Stress</td>
<td>Between group</td>
<td>623.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>207.72</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within group</td>
<td>5801.82</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6424.99</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Between group</td>
<td>8852.58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2950.86</td>
<td>180.35</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within group</td>
<td>3206.84</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12059.42</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4.28 is showing that the four level of private sector employees differ significantly from each other in terms of their role efficacy (F=10.90; p<0.05). Hierarchy wise the group of employees also showing a significant difference in terms of their interpersonal trust (F= 9.25; p<0.05). On the variable ‘organizational role stress’ the private sector employees differ significantly (F= 7.01; p<0.05). From the F-value (180.35; p<0.05) it is clear that the group of employees also differ significantly on the variable job satisfaction.

Hence the null hypothesis Ho36 is rejected.
### Table-4.29
Descriptive statistics for the employees of private insurance companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role Efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33.06</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>30.58</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38.72</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48.04</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46.04</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>43.16</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Role Stress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54.18</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.56</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54.52</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52.44</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>52.68</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82.30</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales managers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>77.60</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73.10</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69.54</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>75.64</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from table-4.29 that among four levels of employees branch managers of private sector scored highest on the variable role efficacy (mean= 33.06). They are satisfied from their jobs due to which they are showing effectiveness in their roles.
The operational staff showed highest mean score (48.04) on the variable interpersonal trust. It is because of the reason that they want to achieve better than others and for this it is important to have a good interpersonal relation with other co-workers in the organization.

The operational staff also showed highest mean score (54.52) on the variable organizational role stress. They are found more stressful for the reason that in private sectors the employees face a lot of competition to achieve better than others.

On the variable 'job satisfaction' the branch managers scored highest mean value (82.30). The branch managers are found more satisfied from their jobs because they are at the top in the hierarchy. Most of their needs are fulfilled due to which they have a sense of satisfaction from their jobs.
Table-4.30(a)

Tukey Post Hoc of ANOVA for Multiple Comparisons for four levels of private sector employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(I) Levels</th>
<th>(J) Levels</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational role stress</td>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>Operational staff</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales managers</td>
<td>Operational staff</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from table-4.30(a) that on variable ‘organizational role stress’ branch managers are showing significant mean difference only with operational staff (MD=2.88; p<0.05). Sales managers are at the second position in the hierarchy and they are showing significant mean difference only with the operational staff (MD=4.96; p<0.05) on the variable organizational role stress.
Table-4.30(b)

Tukey Post Hoc of ANOVA for Multiple Comparisons for four levels of private sector employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(I) Levels</th>
<th>(J) Levels</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Branch</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>14.34</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>managers</td>
<td>agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table-4.30 (b) it can be observed that the branch managers of private sector are showing significant mean difference with the sales managers (MD= 3.06; p<0.05), operational staff (MD= 9.26; p<0.05), and agents (MD= 17.40; p<0.05) on the variable job satisfaction. Sales managers are showing significant mean difference with the operational staff (MD= 6.20; p<0.05), and agents (MD= 14.34; p<0.05) on the variable job satisfaction. Then comes the operational staff in the hierarchy, they are showing significant mean difference with agents (MD= 8.14; p<0.05).
Table 4.30(c)

Tukey Post Hoc of ANOVA for Multiple Comparisons for four levels of private sector employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(I) Levels</th>
<th>(J) Levels</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Efficacy</td>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>Operational staff</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales managers</td>
<td>Operational staff</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.30(c) is concerned with the multiple comparisons of four levels of employees from private insurance companies. It is clear that on the variable role efficacy the branch managers are showing significant difference only with the operational staff (MD = 2.00; p<0.05). Sales managers are showing significant difference with operational staff (MD = 3.62; p<0.05) and agents (MD = 3.44; p<0.05).
Table-4.30(d)

Tukey Post Hoc of ANOVA for Multiple Comparisons for four levels of private sector employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(I) Levels</th>
<th>(J) Levels</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal trust</td>
<td>Branch Managers</td>
<td>Operational staff</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales managers</td>
<td>Operational staff</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table-4.30(d) it is clear that the branch managers are showing significant mean difference only with the operational staff (MD=2.54; p<0.05) on variable interpersonal trust. Then comes the sales managers in the hierarchy, which are showing significant mean difference only with the operational staff (MD=3.44; p<0.05).
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION
AND
SUGGESTIONS
CONCLUSION:

The findings of the present study lead to the following conclusions:

The four categories of employees of government and private insurance companies found to differ significantly in terms of their overall organizational role stress, job satisfaction, role efficacy, and interpersonal trust. From table 4.1 to 4.4 it is clear that 'role overload', role ambiguity', 'resource inadequacy', 'self-role distance', and 'role isolation' were the dimensions of organizational role stress on which both the groups differ significantly. The branch managers, sales managers, operational staff and agents of private sector found more stressful in comparison to their counterparts.

There are many factors due to which the employees of private insurance companies showed high stress, few of them are: job insecurity, excessive long working hours, fringe benefits, holidays and so on. Due to insecurity of their jobs they feel very difficult to settle at one place. With the excessive long working hours they do not get much time to spend with their family and due to which conflict arises between their organizational and other roles.

'Amount of responsibility you are given', 'your hours of work', 'your job security', 'your chance of promotion', 'power and prestige in the job', opportunity to help others with personal problems at work' were the main facets of job satisfaction on which the employees of government and private sector showed a significant difference. The employees of private insurance companies found less satisfied from their jobs in comparison to the employees of government sector (table-4.5 to 4.8). The employees of government insurance companies are found more satisfied because they have job security, they do not work under much pressure from their top authorities,
they do not have excessive long working hours, they get fringe benefits from the company, and they have pension policies, and so on.

It can be observed from table 4.9 to 4.12 that the main dimension of role efficacy were 'creativity', 'growth', 'superordination', 'influence', and 'integration' on which the two groups of government and private insurance companies showed a significant difference. The mean scores of these dimensions suggested that the employees of private insurance companies are more effective. The employees of private insurance companies found more effective in performing their roles because they do not want to stick to the same role rather they get something beyond their regular call of duty. Hence show more effectiveness in performing their roles in comparison to their counterparts.

Table 4.13 to 4.16 it is evident that both the group of employees of government and private sector found to differ significantly on 'maintenance', 'security', and 'intimacy' (dimension of interpersonal trust). The employees of private insurance companies found more trustworthy in comparison to the employees of government sector. The employees of private insurance companies showed high trust due to the reason that the firms of private insurance companies are not having any support from any other source, they themselves manage it. So to maintain a good image in the market it is important to show a high trust level with the customers.

Table 4.17 and 4.18 suggested that 'inter-role linkage', 'centrality', growth and 'intimacy' were found the significant predictors of organizational role stress and 'superordination', 'confrontation', 'integration', 'maintenance', and 'success' were found significant predictors of job satisfaction among branch managers of government and private sector.
Among the administrative officers of government sector and sales managers of private sector the following dimensions of role efficacy and interpersonal trust 'superordination', 'confrontation', 'success', and intimacy' were found significant predictors of organizational role stress while 'growth', 'proactivity', 'maintenance', and 'security' were found the significant predictors of job satisfaction (table 4.19 and 4.20).

From table 4.21 and 4.22 it can be observed that the significant predictors of organization role stress were, 'inter-role linkage', 'creativity', 'integration' 'regard' and 'intimacy'. Where as the significant predictors of job satisfaction were, 'integration', 'creativity', 'proactivity', and 'regard' among the assistants of government sector and operational staff of private sector.

The significant predictors of organizational role stress among the clerical staff of government sector and agents of private sector were, 'creativity', 'superordination', 'growth', 'regard', and 'intimacy'. On the other hand 'integration', 'inter-role linkage', 'helping relationship', 'regard', and 'success' were found the significant predictors of job satisfaction among the clerical staff and agents of government and private insurance companies (table 4.23 and 4.24).

It can be seen from table-4.25 that hierarchy wise the employees of government insurance companies showed a significant difference in terms of their overall organizational role stress, job satisfaction, role efficacy, and interpersonal trust. Assistants showed high organizational role stress; branch managers found more satisfied from their jobs; the administrative officers found more effective in performing their roles in the organization, and assistants showed high trust level among the group of government employees (table 4.26 and 4.27 (a, b, c, and d).
Hierarchy wise the employees of private insurance companies showed a significant difference in terms of their overall organizational role stress, job satisfaction, role efficacy, and interpersonal trust (table-4.28). The operational staff showed highest mean scores on the variable organizational role stress, the branch managers found most satisfied among the group of private employees. The branch managers also found more effective with in the group of employees of private insurance companies. The operational staff showed high trust level among the whole group of employees of private insurance companies (table-4.29 and 4.30 (a, b, c, d).

From the results of the present study it can be concluded that as the role of the employee changes his way of doing work also changes. It means with the change of positions the responsibilities changes and when these changes takes place the employees experience different level of stresses and satisfaction. Since different individuals have different characteristics, hence they perceive different situations in different manner.

SUGGESTIONS:

On the basis of results and discussion of the present study it is suggested that the organizations should take care in defining the roles clearly. It has been proved from various studies that clearly spelled out roles can be easily performed by the employees and they experience more efficacy in their roles. High role efficacy helps to develop high trust among employees which will lead to less experience of stress and employees get higher job satisfaction.

It has also been reported that role efficacy is a strong moderator or mediating variable to enhance the organizational climate. Awareness with new knowledge and technology is not only important for those who acquired higher position and have
greater skills but it became a need of every employee irrespective of the position he acquired in the organization. Thus, it is the duty of the organization to provide better knowledge and training to their employees. The concerned role occupants need to be encouraged to think how they themselves can raise the levels of their own role efficacy. This will help them to become proactive. Then the supervisors and higher levels in the organization can think of various ways of increasing role efficacy of key roles.

Interpersonal trust is crucial in organizational settings. To transfer the knowledge from one person to another it is important to maintain a good interpersonal relationship. The success of a behaviour-based observation and feedback process requires a high degree of interpersonal trust among co-workers. Work relationships characterized by trust enhance cooperation, reduce conflicts, increase the commitment to the organization and deteriorate the tendency to leave. Therefore, it can be expected that trust will have a positive effect on the satisfaction and the commitment of members to their own team.

Role stress is considered very important because it has a negative impact on organizational outcomes. This has become a major problem not only for individuals working within an organization but also for the organization itself. It has negative economic implications such as poor quality of work, low productivity, absenteeism, etc. when organizations tried to manage this stress then it will result in improved performance, work satisfaction, more involvement and productivity. It is necessary for both individual as well as for the organization to examine the strategy that they can use to cope with the high level of the organizational stress.

Lack of job satisfaction is one of the main reasons of daily stress. Organizations can help to create job satisfaction by putting systems in place that will
ensure that workers are challenged and then rewarded for being successful. Job characteristics such as pay, promotional opportunity, task clarity and significance, and skills utilization, as well as organizational characteristics such as commitment and relationship with supervisors and co-workers, have significant effects on job satisfaction.

Research is a continuous effort and can not be complete because many things remain unexplored. So, it can not be free from many short comings, because different people have different way of thinking. Researcher tried her best in this study but then too many things remain untouched because of several unavoidable constraints. The present research also contains various pros and cons, it means the findings obtained are not an end rather it opens new ways for further researches.

This study was conducted on employees working in insurance companies of government and private sector, and the results obtained are quite useful. But side by side there are certain limitations because the area of investigation was very limited and it is also different from the area of metropolitan cities. The investigation of this kind of research work can be done on other samples representing different categories like university teachers, defends personals, policemen, railway employees, etc. Study on these samples may lead to some new and interesting results which might be more informative.
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APPENDICES
**ROLE EFFICACY SCALE**

**Instructions:** In each of the following set of three statements, tick the one (a, b or c) that most accurately describes your own experience in your organizational role. Choose only one statement in each set.

1. (a) my role is very important in this organization; I feel central here.
   (b) I am doing useful and fairly important work.
   (c) Very little importance is given to my role in the organization; I feel peripheral here.

2. (a) my training and expertise are not fully utilized in my present role.
   (b) my training and knowledge are not used in my present role.
   (c) I am able to use my knowledge and training very well here.

3. (a) I have little freedom in my role; I am only an errand boy.
   (b) I operate according to the directions given to me.
   (c) I can take initiative and act on my own in my role.

4. (a) I am doing usual, routine work in my role.
   (b) in my role I am able to use my creativity and do something new.
   (c) I have no time for creative work in my role.

5. (a) no one in the organization responds to my ideas and suggestions.
   (b) I work in close collaboration with some other colleagues
   (c) I am alone and have almost no one to consult in my role.

6. (a) when I need some help, none is available.
   (b) whenever I have a problem, others help.
   (c) I get very hostile responses when I ask for help.

7. (a) I regret that I do not have the opportunity to contribute to society in my role.
   (b) What I am doing in my role is likely to help other organizations or society.
   (c) I have the opportunity to have some effect on the larger society in my role.

8. (a) I contribute to some decisions.
   (b) I have no power here.
   (c) My advice is accepted by my seniors.

9. (a) Some of what I do contributes to my learning.
   (b) I am slowly forgetting all that I learnt (my professional knowledge).
   (c) I have tremendous opportunities for professional growth in my role.

10. (a) I dislike being bothered with problem.
   (b) When a subordinate brings a problem to me, I help find a solution.
   (c) I refer the problem to my boss or to some other person.
11  (a) I feel quite central in the organization.
    (b) I think I am doing fairly important work.
    (c) I feel I am peripheral in the organization.

12  (a) I do not enjoy my role.
    (b) I enjoy my role very much.
    (c) I enjoy some part of my role and not others.

13  (a) I have little freedom in my role.
    (b) I have a great deal of freedom in my role.
    (c) I have enough freedom in my role.

14  (a) I do a good job according to a pre-decided schedule.
    (b) I am able to be innovative in my role.
    (c) I have no opportunity to be innovative or to do something creative.

15  (a) Others in the organization see my role significant to their work.
    (b) I am a member of task force or a committee.
    (c) I do not work on any committee.

16  (a) Hostility rather than cooperation is evident here.
    (b) I experience enough mutual help here.
    (c) People operate more in isolation here.

17  (a) I am able to contribute to the company in my role.
    (b) I am able to serve larger part of society in my role.
    (c) I wish I could do some useful work in my role.

18  (a) I am able to influence relevant decisions.
    (b) I am sometimes consulted on important matters.
    (c) I cannot make any independent decision.

19  (a) I learnt a great deal in my role.
    (b) I learn a few new things in my role.
    (c) I am involved in routine or unrelated activities and have learnt nothing.

20  (a) When people bring problems to me, I tend to ask them to work out themselves.
    (b) I dislike being bothered with interpersonal conflict.
    (c) I enjoy solving problems related to my work.
INTERPERSONAL TRUST SCALE

Instructions: this questionnaire is designed to know about your experiences while interacting with people in general. Please read the statements given below and give your response by writing (1,2,3 or 4) where,

1- Totally Agree
2- Agree to a large extent
3- Somewhat Agree
4- Totally Disagree

1- Most of the people do not do what they say.
2- If you expose your weakness before others, you are in for trouble.
3- Nobody is my friend of enemy in this world.
4- People seem to be in search of opportunities to belittle and degrade me.
5- Most of the people do not feel happy when they see others flourishing.
6- If you have high expectations from people you will be disappointed.
7- I am a lot cautious while dealing with strangers.
8- I have a feeling that most of the people don’t understand me.
9- Most of the people don’t think positively about others.
10- There is so much competition in this world that people will not hesitate in stepping on your toes to go ahead.
11- Neither do I like to seek obligation from others, nor do I like others patronizing me.
12- Whenever I relied on people I was deceived.
13- Most of the people show friendliness only when they have some self interest.
14- Unless you show people your power, they underestimate you.
15- I always try to achieve better than others.
16- People have generally taken advantage of my goodness.
17- Most of the people are not what they pretend to be.
18- If you share your sorrows with people you will only be ridiculed.
19- I know how to retort back when somebody blames me.
20- People seem to be in a habit of opposing even the best of my intentions.
ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS SCALE

Instructions: people have different feelings about their roles. Statements describing some of them are given below. Use the answer sheet to write the responses. Read each statement carefully and indicate the response in the space against the corresponding number in the answer sheet, how often you have the feeling expressed in the statement in relation to your role in the organization. Use the number given below to indicate your own feelings. If you find that category to be used in answering does not adequately indicate your own feelings, use the one which is closest to the way you feel. Do not leave any item unanswered.

Write 0 if you never or rarely feel this way.
Write 1 if you occasionally (a few times) feel this way
Write 2 if you sometimes feel this way
Write 3 if you frequently feel this way
Write 4 if you very frequently or always feel this way

1- My role tends to interfere with my family life.
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 above me.
4- My role has recently been reduced in importance.
5- My work load 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 the responsibilities in my role.
8- I have to do things, in my role, that are against my better judgment.
9- I am not clear on the scope and responsibilities of my role.
10- I do not get the information needed to carry out responsibilities assigned to me.
11- I have various other interests (social, religious, etc.) which remain neglected because I do not get time to attend to these.
12- I am too preoccupied with my present role responsibilities to be able to prepare for taking up higher responsibilities.
13- I am not able to satisfy the conflicting demands of my peers and juniors.
14- Many functions that should be a part of my role have been assigned to some other role.
15- The amount of work I have to do interfere with the quality I want to maintain.
16- There is not enough interaction 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 work with expect of me.
20- I do not get enough resources to be effective in my role.
21- My role does not allow me enough time for my family.
22- I do not have time and opportunities to prepare myself for the future challenges of my role.
23- I am not able to satisfy the demands of client and others, since these are conflicting with one another.
24- I would like to take on more responsibilities than I am handling at present.
25- I have been given too much responsibility.
26- I wish there was more consultation between my role and other roles.
27- I have not had the right training for my role.
28- The work I do in the organization is not related to my interests.
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 in my role.
33- The expectations of my seniors conflict with those of my juniors.
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 several roles (including mine) being involved in joint problem solving or collaboration for planning action.
37- I wish I had prepared myself well for my role.
38- If I had full freedom to define my role, I would be doing something differently from the way I do them now.
39- My role has not been defined clearly and in detail.
40- I am rather worried that I lack the necessary facilities needed in my role.
41- My family and friends complaint that I do not spend time with them due to the heavy demands 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 task to do.
45- I feel overburdened in my role.
46- Even when I take the initiative for discussion or help, there is not much response from the other roles.
47- I need more training and preparation to be effective in my role.
48- I experience a conflict between my values and what I have to do in my role.
49- I am not clear what the priorities are in my role.
50- I wish I had more financial resources for the work assigned to me.
## RESPONSE SHEET FOR ORS SCALE

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Please indicate how satisfied you are with the following by using appropriate rating scale.

2. Very Dissatisfied
3. Dissatisfied
4. Neutral
5. Satisfied
6. Very Satisfied

1- Physical work condition.
2- The freedom to choose your own method of working.
3- Your fellow worker.
4- The recognition you get from good work.
5- Your immediate boss.
6- Amount of responsibility you are given.
7- Opportunity to use your abilities.
8- Industrial relations with management and workers.
9- Your rate of pay.
10- Your chance of promotion.
11- The way your firm is managed.
12- The attention paid to suggestions you made.
13- Your hours of work.
14- The amount of variety in your job.
15- Your job security.
16- Opportunity to help others with personal problems at work.
17- Chance to learn new things.
18- Power and prestige in the job.
19- Opportunity to make decisions.
20- Opportunity to achieve something worthwhile.