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Abstract
Keeping in mind the need of the hours, the present research is framed as, “Impact of Quality of Working Life and Role Stress on Perceived Organizational Commitment and Psychological Well-Being among Various Levels Bank Managers”. It incorporates four important variables, namely, quality of working life (QWL), role stress (RS), perceived organizational commitment (OC) and psychological well-being (PWB).

The present investigation is systematically designed in accordance with the aims and objectives. Generally it assumes significance as related to quality of working life; stress arising out of the role played by an employee in the organization (bank); perceived commitment to the organization in which the employee works and psychological well-being of the bank managers and such other aspects of organizational behaviour. But, specifically, the study aims at relational comparisons of the scale one; scale two and scale three bank managers of the central Indian state of Madhya Pradesh and the north Indian state of Uttar Pradesh respectively.

Keeping in view the problem of the present investigation, the random sampling technique was applied for data collection. The sample comprised of 300 subjects of bank managers in all. 150 bank managers have been selected from the state of MP and 150 bank managers have been selected from the state of UP. Later on each state’s bank managers had been divided into three groups, namely, scale one bank managers; scale two bank managers and scale three bank managers respectively, with 50 bank managers of each scale.

In all eleven comparison groups have been formulated. Likewise the results are divided into twelve different parts. Altogether 160 null hypotheses have been formed, and each of the hypotheses is tested to meet out the objectives of the research.

Various tools which have been used for gathering the information are valid and reliable. Quality of Working Life Scale developed and standardized by Shawkat and Ansari (2000) has been used. It is a five point scale with 48 items divided among 17 dimensions, and its range is from 48 to 240. Role Stress scale developed and standardized by Pareek (1977) has been used. It is a five point scale with 21 items divided among 10 dimensions, and its range is from 21 to 105. Further for measuring the dependent variable Organizational Commitment Scale developed and standardized by Shawkat and Ansari (2000) has been used. It is a seven point scale with 15 items divided among 3 dimensions, and its range is from 15 to 105. The last scale is Psychological Well-Being Scale developed and standardized by Nishizawa (1996) has been used. It is a five point scale with 40 items divided among 8 dimensions, and its range is from 40 to 200. All the scales have been individually administered upon the respondents. Scoring has been done separately as instructed by the authors. Finally, stepwise multiple regression and t-test have been applied to analyze the data.
The major findings of the results show-

- Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Role stress influenced psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
- Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
- Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
- Role stress influenced psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
- Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
- Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
- Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
- Role stress influenced psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
- Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale one bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale one bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale one bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale one bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale two bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale two bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale two bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale two bank managers of MP and UP states.
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- Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale three bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale three bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale three bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale three bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale one bank managers of MP state.
- Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale one bank managers of MP state.
- Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale one bank managers of MP state.
- Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale one bank managers of MP state.
- Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale two bank managers of MP state.
- Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale two bank managers of MP state.
- Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale two bank managers of MP state.
- Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale two bank managers of MP state.
- Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale three bank managers of MP state.
- Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale three bank managers of MP state.
- Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale three bank managers of MP state.
- Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale three bank managers of MP state.
- Quality of working life had not influenced psychological well-being among scale one bank managers of UP state.
- Role stress had not influenced psychological well-being among scale one bank managers of UP state.
- Quality of working life had not influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale two bank managers of UP state.
• Role stress had not influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale two bank managers of UP state.
• Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale two bank managers of UP state.
• Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale two bank managers of UP state.
• Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale three bank managers of UP state.
• Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale three bank managers of UP state.
• Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale three bank managers of UP state.
• Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale three bank managers of UP state.

Further the results of t-test show-

• Mean scores of role stress among overall various levels of bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among overall various levels of bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.
• Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life difference between them is highly significant. There is a significant difference between them.
• Mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.
• Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.
• Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.
• Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.
• Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.
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- Mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.
- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.
- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.
- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.
- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.
- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.
- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.
- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.
- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.
- Mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.
- Mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.
- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.
- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.
organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.
among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

Recommendations

It is a universally known fact that research in any discipline and especially in social sciences is a never ending effort. Similarly any study cannot be free from criticism from varied sides. Researches in psychology focuses on few problem areas, and during the processing of the investigation the researcher comes to know about the novel areas which were unknown during starting the particular study. Each and every research scholar is enthusiastic and is inclined to pursue research which is comprehensive and enduring. However in due process of completion of research, many hurdles and shortcomings pass by the researcher. In a long time period of completing the thesis and thus achieving the desired goal, the investigator has to keep on working by ignoring some important variables because of paucity of time; financial constraints etc. Sometimes the respondents are not available; the other time they may not have the time to answer the investigator’s questions and so on and so forth. As all these unavoidable hindrances accompany a researcher all through the research, many variables in the psychological researches remains unexplored.

By keeping in mind the limitations of the present study, it is suggested that an otherwise extensive plan of study is required to conduct the underlying study on the samples drawn from various other banking organizations like multi-national banks; cooperative banks; lead banks; regional rural banks (RRBs) and private banks may yield fruitful and varied results. Further it is also suggested that this type of research can be replicated on the samples of groups of employees working in some organizations other than banking organizations like railways, educational institutes; medical professionals; government employees of various departments like PHE; PWD; EBS may also be considered to be the source of sample. It would be suggested to use much larger samples. On the contrary, inversion of the dependent and independent variables of the study as-well-as inclusion and seclusion of one or more variables for the study may lead to varied and substantial results. The study can be transformed into a cross-cultural study.
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Chapter One

Introduction
INTRODUCTION

Human-beings are basically psychosomatic entities. They join organizations, in their capacities to satisfy their economic, social and psychological needs. In any organization an employee has to adhere to the given quality of working life and play pre formatted prescribed roles. However, being humans, their nature changes from person to person, and it becomes impossible to satisfy oneself and at the same time others too, in all the walks of life. As a result, role stress arises and an employee becomes psychologically unwell. This in turn lowers down the organizational commitment of the employees which hampers the progress, productivity and profitability of the organization. All such problems and confusions may be unlocked by the master key of proper quality of working life.

Hence, by keeping in view the need of the hours, in the present investigation, we have incorporated the interactions of all these vital phenomenon of organizational behaviour, in the form of variables of study. The present research is framed as, "Impact of Quality of Working Life and Role Stress on Perceived Organizational Commitment and Psychological Well-Being among Various Levels Bank Managers". It includes four research variables, namely, Quality of Working Life (QWL), Role Stress (RS), Perceived Organizational Commitment (OC) and Psychological Well-Being (PWB). Former two variables are the independent variables, whereas the latter two variables are the dependent variables.

QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE

Quality of Working Life (QWL) has emerged as a potent factor in recent past, throughout the developing economies in the entire world. In a noble and culture specific country like India, its scope seems to be much brighter than many labour legislations, enacted to protect the cause of workers.

Freedom to decide means freedom to think. This is the basic notion behind the humanitarian movement, and the same became the very concept of QWL movement (improvement). QWL is so vital that, it has emerged as an inevitable and crucial tool for both, the employers, as well as the employees. It is essential for employees as, a substantial part of their lives is spent on the job, making QWL to have a bearing upon the quality of their lives. Similarly, QWL is required for employers, as it is instrumental in achieving organizational goals.

The term QWL was introduced by Hoppock in 1935. Conceptually, it is an admixture of all efforts for enhancing motivation and satisfaction at work, with respect to its (work's) humanitarian aspects. Motivation and satisfaction
are the keys to ensure good behaviour on the job. This can be internally done by improving QWL. Employees are the backbone of any organization. So, a good QWL is required for a healthy mind and sound body, fair working methods, high efficiency of employees on one hand, and production and profit on the other.

Before moving further and actually defining and learning the concept of QWL, let us go through its brief history. Thus, we will be able to examine it in a better and analytical manner. Initially, Taylorism, Hawthorne studies, Mayo’s experiments sowed the seeds of QWL movement. QWL proved to be an eye-opener to the inhuman working environment of Pre-Industrial Revolution. Before the onset of the so called humanitarian movement, there were no policies, programmes, rules and regulations pertaining to working conditions. Awareness came after 1750, in England. QWL approach was a pioneer of potential quality of life improvement. It was more than a sheer work-organizations movement, which focuses on job-security and economic growth of employees.

Path breaker in the arena of QWL improvement was Taylor’s book, “The Principles of Scientific Management”, which was published in 1911. In this work of Taylor, he elaborated concepts of scientific management, which may be termed as, fore-runners of QWL concepts. They may be put into words as-

- Separation of planning from doing
- Functional foremanship of supervision, having eight different supervisors to give instructions in their respective fields
- Job-analysis based on time, motion and fatigue studies, to determine fair amount of work
- Standardization of tools, period of work, working conditions and cost of production
- Scientific selection and training of workmen
- Financial incentives to motivate workmen

Historically, the concept of QWL also included wages (Lawler 1968; Seashore and Barnowe, 1972; Pierce and Danham, 1976), working hours and working conditions (West, 1969; Ganguli and Joseph, 1969; Davis, 1971; Jhonsen, 1975). Thus, after examining the concept and history of QWL we can say that QWL is a relatively naive term for a bundle of old issues. It has long been of interest to philosophers, theologicians, social scientists, workers and employers. It’s a broad term that can embrace every conceivable aspect of work ethics and working conditions, workers expression of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, managerial concerns about efficiency of outputs. QWL broadens consideration of social cohesion and stability. All thus can be made
more clear by going through various definitions of QWL, stated by different experts and scholars of the field. They are as follows-

Benium (1974) has defined QWL in terms of quality of relationship between man and his task.

Ketzell and Yankelovich (1975) defined QWL as, “an individual’s evaluation of the outcomes of the work relationship. They observed and witnessed that a worker can enjoy a good QWL when- firstly, job incumbents have positive feelings towards his/her job and its future prospects. Secondly, is motivated to stay on the job and perform well. Thirdly, when he or she experiences and feels working life quite benefitting with his or her private life.

Spink (1975) defined QWL as the degree of excellence in work and working conditions, which contribute to overall satisfaction of individual and enhances the individual, as well as organizational effectiveness.

Trist (1975) stated that QWL is both means and end. It is an end in itself because it is highly significant component in quality of life in general and it is a means by which the employee can acquire civic competencies and skills.

Walton (1975) stated that QWL is the degree to which members of work organization perceive that they are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experiences in organization.

Hackman and Suttle (1977) made concerted efforts to define QWL in a broad sense, encompassing professional viewpoint. QWL refers to industrial democracy; high worker’s participation in corporate decision making or a culmination of the goals of human-relations. From management’s perspective QWL relates to a variety of efforts to improve productivity by improving human potentials and skills, rather than capital or technical inputs of production. From individual worker’s viewpoint, it refers to the degree to which he is able to satisfy important and personal needs through his experience in organization. From union’s perspective, it is high equitable sharing of income and resources of the work organization, and more humane to heal their working conditions. In philosophy, it means quality of content of relationship between man and his task in all its diversity. Relationships can be approached from the divergent viewpoint including man, organization and his society; embracing job-design; work organization; basic human needs and values and social concepts.

Lippit (1977) thought QWL as, “the degree to which work provides an opportunity for an individual to satisfy a wide variety of personal needs to survive with some security, to interact with others, to have a sense of personal
usefulness, to be recognized for achievements and to have an opportunity to improve one's skills and knowledge. Here Lippit covered the whole gamut of work life which may increase organizational effectiveness.

Cherns (1978) considered QWL as an area emphasizing to humanization of work place, work place democracy, work restructuring or job-design. His contention to view the concept of QWL seems to be an inspiration taken from movement started by Elton Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson in 1930's, which is called 'Human Relation Movement', an employee oriented approach and humanization of the job.

Cohen and Rosenthal (1980) viewed QWL as an internationally designed effort to bring about increased labour management cooperation to jointly solve the problem of improving organizational performance and employee's satisfaction.

Carlson (1980) stated that QWL is both a goal and an ongoing process for achieving goal. As a goal, QWL is commitment of any organization to work for improvement, the creation of high involvement, satisfaction and effective job and work environment for people at all levels of organization. As a process, QWL calls for efforts to realize goals through active involvement of people in achievement of organizational goals. Improvement in technology, information system, educational levels, affluence and independence lead to general life-satisfaction and some to lead to improve QWL.

Bhardwaj (1983) referred QWL as related to firstly, job satisfaction humanizing work or individualizing the organization and secondly, organizational development programmes.

Nurick (1985) views QWL as a set of firstly, philosophy with underlying values and assumptions; secondly, structure and method for organizational change; thirdly, human process as operating as operation of a planned change and fourthly, outcomes that can be monitored and assessed.

Dubey et al. (1988) were of the view that the term quality of life tends to cover a variety of areas such as physical, mental, psychological, social and spiritual well-being, personal functioning and general limitations. Quality of life means degree of excellence of one's life that contributes to the person and benefits to society at large.

Davis (1995) opined that QWL is quality of relationship between employees and the total work environment.
Gani and Ahmad (1995) said that the term QWL may be conceptualized as a subset of quality of life which includes all life and living conditions.

Yousuf (1996) emphasized that QWL is a generic phase that covers a person’s feelings about every dimension of work including economic rewards, benefits, security, working conditions, organizational and inter-personal relations and their intrinsic measuring.

With the growing importance and popularity of QWL, the American Society of Training and Development established a task force on QWL in 1979 and defined QWL as, “a process of work organizations which enables its members at all levels to actively participate in shaping organizational environment, methods and outcomes. This value based process is aimed towards meeting twin goals, that is, enhanced effectiveness of organization and improved QWL for employees”, (Skrovan, 1980). This clearly indicates the objectives of QWL programmes at work.

QWL is a highly complex and multi-faceted concept implying a deeper concern for the members of an organization, irrespective of the level to which they belong. Nadler and Lawler (1983) after reviewing the literature in the field of QWL concluded that the definition of QWL underwent several changes and modifications with respect to its conceptual understanding. They categorized six significant definitions of the concept, which were modified through various stages depending upon the type of work environments. The stages are mentioned here under –

First stage (1959-1972): during this period QWL was conceived as a ‘variable’. Therefore, the emphasis was on individual worker’s reaction to personal consequences of work, experienced as job-satisfaction, job-motivation, mental health etc.

Second stage (1972-1979): here QWL was defined as an ‘approach’. It laid emphasis on individual worker and neglected the organizational outcomes. To this study, this definition seems to be incomplete as for overall organizational productive efficiency, both individual worker’s state of living as well as, organizational outcomes are equally important; hence, both should be equally taken care of.

Third stage (1979-1984): during this stage, a third view of QWL came out, according to which QWL was defined as ‘methods.’ This approach of QWL focused it as a set of methods, approaches or technologies for enhancing the work environment. All this is to make QWL as a highly productive and satisfying concept.
After examining these stages of QWL, it can be made clear that QWL engulfs the whole aspect of work environment. This work environment may affect quality of life of individual worker in jobs. Nadler and Lawler (1983) stated that QWL is a way of thinking about people, work and organizations. This makes clear the managerial functions of QWL. That is to say, QWL not only focuses on how people can do work better but also on how work may lead people to spend a better life.

In the context to types of definitions of QWL; here it is worth to mention the views of a renowned Indian scholar Reddy (1985). He very beautifully analyzed QWL concept across cultures and nations and presented a colourful opinion regarding QWL. The cross-cultural psychological attitude of Reddy is ‘hat, QWL is ‘work-redesigning’ in UK; ‘humanization of work programme’ in West Germany; and for the Japanese it is, ‘improving quality of products.’

During the last decade, there has been great progression in field of QWL. It started being associated with quality circle movements in large way. Japanese introduced the movement for the first time, in their industries. With the passage of time the Quality Circle Movement (QCM) started dominating European world too. Quality initially enhanced employee participation, which leads to valued outcomes (Mohram and Novelli, 1985; Balance, 1984). Quality circles, when extended at a greater parlance, it aims at humanization of work culture. This contributes towards improving quality of life of employees at work. So, we can conclude that QWL is studied in relation to job satisfaction across managerial levels, organizational climate, as well as cultural differences causing QWL. Likewise Hartenstein et al. (1984) emphasized that for QWL measures to be successful, management and labour must share their values. In absence of such values, often managers turn into authoritarian leaders. They deny their employees involvement, responsibility and autonomy. All such things lead to lack of competition and decrease in productivity.

We may infer from the aforementioned details that QWL touches many aspects of organizational behaviour. So, the researchers of this field identified its various dimensions. Some of them are summarized here under-

Walton (1975) identified eight dimensions of QWL. They are-

- Adequate and fair compensation
- Safe and healthy working conditions
- Development of human capacities
- Growth and security
- Social integration in work organization
• Constitutionalisation in work organization
• Work and total life space, and
• Social relevance of work life

Boiswert (1977) gave fifteen dimensions and Carlson (1978) stated sixteen dimension of QWL. With their seventeen dimensions Sinha and Sayeed (1980), developed a scale of QWL. Their dimensions are:

• Economic benefits
• Physical working conditions
• Career-orientation
• Advancement on merit
• Effect on personal life
• Mental state
• Union-management relations
• Self-respect
• Supervisory relationship
• Intra-group relationship
• Apathy
• Confidence in management
• Meaningful development
• Control influence and participation
• Employee commitment
• General life satisfaction and
• Organizational climate

Rosow (1981) gave eleven dimensions of QWL. They are:

• Pay
• Employee-benefit
• Job-security
• Alternative work schedule
• Job-stress
• Participation in decision-making
• Democracy in work-place
• Profit-sharing
• Pension right
• Company programmes designed to enhance worker welfare
• Four days work a week
Takezwa (1984) elaborately enlisted the dimensions of QWL as-

- Occupational safety and health
- Working hours
- Job-security
- Fair treatment at work
- Influence on decision-making
- Opportunity for advancement
- Worker's representation at company's board-meetings etc.

Recently, Heizel et al. (1993) proposed four dimensions of QWL as –

- Growth
- Mastery
- Involvement
- Self-control

It can be stated that QWL is an old wine in a new bottle. Improvement of QWL or the QWL-movement in itself is not a new approach. Many early concepts like job-enrichment, job-design, organizational structures, modes of communication, leadership behaviour were used to enhance the morale and motivation of human resources at work. They along with human needs gave rise to the very concept of QWL. It was very late, in 1972, Davis formally coined the term, "Quality of work life", in his paper presented at an international conference at Arden House, New York.

The decade of 1970s realized that, the whole structure of workplace based on socio-technical principles and the organization of work is necessary to meet the changing expectation of employees and to increase productivity. It was also to improve QWL (Walton, 1972; Thorsund, 1970; Anderson, 1975; Griffeth, 1985). Last decade proved to be a revolutionary one for the growth and development of QWL. Many studies were conducted on it, and aspects related to it.

Need of the hour is to recognize the problems created by activities of QWL, for professional roles of middle managers. QWL may indicate the problems faced by middle management, for example, inadequate recognition at work, lack of influence, hectic workplace etc. (Schlesings and Oshry, 1984). Hence, it is beneficial to create a balance between organizational change adopted as a part of QWL and the existing and practical organizational structure and system, as things can not change overnight. It is the responsibility of the management to provide means to middle-management for discussion, concerns, and problem-sharing and also for problem-solving, developing
skills for organization and so on and so forth. Hence, QWL actions should be implemented by neutralizing its ill effects and after eradicating their drawbacks.

ROLE STRESS

Role stress is a highly charged concept of organizational psychology. Both positive as well as negative implications are attached to it. It may be positive, for example as an opportunity or negative, for example in context of new demands and commitments. It is an evil monster who has gripped fast developing nations. Its encroachment is so much, that it has proceeded to grow as water-hyacinth and suffocated those who are serving human organizations.

Present industrial world is full of materialistic race. To cope up with cut throat competition of globalization, Indian organizations have to upgrade themselves. Thus, it can be concluded that life in complex industrial organizations can be a great source of stress (Cooper and Marshall, 1978). Stress in work environment has gained impetus over the years.

One of the major sources of organizational stress is work role or the role assigned to an employee, in an organization. This is so, as the very nature of role has an inbuilt potential for stress. Work roles may create stress as they are in conflict with each other, or with the needs, values abilities and potentials of employees. Role stress may also occur as, even though people occupy identical positions, they differ in their abilities, motives, need and above all their personality. Before literally understanding the real concept of role-stress, let us split it into two individual words, ‘role’ and ‘stress’, analyze their meaning and implications, and then enter into actual concept of role stress.

Since times immemorial, stress has become an unwanted pal of mankind. The substantial difference between past and present day stress, is the context in which stress is interpreted across cultures. During ancient and medieval times, stress was due to unpredictable natural phenomenon, so old age was regarded as, “Age of Uncertainty” (Galbraith, 1997). Whereas, in present era, stress is a result of overdemands, thus this is considered to be “Age of Anxiety” (Albrecht, 1979).

‘Stringere’ is a Latin word from which the word ‘stress’ has been originated. Stringere, in Latin means, ‘to draw tight’. However, the word partially derives its origin from French word ‘estresse’ meaning ‘narrowness’. In physical sciences, stress is an exerted pressure, strain or force exerted upon any object, wherein the object tends to resist the force or strain to maintain its original
state. According to physiology, stress is the changes in the physiological functions in response to evocative agents.

The credit of introducing "stress" in Life Sciences goes to a Canadian researcher, Seyle. He in 1936 made stress a biological concept and explained it in terms of 'General Adaptation Syndrome' or GAS. GAS states that, there are three phases in response to stress. They are-

- Alarm
- Continuous resistance, and
- It may terminate with Exhaustion

These three changes are incorporated in physical and chemical changes, which prepare an individual to fight or flee. Stress is a universal phenomenon, and is experienced by almost all people, in all spheres of life. Here, we are concerned with stress as a concept of psychology and then its role played in carrying on a role, that is to say role-stress. Till 1960s stress was studied in physiology and other physical sciences only. It was only in late sixties that stress grabbed the attention of psychologist and sociologists. Since then it is studied in both disciplines, extensively (Agrawala, Mahajan and Singh, 1979).

Psychologically, stress is any external event or any internal drive which threatens to upset the organismic equilibrium (Seyle, 1956). Stress is a concept which is studied in all streams of the subjects, primarily being a part of physiological psychology. For them stress is that stimulus which imposes detectable strain that cannot be easily accommodated by body and so presents itself as impaired health and behaviour.

Discussing stress, that too in psychology is a real interesting subject matter. But here we will have to limit the widely studied concept to compartment of role-stress. Stress has far reaching effect on health, happiness and success as the working of any employee depends upon his adaptation to various stressful situations. In the parlance of management, stress may be defined as, any external, unexpected force or pressure that leads to increased role load and role conflict on the part of local person. Pestaonjee (1992) has given three sectors of life, in which stress originates. They are-

- Job and organization sector: This sector covers all aspects of work environment.
- Social-sector: Social and cultural factors like, caste, food habit, language etc are included in it.
- Intra-psychic sector: Factors of intimate and personal importance fall here. It may take into concept like attitudes, interest, health, temperament etc.
Stress may emerge from any of these sectors and factors or from a combination of all of these factors and sectors.

Before heading further, it becomes necessary to discuss the very concept of 'role' as, the concept of 'stress' has been described. Linguistically the word 'role' is enrooted in French word 'roule' meaning the role of paper on which an actor's part was written. In English too the word denotes more or less same meaning as a person's or things function in a particular situation. Organizations also follow the same meaning of the word role, with the change of its context. An employee of any organization may have to play varied roles. This may make him as a prey of stress, as role has an inbuilt potential for stress. Roles-stress can be experienced in any occupation. It is not the kind of occupation which gives birth to role-stress; rather, it's the transaction between job-environment and personal characteristics (Handy, 1988).

The role theory views person as an actor on social stage. It assumes behaviour to be shaped by logic of one's tasks and the social expectations as to what is the permissible range of proper behaviour. Thus, we can conclude that role theory gives primacy to technological and social factors in shaping of behaviour and also to internalized norms and values (Khandwalla, 1977). Role is the similarity in response of different individual to same situation (Pareek, 1981). It can also be defined as position of a person in a system (Pareek, 1976). Or to state more accurately role is the position one occupies in a social system, as defined by functions he/she performs in response to the expectations of the significant member of social system and his or her own expectations from that position or office (Pareek, 1983).

Kahn, Wolfe, Sno:skand and Rosenthal (1964) introduced the concept of role into organizational behaviour. It was formally done through publication of their work in form of a book entitled “Organizational Stress Studied in Role Conflict and Ambiguity” in the year 1964. They gave a role episode model in which a focal person and role senders (collectively termed as role set) interact cynically within a context influenced by organizational factors (for example infrastructure of an organization economic necessities etc) and personality factors (abilities, morals, motives, fears etc.) and interpersonal relations factors (influencing powers, dependence on others etc). The expectations of role senders regarding role performance take the form of 'role pressures'. These pressures are perceived and processed by focal person and act as role forces to influence focal person's behaviour in a manner according to or opposite to role sender's desires. They gave three separate dimensions of role related stress as-
• Role ambiguity
• Role conflict and
• Role overload

Both role conflict and role ambiguity were seen as having an objective or environmental component and a subjective or psychological component. Objective role construct refer to real evident situations in work environment and subjective role conflict and role ambiguity are internal states of focal person. This subjective parts of role conflict and role ambiguity may or may not correspond with their objective counterparts. All this depends upon the mediating influences of personality and inter-personal relations factors. Role overload is due to interaction of these two role overload: a set of obligations requiring the focal person to do more within a specified time limit, that is, role ambiguity, and role conflict.

Banton (1965) proposed three types of roles-

• Basic
• General and
• Independent

Mc Eachen (1958) defined and operationalized many role concepts. Pareek (1981) postulated a role-theory in which he projected role as a system; the system of various role an individual carries and performs; and system of various roles of which a person’s role is a part and in which the person’s role is defined by other significant roles. That is to say there are two aspects of role— the first is role set, and the second one is role space. Role set is the role system within the organization of which roles are and part and by which individual roles are defined. It is a pattern of inter-relationship between a role and other roles. So, role set leads to various expectations from an individual. When an individual is not able to come through according to expectations from him (or expectations from his role) here arise conflicts. These conflicts are of double nature. Firstly, they are between individual and his role-set expectations and secondly, they are between others and the individual (role-set). Collectively they are termed as “role-set conflicts”. Their various forms along with their descriptions are-

• Role ambiguity: experienced when there is lack of clarity about demands of the role.
• Role expectation: symbolizes conflicting demand made on the role by different persons (supervisors, subordinates and peers) in the organization.
• Role overload: is the feeling that too much is expected from the role than what the role player can cope with.
Role erosion: arises when a role has become less important than it used to be. It means that challenge associated with the role has somehow lessened.

Resource inadequacy: crops in when human or material resources allocated to role player are inadequate to meet demands of the role.

Personal inadequacy: is demonstrated by the absence of adequacy skills, competence and training to meet demands of one's role.

Role isolation: indicates absence of strong links of one's role with other roles in the organization.

Role space is a dynamic relationship between, self and various roles. Self is the experience of identity arising from a person's interaction with the external reality things, person and systems various roles are played by a person which are centered on self and interactions with others. This forms role space. It is the dynamic relationship among various roles an individual occupies and his self. It has three main variables. They are- self, role under question, and other role focal person occupies or plays. Any conflict among these three variables of role space is referred to as role space conflict or "stress". They may be of various types, such as-

- Inter-role distance: a conflict between organizational and non-organizational roles e.g. role of a lecturer versus role of a daughter.
- Self-role distance: arises due to a space or gap experienced between one's concept of self and demands of the role.
- Role stagnation: refers to the feeling of being in the same role, which may lead to lessening of opportunities for growth and learning.

By far we have analyzed and described the concept of stress and role. Now it is high time to study about role-stress as a major organizational stressor of organizational settings.

An organization consists of four interacting subsystems namely, people, structure, technology and environment. All these systems work together to achieve desired common goals. An organization can also be viewed as a system of roles. Role is the channel through which an employee gets integrated into an organization. Among other organizational variables employee's job roles have been found to be major occupational stressor. In a formal organizational setting, a role can be defined in terms of job-description, job-specification and by organizational-structure (Francis and Milbourn, 1980). The success of any role play depends upon the extent to which the focal person's expectations and organizational expectations tally each other.

Fulfillment of needs depends on the success of complex roles played by people in society as well as work place. The interaction of one's personality, roles and society helps in to attain satisfaction. Satisfaction may be full;
Chapter I Introduction

partial or negative, that is, dissatisfaction. The needs, abilities, values of the role player may be in contrast to his or her role. This feeling gives rise to role stress. Non-work roles may also affect job stresses and its correlated domains like job-satisfaction (Cooper and Payne, 1990). The pressure from work or family may heighten conflict between work and family roles (Greenhaus and Beutall, 1982). They gave three ways which gives rise to role pressure or role stress-

- Time spent in one role may give little time to denote to other roles,
- Strain within one role domain may “spill over” into another one,
- Behaviour appropriate to one role may be dysfunctional in another.

The enactment of an organizational role by an individual is an inter-action and partial overlap of two separate systems, the person system and organizational system overlap occurs in certain cycles of behaviour that are shared in time and space. They are identical for person and organization. These overlapping cycles contributes to organizational effectiveness. The effectiveness of work is affected by the assumption that how much role stress individuals perceive.

There are many extrinsic and intrinsic factors, which gives rise to role stress. (Malik and Sabharwal, 1999).

Organizations are major sources of role stress. People from various walks of life, with different capacities join an organization and perform diverse tasks to achieve a common goal. All this hinders one’s freedom as employees have to follow rules and regulations within an organization. This leads him or her to stress. Since various stressors are found in organizations there have been efforts by researchers to identify and classify these stressors. One of such classification was proposed by Cooper and Marshall (1976, 1978) described seven categories of stressors which serve as a basis of occupational stress. They can be described as-

1. **Intrinsic to job**
   - Too much/too little work
   - Poor physical working conditions
   - Time pressure
   - Decision-making etc.

2. **Role in Organization**
   - Role conflict/ambiguity
   - Responsibility for people
   - No participation in decision-making etc.

3. **Career Development**
   - Under promotion/Over promotion
   - Lack of job security
• Thwarted ambition etc.

4. Organizational Interface
  • Company Vs. family demands
  • Company Vs. own interests etc.

5. Organizational Structure and Climate
  • Lack of effective consultation
  • Restriction on behavior
  • Office policies etc.

6. Relations within Organizations
  • Poor relations with boss
  • Poor relations with colleagues and subordinates
  • Difficulty in delegating responsibility etc.

7. Individual Manager
  • Personality
  • Tolerance for ambiguity
  • Ability to cope with change
  • Motivation
  • Behavioural pattern

Few and Bruning (1987) has identified six categories of stressors which serve as a basis of occupational stress. They may be described as-

- Task demands: they are related with different aspects of a person’s job. e.g. autonomy, computerization, task variety, physical working conditions and interdependence of different tasks. High temperature, intense noise, over-crowding and frequent interruptions may arouse level of anxiety.
- Interpersonal demands: poor social support from peers, inadequate interpersonal relationships and undue pressure created by one employee or other.
- Role demands: forces exerted on a person by particular role the person performs in the organization. They are-
  - Role conflict: expectations from an employee, which he is unable to fulfill.
  - Role overload: is to perform more on the job, than specified permitted time.

Role ambiguity: role of an employee, not clearly defined.
- Organization structure: job hierarchies, rules and regulations, company’s policies and lack of industrial democracy in organization.
- Organizational leadership: factors emerging from functions of top officials. Their working style may lead to fear, depression or anxiety. It can
also impose unrealistic pressures on employee by exercising tight control and frequent punishments.

- Organization's life stage: establishment, growth, maturity, declining stage poses many kinds of problems for employees. Out of them establishment and declining stage are highly stressful. Establishment leads to excitement; uncertainty and declining stage brings in downsizing, layoffs and varied uncertainties.

The research area of occupational stress has been widely studied. Schuler (1980) and Steers (1981) pointed out that stress causes absence from job and effects turnover. Role stress arises due to organizational climate and structure. It is a result of physical working conditions, while work stress is experienced during work performance of employees.

Other side of role stress can be its inter- organizational context. Role stress may occur not only during job but also outside the organization. It may arise in the interaction with family or other socio-cultural situations too (Vachom, 1987). Women experience more role-stress as compared to men (Sen, 1981). Stress at work may affect individual at home and in society too (Cooper, 1981).

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Attraction, attachment, dedication, loyalty and support towards one's organization are the simplest words to explain organizational commitment. Commitment represents everything beyond negative attraction and attachment; inverse dedication; passive loyalty and support. It is an active involvement with the organization where employees' nurtures true relationships with the organization per se, and willingly give their best to organizations, in order to help their organization prosper and succeed, in each and every possible way.

Organizational Commitment is a recent addition to organizational behaviour's literature. Becker's (1960) "side-bet" concept was the first source of defining the term commitment, in organizational psychology. He analyzed that the concept enjoyed wide usage with little formal analysis or concrete theoretical reasoning. Becker (1960) defined commitment involving "consistent lines of actions" in behaviour that are produced by side-bets. Side-bets link extraneous interests with a consistent line of activity. These side-bets can be lost, if activity is discontinued. Whyte (1950) gave the concept of "The Organization Man". This refers to one's over commitment to the organization. For him, his 'organization man' is a person who works for the organization and posses a feeling of psycho-belongingness towards the same.
Hall et al. (1970) considered commitment as the process by which the goals of organization and of individual becomes increasingly integrated or congruent. However Sheldon (1971) stated that commitment is an attitude or an orientation towards the organization which links or attaches identity of a person to his organization. Porter et al. (1976) opined that commitment is the strength of one’s identification with job and involvement in particular organization, hence, characterized by one’s willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of organization and a desire to maintain their membership in it. They perceived commitment as a highly active and positive orientation towards the organization.

Organizational commitment is a universal phenomenon. It is an affect of working condition and organizational climate, other than employee’s work related attitude and behaviour per se. Modway et al. (1979) defined organizational commitment in terms of three factors. They were-

- A strong belief in acceptance of goals and values of organization.
- Readiness to exert considerable effort on behalf of organization.
- A strong desire to remain member of organization.

These factors refer to behavioural dimension to evaluate employee’s strength of attachment (Welsh and La Van, 1981; Morrow, 1983). More analytically, organizational commitment is a state in which an employee identifies with a particular organization, its goals and wishes to maintain membership in the organization (Blau and Boal, 1987). Similarly, organizational commitment is an acceptance of organizational goals and values, willingness to retain membership in the organization (Balaji, 1992). It is also viewed as an employee’s loyalty to the employer (Kin et al, 1996). Mottaz (1998) viewed commitment in terms of attitude. He called it an effective response resulting from an evaluation of the work situation, which links or attaches the individual to the organization. Venkatachalam (1998) talked about organizational commitment as taking on the organizational identity.

Organizational commitment is to identify with one’s employing organization. So, it is the relative strength of an individual’s identification with the involvement in a particular organization (Mishra and Srivastava, 2001). Whatever may be the words to describe organizational commitment, they measure a common concept. That is to say all of them indicate organizational commitment to be a bond on link of an individual to the organization. It’s a process through which employees of any organization identifies and hence makes organizational goal as their personal goals. They are desirous of maintaining membership in the organization (Salanick, 1977).
March and Simon (1958) interpreted that real commitment creates an exchangeable relationship in which employees attach themselves to the organization in lieu of rewards or outcomes. The employees who are truly committed to the goals and values of an organization are more likely to participate on organizational activities.

After discussing a lot on organizational commitment, it becomes necessary to discuss about its types, at length. Etzioni (1961) was the first to develop a typology of organizational commitment. The basic notion behind evolving these types was that power or authority that organization’s deliver over their employees is enrooted in the nature of employee’s involvement in the organization. It can be put into words as-

- **Moral involvement**: it refers to positive and highly intense orientation towards organization, based on internalization of organizational goals and values or identification with authority.
- **Calculative involvement**: it is a less intense relationship with the organization and is largely based on rational exchange of benefits and rewards.
- **Alienative involvement**: here, least involvement with the organization is seen. Coercion plays a vital role in this type.

Here, Etzioni gave primary control mechanism. They are often used to have compliance with organizational directives.

Second typology was presented by Kanter (1968). He suggested his categories on the basis of social values. According to him, the three forms of commitment are-

- **Continuance commitment**: this refers to an employee’s dedication to the survival of the organization.
- **Cohesion commitment**: it is the attachment of the social relationship in organizational context. This is brought by public renunciation, of previous social bonds or through employing in various social functions.
- **Control commitment**: in this type, the individual’s attachment to his organizational norms can be viewed. This norm shape behaviour of individual in desired directions or may develop employee’s pro-activity, conducive to organizational objectives.

Organizational commitment is a powerful tool, which can be used as an aid to achieve high level of performance. It can also be used to develop and maintain discipline in the organization (Sheldon, 1971). Most recently Meyer and Allen (1991) developed a framework of commitment based on three components. The components can be analyzed as-
• Affective commitment: employee’s emotional attachment to the identification with and involvement in the organization.
• Continuance commitment: an awareness of cost associated with leaving the organization, and
• Normative commitment: a feeling of obligation to continue with the associated organization.

Meyer et al. (1993) found out that job-status was positively related to affective and normative commitment, and negatively related to continuance occupational commitment.

Organizational commitment is concerned with psychological attachment to the organization that keeps the employees to have difficulty in isolating themselves from organization. The three parts of organizational commitment, which draw back an employee, to quit the organization are-

• Goals and values agreement.
• Behavioural investments in an organizational desire to retain organizational membership. There are many instances where organization requires individual employee, specialized in those critical position, to perform above and beyond the call of duty for the benefit of organization. Motivational basis for that ‘extra-role behaviour’ likely require more than simple compliance. The true antecedents of organizational commitment can be categorized into four categories, as, personal characteristics; role related variables; work experience and structural characteristics.

All of these categories have an impact on subjective utility of organizational membership, which directly have a bearing upon different levels of commitment (Modway et al., 1982). Stevens et al. (1978) gave different approaches to organizational commitment. He grouped various facets the concept and suggest its two types-

• Exchange approaches: over here, commitment is an outcome of inducement or contribution transaction between organization and the employee. This is with an explicit instrumentality of membership (in the organization) primary determinant of membership of members, irrespective of gain or loss in the process of exchange. The higher the favourability of exchange from member’s perspective, the higher will be his/her commitment to the organization.
• Psychological approach: this approach was the real idea of studies of Porter et al. (1976). According to psychological approach, organizational commitment is more active and positive orientation towards the organization. The employee wishfully keeps himself or herself committed
to organizational goals. Thus, as a consequence, it becomes more or less
difficult for the employee to quit his/her organization.

Steers (1977) developed a framework giving antecedents and outcomes of
commitment. He divided them into three groups, based on variables which
influenced commitment. They are-

- Personal characteristics or attachments: age, education, need for
  achievement and work experience are few variables describing personal
  characteristics.
- Work experience: refers to varied socializing forces which have an impact
  on attachment with one’s organization. It signifies experiences, attitudes of
  individuals as well as of groups towards their respective organizations.
- Job-characteristics: job challenges, opportunities for social interaction,
  feedback are the determinants, which explain this category.

Following the same line of explanation Becker (1992) suggested additional
support and multiple constituency approach to describe organizational
commitment. He demonstrated that employee’s commitment to top
management, supervisors and work itself contributed in an important manner,
more than the organization itself for determining job-satisfaction and job-
quitting. Also they predict the pro-social and organizational behaviour.
Further Becker and Billings (1993) suggest four dominant profiles to identify
commitment to various constituencies in the organization. They were-

- Locally committed: that is, attitude towards supervisor and work group.
- Globally committed: that is, attitude towards management and organization.
- Committed: that is, locally and globally committed and finally
- The uncommitted: neither locally nor globally committed.

Brown (1969) suggested three significant facets of commitment as-

- Notion of membership.
- Current position of individual
- Predictive potential concerning certain aspects of performance, motivation
to work, spontaneous contribution and other related outputs.

Interestingly, organizational commitment is also viewed as a process of
identification with the goals of organization’s various departments. This also
includes its human resources, their top management and also their customers,
at large. Here goals and values are focal pivot of commitment. This
description of organizational commitment realistically reflects the nature of
employee’s attachment with the organization (Rechiers, 1985). An
employee's psychological attitude toward his or her organization presents a variety of three major psychological foundations. They can be categorized as-

- Compliance: compliance arises when attitudes and behaviour are adopted for gaining rewards, not for sharing benefits.
- Identification: it occurs when an individual willingly get influenced by a relationship, in order to be proud of the accepted relation. This is like adoption of values of a group, without really adhering to them as their own.
- Internalization: here influence is adopted due to the induced attitude and behaviour, which are like one's own values. The values of group and organization are one and the same (O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986).

Organizational commitment has always been the backbone of any organization. Its spirit is vital for the survival of any organizational set-up. Its importance has heightened due to present pace of development in the world. It has become a great concern for both, the employers as well as the employees. Organizational commitment has thus become most studied work related behavioural phenomenon, which directly or indirectly influences productivity and effectiveness, positively.

**PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING**

Psychological well-being is not a new concept for human race. Psychological well-being fathers happiness for mankind. The concept of well-being is as old as human civilization, yet its relevance in present age is as novel as a nascent child. Psychological well-being or subjective well-being deals with people's feelings in their day to day life (Bradburn, 1969; Campbell, 1976; Warr, 1978). These feelings may vary from negative ones (like anxiety, depression, dissatisfaction etc.) to positive ones (like elation, satisfaction etc).

Well-being is the opposite pole of depression (Joseph and Lewis, 1998). In psychology, the concept of psychological well-being or subjective well-being have started gaining impetus, recently more, due to hectic work schedules and metro lifestyle. All the researches in this field have paid good interesting results (Argyl, 1987; Diener, 1984 and 2000; Eysenck, 1990; Strack et al., 1991).

Before moving further, let us take a quick glimpse of historical antecedents of the concept of psychological well-being. Since times immemorial, psychological well-being is a part and parcel of man's lifestyle. Basically it was studied in philosophy, under the name of 'Eudoemonics'. This can be clearly studied in Aristotle's 'Ethica Nicomachea'. Later, with the sheer development of human race, socially, the compartmentalization or more
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precisely specialization began. This led to the concept of psychological well-being to creep into the discipline of psychology too. Since then, it has become a topic of psychology as well as philosophy and theology.

Theology deals with study of religion. Analyzing theologically the concept of well-being, one can conclude that by the grace of people's devote faith in the respective religion or religions, walking with love on the righteous path should lead to their true well-being or true worthiness of life (Nishizawa, 1998).

Buddhism preaches love and well-being for all that is not only for the believers of their faith, but also for the followers of other religions. Christianity's mission is to bring about true well-being from mankind. Hinduism starts with “Sarve Bhavantu Sukhin” (let all enjoy well-being). Geeta claims well-being to be most important feature of life. This well-being can be attained by emancipation from anxiety producing fixations and attachments.

In Islam, the holy Quran states “Saber Tawakkul” that is to have patience and to have faith in God. It implies that having faith in God and observing patience leads to real well-being.

Well-being is an admixture of affective, cognitive and somatic state of affairs. It presents an overall view of subjective well-being (Joseph and Lewis, 1998). It also includes motivational experiences of life with subjective feeling of satisfaction. Terms like happiness, hope, positive mental health, quality of life, optimism or satisfaction are invariably used as synonyms of well-being. Happiness and satisfaction are the steps to the goal of well-being. They involve multiple life situations as belongingness, creativity, education, familial responsibilities, financial complexities, health (all mental, physical and social health), matrimony, opportunities self-esteem and trust in others. Satisfaction is an over whelming term which goes beyond the context of well-being. Restoration, homeostatic and drive reduction are its determinants. It is an experience unique to humans and is bombarded with values and morals.

Depression-Happiness is a measure of well-being. In over-viewing the concept, it was observed that well-being is the opposite pole of depression (Joseph and Lewis, 1998). Global measures of life situation can be influenced by mood at any given moment of time. This has an effect on well-being (Schwartz and Strack, 1999). However, situational factors fail, as compared to long term influences on well-being. Psychological well-being is also exhibited in socially desirable ways. On the other hand like its name, subjective well-being is a subjective experience (Eid and Diener, 1999). Well-being is also related to the constructs of hope, efficacy and optimism. Hope includes both
will and ways, optimism denotes general expectancy that one will experience 
good outcome in life. It does not imply the specification of agency through 
which good outcomes are realized (Magaletta and Oliver, 1999).

Subjective well-being or psychological well-being is also studied under the 
name of quality of life. Well-being is examined as a harmonious satisfaction 
of one's desires and goals (Chekola, 1975). Quality of life is a total measure 
of physical, mental and social well-being. Also psychological well-being or 
subjective well-being is an important construct of quality of life (Campbell et 
al., 1970). Well-being can also be defined as a dynamic state of mind 
characterized by a reasonable amount of harmony between an individual 
abilities, needs and expectations and environmental demands and 
opportunities (Levi, 1987). Three features of subjective well-being have been 
identified as-

- It is based on subjective experiences, instead of objective conditions of life
- It has a positive, as well as a negative affect, and
- It is a global experience, as opposed to experience in particular domains 
such as work (Okun and Stock, 1987).

Oshi et al. (1999) proposed “value” as a moderator of well-being. The 
examination of individual developmental and cross-cultural variations in the 
process of well-being is a promising pathway to gain insight into the nature of 
subjective well-being. Subjective well-being centres on the person's own 
judgments (Diener, 1984). Good life can be put into words in terms of 
“subjective well-being” (SWB) and in colloquial terms, it is labeled as 
“happiness”. Subjective well-being is not sufficient for good life, but it 
appears to be increasingly necessary for it (Diener; Sapyta and Suh, 1998). It 
refers to people’s evaluation of their life evaluations, which are both affective 
and cognitive. People experience abundant subjective well-being when they 
feel many pleasant and few unpleasant emotions, when they are engaged in 
interesting activities, when they experience many pleasures and few pains, 
and when they are satisfied with their lives (Diener, 2000).

There is a dubious relationship between well-being and quality of life. WHO 
defined quality of life as the condition of life resulting from combination of 
effect of a complete range of factors. For example those factors which 
determine health, happiness (including comfort in physical environment and 
satisfying occupation) education and social; intellectual attainments, freedom 
of action, justice and freedom of expression. Well-being is often regarded as a 
broader concept which includes standards of living, level of living and quality 
of life, that is, subjective well-being.
Standards of living is denoted by income, occupation, standard of housing, sanitation and nutrition, level of health provisions, educational, recreational and other services. Level of living is indicated through nine components. They are:

- Health
- Food consumption
- Education
- Occupation and working conditions
- Housing
- Social security
- Clothing
- Recreation and leisure and
- Human rights

These objective characteristics are assumed to influence human well-being. The World Health Organization Quality of Life group proposed a broader range of criteria for subjective quality of life comprising twenty-four facets. The subjective definition of quality of life considers that each individual has the right to decide whether his or her life is worthwhile.

The subjective feeling of contentment, happiness and satisfaction with life experience and of one’s role in the world of work, sense of achievement, utility, belongingness and no distress, dissatisfaction or worry etc. is the way to describe general well-being (Verma and Verma, 1989). They laid special emphasis on the term “subjective well-being”, as they attribute that the aforementioned aspects cannot be evaluated objectively. General well-being is a part of the concept of positive mental health, which is not a mere absence of disease or infirmity (Verma, 1988). He further elaborated the absence of psychological ill-being. A person can have both conditions—poor or good with all its accompanying results. Psychological well-being is a person’s evaluative reaction to his or her life satisfaction, that is, “cognitive evaluations or effect”, “ongoing emotional reactions” (Diener and Diener, 1995).

Physical well-being is generally taken to be happiness, along with one’s cognitive appraisal of how satisfying his or her life has been, and it is also encompassing positive future prospects of life, that is, “hope”. It is also integrative character of mental healthiness which is, supposed to be composed of certain set of stable traits of personality, moral beliefs system, as well as stocks of psycho-behavioral resources connected with one’s major life domains such as home, school or workplace.
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The second chapter deals with the review of literature in relation to the variables of the proposed research topic. Literature review is carried on to gather information regarding the work done in the past and also to ascertain what is being done currently in the context of variables of the study under investigation. This in turn particularly helps in gathering the information about the topic which is being researched upon. It is also useful in selecting the predictor as well as the criterion variables; selection of research methodology and finally in the statistical data-analysis. At the same time it also helps in the discussion and interpretation of the research findings.

In the proposed study, in all four currently relevant variables are selected. Quality of working life and role stress are the two independent variables, whereas, perceived organizational commitment and psychological well-being further are the two dependent variables. Efforts had been taken to condense only relevant and exhaustive studies conducted so far.

**STUDIES ON QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE**

Quality of Working Life or QWL has always been important in studying organizational behaviour. In present scenario of high technology world, it has become a great concern for management as well as employees. Quality of working life is the most substantial work related behavioural phenomenon, which has positive impact on productivity and effectiveness at large. Though there are a number of studies conducted time to time on quality of working life of administrative staff, educators, teachers, hardly any study was conducted to assess the quality of working life of various levels bank managers. However, attention has been given to as many studies as would pertain to research problem in hand.

Payne and Pheysey (1971), had conducted studies on organizational climate. Organizational climate scales were correlated with three facets of Job Descriptive Index Scale namely, satisfaction with work, supervision and pupil. Sample was of 348 managers, supervisors and staff personnel. Positive correlations were obtained between positive perception of organizational climate and job satisfaction. This was to highlight quality of employee's work life. Job satisfaction is an indication of positive quality of working life (QWL). Hence, whatever studies will be put forth on job satisfaction would be determining relationship of some variable with QWL as job satisfaction is a good indicator of QWL.

Pestonjee (1973), reported that supportive organizations are positively related to workers morale and job-satisfaction. Similarly, in a study conducted by Schneider and Snyder (1975), it was found that climate and satisfaction are
positively correlated, and almost the same result was found in a study of Lafollette and Sims (1975), as they found organizational climate and organizational practice correlated to jobs. Rajappa (1978), found that organizations with achievement oriented climate were highly productive.

Costello and Sang (1974), reported that majority of job incumbents of publicly owned utility firms were satisfied with security and social needs but, were different in the fulfillment of increase order needs – self-esteem, autonomy and self-actualization. Study made by Rhinehard et al (1969), on managers, compared managers working in government agencies with those from business and industries. They found that perceived deficiency in need fulfillment likely to increase successively at lower level which was almost similar to the findings of Jhonson and Marcrum (1968). Their study also revealed that increased dissatisfaction was found among managers of government agencies as compared to managers of business and industries.

Balkrishnan (1976), examined the relational importance of physical, social, financial, security, achievement, responsibility, recognition, and growth factors of industrial employees. Results indicated that financial and physical factors were very important as compared to other factors. Workers were found to be above physical and safety needs and were somewhere between social and ego needs.

Kumar and Bohra (1978), studied relationship of workers job satisfaction with their perception about existing organizational climate. Results revealed that perceived organizational climate effects workers job satisfaction significantly. Workers perceiving organizational climate as democratic had increase in job satisfaction as compared to those who perceived organizational climate as autocratic or undecided.

Singhal (1983), emphasized on the job quality of life where it is pointed out that quality of working life (QWL) will be meaningful if the people working in organization live a happy life in society. Economic, family and health related aspects to which employees are exposed as member of larger significant-society are significant factors that influence their quality of working life (QWL) experience. He also made a point that QWL is a time and situation bound concept that requires constant revisions and modifications as psycho-socio and organizational contents change over time.

Sharma (1983), studied the importance of organizational climate for employed manager and satisfaction at work. The study consisted of 50 industrial organizations which were surveyed. Observation was – work related facets like, grievance handling; recognition; opportunities for growth and development and participative management have been found to be important
factor for healthy organizational climate, which enhances work motivation and satisfaction of job incumbents. Almost same results were obtained by Srivastava and Pratap (1984), who found a significant positive relationship between positive perception of organizational climate and job satisfaction.

Kornbluh (1984), suggested that the contribution of increased worker’s participation in decision-making is appearing more often on labour-management agenda as a strategy to increased employee’s QWL. The reason for management interest include need for (i) increased probability positive quality (ii) improving QWL for the new workers who are educated and have good work ethics, but are alienated and unmotivated under current management practices (iii) meeting foreign competition.

Levine, et al. (1984), made an attempt to develop a definition and measure of QWL. In a specific case setting, 64 employees engaged from large insurance company Delphi Panel constituted in defining QWL. A 34 item QWL questionnaire was developed from that definition. Tested on 450 employees of company, results showed 7 predictors of QWL, which extended beyond job content. 7 predictors, were (i) Organization to which supervisors show respect and have confidence in employee’s abilities, (ii) Variety in a daily work routine (iii) Work challenges (iv) Organization to which present work leads to good future opportunities (v) Self-esteem (vi) Extent to which life outside work affects work (vii) Extent to which work contributes to society.

Rice and others (1984-85), found out the relationship between work satisfaction and quality of life. Work experience and outcomes can affect person’s general quality of life both directly or indirectly through their effects on family interaction, leisure activities and levels of health and energy. Modification in workplace can have their effect by changing environment or changing worker’s own class and they can affect his quality and family life.

Braun (1985), presented a paper at annual meeting of rural sociological society in which he propounded some important suggestions regarding QWL programmes and industrial justice. According to him currently, QWL programmes exists only to increase physical productivity, never to decrease it for the benefit of increased workers happiness. To properly judge true productivity based on industrial justice, there must be a great societal and worker’s voice on how productivity is defined. Small benefits to the company at great cost to worker’s and to society at large are to be avoided. Such costs include speed up discrimination, reduction in work freedom through increased setting of standards, lack of flexibility in setting up and enforcing standards, pseudo-careerism, and defining out of existence of unskilled workers that had served as a social buffer to provide jobs for anyone, no matter what is his experience. Industrial justice requires that workers be allowed to produce with
an average rather than an extra-ordinary amount of effort, and that they have right to demand sympathy on occasions.

Graham (1985), investigated worker's support and rejection attitude towards QWL programmes on the sample of shop floor workers. Results indicated that attitude towards QWL leads to four generalization (i) When workers experience increased influence and organizations in their relation with management they likely support QWL (ii) When this greater influence enable them to obtain changes in both job procedure and working conditions, they are likely to continue their participation (iii) If QWL increased cooperation among workers, they will support it, but if it increased competition they will likely reject their programme (iv) Worker's support for a QWL programme is likely to be maintained only if the power of union in bargaining is not hindered. When QWL programmes have such positive effects on these four sets of relations, workers ability to obtain changes in workplace to which they see as significant, is increased and their support for increased cooperative relation with management is most likely to be developed and then maintained.

Sengupta and Sekaran (1985), studied bank employees and found, QWL in bank is not high and he gave reasons for the same. External environment (government and union interference) facing the banks are seen as impendent to take effective actions by banks. Findings showed that government formulating broad policies, leave it to banks to attain goal by whichever means they think, greater decentralization, more autonomy and power will facilitate banks to recruit right people, design job as per requirements, rewards employee differentially on the basis of performance and enhance QWL and offer quality service to people.

Chakraborty (1986), found out that there are many organizational situations which indicate hidden realities of QWL. Researchers are required to examine QWL in light of new paradigm based on study of Indian psycho-philosophy offered from a strict problem-solving point of view and may have relevance to educate predicting managers.

Keller (1987), studied relative contribution of work and non-work variables on QWL among different ethics groups. 127 White, 30 Hispanic, 33 American Banker and 121 Mexicans were taken as the subjects. Results showed no significant relationship between ethics' groups and QWL. Home life and family network variables accounted for increased variance in QWL than did work variables like jobs, job-stress and job level.

Dhillon and Dandona (1988), conducted a study on “QWL and Job Involvement: A comparative study of managers of public and private banks.” The study found significant difference in QWL variable related to job
involvement in public and private sector banks. Karrier and Khurana (1996), found managers with increased job satisfaction and more job involvement had perception of increased QWL.

Srivastava (1996) pointed out that organizational climate and higher order needs (self-esteem, autonomy and self-actualization) are positively related to job involvement. This study has not denoted variables which had been undertaken for study as term QWL but also organizational climate, higher order needs and all other bio-social needs which are determinants of QWL. Therefore, it is not always necessary to use the term QWL but the variables are attributed to the aspect referring to QWL.

Gary (1988), tested the specific hypothesis regarding apprenticeship-socialization strategy, using sample of new insurance company employees. He found that perceived quality of intern-assignment managers work relationship to have important direct and moderating effect on intern work outcomes. Quality of work relationship was significantly positively related to intern met expectations, role clarity, organizational commitment, and performance.

Chakraborty (1989), suggested that quality of domestic life transmits its inevitable effect on quality of home life so as to reduce the intensity of stress experience in context of work life. According to one forecast, by the end of 1990, 50% of American children will belong to single parent or no parent category, is used by author in constructing major emerging scenario of stress. He warned Indians to restrain from uncalled problems of socio-cultural changes. There exist reinforcing cycle of stressors both at home and in workplace.

Mee Lin and Bain (1990), have studied relationship between QWL programmes and organizational performance measures through a review of 27 studies on unionized firms. Impact of QWL on organizational effectiveness (performance of labour management relations and economic and non-economic performance of the firms) was measured in these studies at 3 levels: (i) industrial (ii) group division/store (iii) plant/store of industry. All studies found favourable attitude of workers towards QWL programs and 7 of 10 studies at division level and at job 10 macro level studies found positive effect of QWL programs on productivity. At 3 levels employee participation measures and job redesign were the approaches of QWL programmes were most commonly implemented by both union and management. Mixed impact of QWL programmes on absenteeism, grievances, turnover, discipline, and labour relations.

Havlovic (1991), studied the influence of QWL initiatives on HR outcomes. Data was collected by unionized Midwestern heavy manufacturing firm for
period during 1976-1986. Results indicated that QWL initiatives significance reduce absenteeism, minor or accidents, grievances and quits.

Venkatachalam, et al (1997), studied that production increased with change adapted by increased QWL. Perception of employees, several other factors like security, autonomy, equity of pay and rewards help to increase QWL, satisfaction, involvement, work environment and so on. Some findings showed significant positive relationship between QWL and organizational commitment.

Nasreen and Ansari (1997), conducted a study on supervisors and middle level managers and reported that socio-psycho personality variables failed to influence QWL perceptions. Barkat and Ansari (1997), found significant influence of job tenure and number of promotions earned on perceived QWL. The above two studies did not include job involvement but are important to highlight relationship of biographical and psycho-social personality variable in relation to QWL. Job involvement is a phenomenon which is outcome of perception of increase QWL in which aspects like identification with work, organization, as well as incumbent conductive conditions. Most appropriate to work and working environment as above all variables combined together determine level of job involvement.

Lan and May (1998), examined how perceived image of a company’s QWL will affect its market and financial performance growth. Profitability of two groups of company was compared, based on sales growth, assets growth, return on equity, and return to assets. Results indicated companies with increased QWL can also enjoy exceptional growth and profitability.

Robert (1998), presented a summary of determined tests of the assumption that success rates are so low in organizational commitment that doubt or cynicism constitute the appropriate mind-sets. This opinion continues to appear in the literature, both scientific and popular, despite the existence of several large data sets that could either reinforce the doubt or cynicism, or require variously nuanced caveats about them. 16 major data sets are reviewed in effect to sketch some confidence intervals concerning reasonable estimates of success rates in varieties of planned change commonly labeled as QWL; organizational development and organizational commitment.

Donaldson, et al. (1999), studied a major incentive for work-site. Health promotion activities promised increase of company’s profitability. Although employee sleep patterns predicted health care utilization and psychological well-being, for most of the part employee-health behaviours were not strong predictors of proximal organizational effectiveness factors. However, QWL factors significantly predicted organizational commitment, absenteeism, and
tardiness frequency. Findings suggested the value of improving the system of work in which employees are embedded as part of comprehensive work-site health promotion efforts.

Eden (2000), described the importance of different factors in relation to quality of working life among individuals (aged 25-29 years) granted early retirement due to disorders of the musculoskeletal system. Explanatory variables concerning poor quality of life were established among disability pensioners with musculoskeletal disorders and a control group. In both groups, health status, leisure time activities, and social network were important for quality of life. Among the retirees immigration, employment before retirement, and a negative attitude to the disability pension were related to poor quality of life.

Pirjo and Seppo (2000), measured six dimensions of QWL to find out the relationship of burnout and QWL in the retail trade versus metal industry. Some demographic variables were included in the analysis. Results showed the great impact of psychological job demands on burnout in both business lines. The impact of the other five indexes (conflict, job-control, work of superior, organization of work, and monotonous job) on burnout was different in these two business lines. Still variables had some impact on burnout in both the retail trade and in the metal industry. Age turned out to be a complicated factor in relation to burnout.

Chan, et al. (2000), compared the experiences of work stress, work satisfaction and mental health on 2,589 managers and workers from six different professions and para-professions, namely; general practitioners, lawyers, engineers, teachers, nurses, and life insurance personals. Results showed that performance pressures and work family conflicts were perceived to be the most stressful aspects of work. Two of the stressors contributed to the overall work stress. Further, stress arising due to work, family conflicts, performance pressure and poor job prospect was negatively associated with level of work satisfaction. These findings were discussed in contexts of increasing professionalization, and deprofessionalization and growing emphasis on productivity and efficiency in a quickly developing economy.

Sirgy, et al. (2002), developed a new measure of QWL based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. The measure was designed to capture the extent to which the work environment, job requirement, supervisory behavior, and ancillary programmes in an organization are perceived to meet the needs of employees. Seven major needs were identified, each having several dimensions. There are: (a) Health and safety needs (b) Economic and family needs (c) Social needs (d) esteem needs (e) Self-actualization needs (f) knowledge needs (g) Aesthetic needs. The measures convergent and
discriminant validities were tested and the data provided support to construct validity of QWL measuring. Further, the measures nomological (predictive) validity was tested by hypothesis deduced from spill over theory.

STUDIES ON ROLE STRESS

The second, and also the second independent variable of the study is Role Stress. Stress of job life develops negative and positive attitudes about various aspects of job in the employee, which ultimately generate the feeling of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the employees. This leads to study the stress, arising out of role played by an employee in an organization.

Jhonson (1979), investigated the relationship of situational and individual differences. Variables with role stress, psychosomatic symptoms and jobs in entry level police and safety officers. Increase role stress was significantly correlated with decrease group cohesiveness, increase need for independence, decrease need for achievement, increase dogmatism, decrease distortion in responding, external locus of control, and more psychosomatic symptoms.

Fielder et al. (1979), investigated the conditions under which personnel in leadership and staff position effectively use their intelligence and experience in performance of their task in military organizations. Results provides consistent evidence that individual use their intelligence if the relationship with immediate superior is non-stressful. They fail to use their intelligence or misuse it, if the stress with superior is high. Experience is used effectively when this stress is increase not decrease.

Shah (1980) studied impact of stress or sample of officers representing cooperative banks, marketing and consumer society, industrial society and cooperative departments. Physiological changes felt by these officers were fatigue, exhaustion, migraine, headaches, hypertension, and decrease of appetite, indigestion, sleeplessness and dizziness.

Parasuram (1981) conducted a study on individual in middle and junior level positions. Found that role frustration and technical problems were major sources of stress that is stressors reflecting quantitative overload, decrease status, and adequate supervisory instruction and impediments to task accomplishment in form of technical resource inadequacies that managers tended to be more production and quality.

Sen (1982), reported that bank-managers with intermediate level of qualification experience decrease inter-role distance, role autonomy, role overload, because such employees knowing that they are educationally handicapped in going up in the organization, takes their duties rather lightly.
Srivastava (1982), examined whether or not the employee's potentiality produce comparatively increase influence upon their perception of role stress. Results showed employee with low and high production group significantly differed from each other with respect to their indices of perceived role stress. Employees' producing higher was observed to perceive low ambiguities, conflicts and work load with respect to their job roles as compared to those belonging to low production group.

Koch et al. (198?), investigated the relationship between perceived job related stress and certain personal characteristics among school administrators. Four factors of perceived job stress (role based stress, conflict mediating stress, task-based stress, and bounding based stress) were extracted. They found that each of these two factors were related to respondents' self-report of physical health. These factors of perceived job-stress were found to have differential effects among subjects depending upon respondent's age, year of administrative experience and position in organization.

Jagdish (1983), studied the relationship of occupational stress with job satisfaction and mental health of first level of supervisors. He reported that occupational stress arising from role overload, role ambiguity, role conflict, group and political pressures, responsibility for persons, under participation, powerlessness, poor peer relations, intrinsic impoverishment, low status, strenuous working condition and unprofitability significantly impaired the supervisor's job satisfaction, overall as well as area wise. He further reported that occupational stress showed a more inverse relationship with on-the-job dimensions of satisfaction than with its off-the-job dimensions.

Cooke and Roussean (1984), investigated the contradictory models of effects of family role and work-role expectations on strain in teachers. Role theory predicts that multiple roles can lead to stressors (work-overload, and inter-role conflict), and in turn to symptoms of strain. Results indicated that work expectations were found to be related to work overload and inter-role conflict, and these stressors were found to be related to strain. Family roles were found to be related to strain in three ways: they interact with work role expectations, so that the relation between these expectations and work overload is progressively greater for single teachers than those who are married, and those who have children; they are indirectly related to strain through their relation to inter-role conflict; and finally, they are directly and negatively associated with physical strain when their relation to inter-role conflict is controlled.

Osipaw et. al (1985), showed that older respondents generally reported increased overload and responsibility, boundary role and physical environmental stresses than did their young counterparts. Older subjects displayed a trend towards decrease vocational, psychological, physiological
and interpersonal strain than did younger ones, and increase recreational self care and rational-cognitive resources than younger subjects. Their study brings out possibility of age moderating stress strain relationship.

Ahmad et al. (1985), conducted a study of stress among executives. Thirty executives from personal and private sectors were compared on role stress. Out of ten dimensions, significant difference in three dimensions, that is, role isolation, role autonomy, and self-role distance was found. It was also found that public sector executives had slightly increased stress than private sector executives.

Jasmine (1987), compared job related stress among public and private sector blue-collar employees. Role incumbents of public sector organization experiences significantly higher role stress than subjects of private sector organizations.

Vachom (1987), conducted a study on executives and pointed out that role stress may occur not only during one's official professional job but may also result from the fact that they are expected to continue their role when they are outside the organization. Thus, Vachom's views provide significant information that role stress does not only have its impact within the organization but, also outside the organization that is in the family and other segment of socio-cultural conditions.

Srilatha (1988), found young and higher earning salary managers experience higher organizational satisfaction, role overload, and role conflict than managers who were older and earned less salary.

Srilatha (1988), investigated that opportunity for promotion was negative and significantly associated with role stress variables. Managers, who received five or higher promotions exhibited significance, lower role overload, role conflict and overall stress than those who had not received any promotion.

Singh (1988), studied stress experiences of 250 juniors and middle level executives belonging to seven private and three public sector organizations of North India. Junior level executives experienced higher stress (namely lack of group cohesiveness, role conflict, inequity, role autonomy, role overload, lack of leadership support, inadequacy of role authority) than their middle level counterparts.

Chaudhry (1990), studied the relationship between role stress and job satisfaction among bank officers. Results revealed that role stress and job satisfaction were negatively correlated in high as well as low age group of bank officers.
Siegrist and Klein (1990), analyzed the influence of chronic occupational stress on cardiovascular reactivity in healthy blue-collar male workers. High occupational stress leads to high blood pressure elevations under challenge than did subjects with lower level of stress.

Akhtar and Vadra (1990), pointed out that there are many sources of stress within the organization which are directly or indirectly related to outside events. Amongst other factors, family and society have its higher impact such as illness of any family members, conflict between members of family, family financial crises etc.

Singh and Nath (1991), explored the effects of organizational role stress on job involvement among banking personals. Results revealed higher organizational role stress (overall as well as dimensions wise) were lower involved in comparison to subjects of lower organizational role stress.

Srivastava and Krishna (1991), examined the relationship of different degrees of occupational stress with job performance of technical workers in a locomotive industry. Subjects experienced moderate level of stress performed job most efficiently and low and high occupational stress correlated positively and negatively with job performance.

Ganesan and Johnson (1992), examined occupational stress and health among supervisors. They reported that organizational group and career stressors were experienced by the supervisors in the lower range but these stressors were indicators of a possible causal relationship to physical and psychological symptoms and to the physiological indicator of stress.

Reddy and Ramamurti (1992), investigated job-stress among executives. They found out that older executives experienced more stress in the area of relationship with colleagues, role in organizational, working conditions and home work interface. However they experienced low stress in some areas of organizational structure, its development and relationship with the boss.

Vander and de Hues (1993) examined difference between male and female Dutch managers in work stress, social support, and strains. Work and life support negatively correlated with work stress. Only work support was strongly related to each measure of strain.

Terry et al. (1993), hypothesized that higher level of work stress would have a negative impact on job satisfaction and psychological well-being and availability of work related support from supervisors buffered the negative effects of work stress that is role conflict and work overload.
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Akinnusi (1994), found out education to be significantly associated with stress. The higher qualified the managers, the higher psychological stress they experience. They are also highly subjected to organizational stressors but suffer low job stress, probably because they occupy positions of authority and their jobs are more intrinsically satisfying than their lower qualified counterparts.

Mishra (1994), reported that under particular situation some stressors did not have moderating effect on the relationship between job satisfaction and involvement.

Spielberger and Reheiser (1994), measured perceived psychological severity and anxiety of thirty job stressors events. Overall stress levels were similar for male and female but gender difference was found in perceived severity and frequency of occurrence of individual for events. Managerial group was higher on job satisfaction than clerks.

Chandraiah et al. (1996), examined the incidence of occupational stress, job satisfaction and type ‘A’ behaviour among 255 managers (upper middle level). They reported that junior managers experienced higher job related tension, particularly in terms of home work interface as well as lower job satisfaction on the “job itself”.

Anirudh (1997), developed a model for predicting role efficacy and role stress of workers and supervisors using demographic variables like age, education, and experience. Out of eleven models, development and prediction of ten dimensions of role stress to all eight models and predictions of role-stagnation, role-erosion, role-x-on, personal inadequacy, self-role distance, role autonomy, role inadequacy and role stress total were found to be good predictors.

Mishra (1997), conducted a study to compare the level of occupational stress among public and private sectors public relation officers. He found that PRO of public sector experienced significantly higher occupational stress on the dimensions of role ambiguity, role conflict, reasonable group and political pressures, powerlessness, poor peer relations at work, intrinsic impoverishment, low status and strenuous work conditions as compared to PRO’s of private sector. He also explored that, PROs of private sector were significantly higher on role overload than the PROs of public sector.

Jagdish and Singh (1997), examined the moderating effect of hierarchical level on occupational stress and strain, job satisfaction and mental health. They reported a significant relationship between job satisfaction and
occupational stress. However, this was not observed in case of occupational stress and mental health.

Rajendran et al. (1997), measured occupational stress and different coping strategies employed by executives during stressful encounters. Two groups—executives of neurosis control group differed significantly in work, role ambiguity, poor peer relations, low status, strenuous working conditions, responsibility, under participation and powerlessness. Significant difference was observed between acting strategy and interpersonal strategy of coping used by comparison group.

Venkatammal (1998), examined stress experienced by teachers of Annamalai University. Results revealed factor of autonomy, factor of stress do not differ significantly on occupational stress for male and female. Teachers who are just satisfied with their jobs show high stress than those who are highly satisfied with their jobs.

Pandey (1998), explored relationship between personality dimensions of individuals and their perceived organizational role stress. Results indicated that psychotic reality and neuroticism stability dimensions were found positively associated with individual’s perceived organizational role stress; whereas extroversion-introversion dimension was found to be negatively associated with perceived organizational role stress.

Ritsa and Cooper (1998), examine the findings of large community-wide survey on occupational stress and job satisfaction. They reported that job satisfaction was greater among the high socio-economic groups. Hey also found out that the issue of “Control” was significant in predicting greater job satisfaction among social classes, but not for mental or physical well-being.

Yu Shanfa et. al (1998), studied occupational stress of 121 Chinese steel work employees and 122 managers. They explored that organizational structure and climate and relationship with other people was important predictor for workers. Moreover, management process and organizational forces emerged as strongest prediction of job satisfaction for both managers and workers.

Malik and Sabhrawal (1999), carried out a study to analyze relationship between role stress and locus of control. Results indicated that externally controlled subjects perceived higher role stress in three areas namely role-expectation conflict, role overload and role ambiguity as compared to their counterparts.

Mohan and Chauhan (1999), reported that higher level executives experienced less stress and strain as compared to the middle and lower level executives, utilized better coping strategies and enjoyed more positive outcomes.
Moreover, executives of public sector organizations experienced less effective coping strategies and rated themselves as less effective than their counterparts from private sector.

Upadhaya and Singh (1999), found that executives as well as the teachers experienced a moderate level of stress, executives experienced more stress as compared to teachers. The results revealed a significant difference between these two groups on the experience of stress on factor such as role overload, intrinsic impoverishment and status variable.

Pradhan and Mishra (1999), explored experience of occupational role stress (ORS) perception of HRD climate among 120 younger (25-45 years old) versus 120 older (45-65 years old) executives from public versus private sector occupational sector. Subjects completed measures of ORS and HRD climate. Younger subjects significantly differed from older subjects with respect to their experiences of role stagnation, role ambiguity and self-role distance, suggesting that younger subjects experienced slightly higher stress with respect to role expectations conflict on total ORS scores. There were significant differences between younger and older subjects and between public and private sectors subjects with respect to perception of HRD climate. There were significant differences due to age but not due to public versus private sector.

Peiro et al. (2001), examined the effects over three role stress variables (role-conflict, role-ambiguity, role-overload) on three burnout dimensions (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment). Results revealed three role stress variables predict emotional exhaustion overtime. Role ambiguity predicts personal accomplishment overtime.

STUDIES ON PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Studies conducted, on this particular variable, till recently, relate directly or indirectly to general organizational commitment. In the present endeavour, perceived organizational commitment will be taken into consideration. Organizational commitment being the primary source of positive attitude towards job and job related aspects plays a vital role in industrial psychology. Due to the pivot of the interest in perceived organizational commitment, it is kept in the focus and several studies have been reported in literature review on the same. Some of the studies sought to find out relative importance of organizational commitment. Some studies attempted to determine relationship between organizational commitment and work characteristics. Some studies have ascertained factorial structures and sought to find out work related differences related to organizational commitment.
Bruning and Snyder (1983), investigated and concluded that respondent’s sex and their employment position are predictors of employee’s commitment. 583 employees of social service organizations were taken. The findings failed to predict organizational commitment as a function of employee’s hierarchal position and sex difference.

Fukami and Larison (1984), tested parallel models of commitment to company and commitment to union on a sample (N= 114) of transportation department employee of a unionized metropolitan newspaper. Results showed organizational commitment model is lowly successful in predicting union commitment than company commitment. Most striking divergence occurred with respect to personal characteristics, which were significantly correlated with extraneous variables related to supervisory relations and social involvement were significantly correlated with both union and company commitment.

Williams and Hazer (1986), reviewed the model of commitment to identify the casual relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, to identify the antecedents of these variables. Results indicated support relationship between personal or organizational characteristics and job satisfaction and between satisfaction and commitment. Moreover, commitment was also found an important aspect of turnover.

Bhattacharya and Verma (1986), studied 160 executives of Bharat Cooking Coal Limited, Dhanbad. Results showed organizational commitment, need satisfaction, and managerial respect were significant and positively related with job satisfaction both either independently or in conjunction thereof.

Jhonson (1990), investigated how changes in key antecedents (leadership behaviour, role stress and job satisfaction) influenced the development in commitment and how changes in commitment affected turnover intentions and behaviour. 102 sales people suggested that role ambiguity and job satisfaction (but not leadership behaviour) is significant contributors to the development of organizational commitment during early employment. Moreover organizational commitment influenced turnover through its significant impact on prosperity to leave.

Luthans et al. (1992), evaluated importance of social support for employee’s commitment and found strong positive correlation between strong supportive climate and bank tellers organizational commitment.

Christopher (1994), examined the perceived political climate organizational commitment, and job satisfaction of 119 employees of a financial service
firm. Their status or level in the firm was rated by firm’s personal manager. Results showed employee’s level or status moderated the relationship among political climate, commitment and satisfaction.

Angle and Lawson (1994), studied the relationship between employee’s commitment and performance in manufacturing firm. Link between organizational commitment and performance may depend on extent to which motivation rather than ability underlining performance.

Vandenberg and Scrapello (1994), investigated in one of their longitudinal study the relationship between employee’s commitment to occupation and organization and they viewed occupational commitment as casual antecedent to organizational commitment (N=100). First management system professional supported through cross-lagged analysis. Further, authors examined longitudinal causal model of turnover process in which occupational commitment was placed as an antecedent to organizational commitment.

Akhtar and Jan (1994), examined organizational commitment questionnaire on 259 retail bank employees. Factor analysis founded three dimensions proposed by Porter et al. first dimension, that is, desire to maintain organizational commitment overlaps the withdrawal construct. Consistent with three-dimensional attitude theory, organizational commitment was re-conceptualized in terms of cognitive, conative and emotive meanings. Proposed dimensions include need commitment, ambiguity commitment, volititive commitment (extent of conative orientation towards organizational goals).

Lowe and Vodanovich (1995), examined the effect of distributive (outcomes) and procedural factors on the satisfaction and organizational commitment. Results indicated aspects of distributive (outcomes) were stronger predictors of satisfaction and commitment then were aspects of procedure. Neither fairness nor level of outcome consistently interacted with procedural justice.

Brett et al. (1995), examined the role of employees’ financial requirement as a moderator of relationship between their organizational commitment and performance. Results indicated stronger relationship between organizational commitment and performance of those lower financial requirements than for those with higher requirements.

Wilson (1995), investigated the effects of power and politics on organizational commitment. Two theoretical explorations for organizational commitment were developed which incorporated five independent variables were there. (1) Power based theory of commitment (2) Theory of politics. (a) Sub-unit power
(b) leadership power (c) leadership behaviour variables (d) arbitrary personal practices (e) political control variables. 942 senior executive service managers in federal government who completed ambiguity commitment scale which measured strength of loyalty, identification with their sub-unit. Results showed empirical support for effects team power, good leader member relations, political control on commitment levels of top executives in federal government.

Sharma and Pandey (1995), tested that will QWL will show significance with organizational commitment of managers in India. 200 young managers (25-27) were selected from five level of managerial hierarchy. Results revealed that perception of QWL were significant and positively related to organizational commitment. Moreover QWL, work involvement, organizational effectiveness, and pursuit of organizational and industrial goals were found to be significant predictors of organizational commitment of members.

Mishra, and Patnayak (1995), conducted a study on 80 employees of public sector industrial organization. Results indicated that experience of commitment was satisfactory and often increased among employees. No difference between technical and non-technical subjects was seen. Moreover technical education had not influenced experience of commitment or resistance to accept work experience.

Knoop (1995), studied the relationship among participative decision making, overall job satisfaction, facets of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Participative decision making positively correlated with organizational commitment, overall job satisfaction and five dimensions of job satisfaction—work, pay, promotion, supervision, coworkers. A significant correlation was found between commitment and job satisfaction. Making decisions jointly with employees showed highly positive job outcomes.

Randell and O'Driscoll (1997), found high level calculative commitment associated with lower perceived organizational support, lower agreement with organizational policies, fewer perceived organizational values, and fewer bonds to various facets of organization. This pattern of findings was reverse for affective commitment.

Harrison and Habbard (1998), conducted a study to examine commitment levels among Mexican employees in US firms along with potential antecedents to their commitment, job characteristics, organizational characteristics, and work experience. Results showed job satisfaction, participative decision making, and age was predictive of organizational commitment. Leader behaviour and tenure was found to be significantly
correlated to commitment, whereas perceived organizational effectiveness tends to be correlated with commitment.

Patel (1998), studied the relationship between perceived organizational health and organizational commitment. 100 employees from private unit manufacturing organization were taken as subjects. Results showed significant positive correlation between overall organizational health and organizational commitment. Skilled staffs perceived highly favourable overall health of their organization and were also highly committed to their organization than to their counterpart workers. In case of skilled staff, high organizational health perceivers were found to have better organizational commitment than low organizational health perceivers.

Venkatachalam (1998), made an attempt to explore various related aspects in literature on organizational commitment, with special emphasis on concept, definition, and approaches, followed by literature on individual and organizational characteristics of organizational commitment. He reported that several empirical studies revealed that there is a strong relationship between the demographic variables (age, sex, pay, job tenure) and organizational commitment whereas, education showed negative relationship with organizational commitment. Work values, rewards, motivation, culture, organizational climate etc are principle determinants of organizational climate. Turnover, absenteeism, job satisfaction, job tension, job role, autonomy, personality factors, workers, characteristics and role conflict are certain outcomes of organizational commitment.

Meyer, Irving and Allen (1998), tested the hypothesis that influence of early work experience on organizational commitment would be moderated by the value employee place on these experiences. Work values were measured in two samples of recent university graduates prior to organizational entry, the measures of commensurate work experience and forms of commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) on different occasions following entry. Regression analysis revealed that values and experience did interact in prediction of affective commitment and need commitment but nature of interaction was different from different work values or experiences combinations. This challenged common sense assumption that positive experience of work will have strongest effect on commitment among those who value most such experiences.

Schappe (1998), investigated the influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). Hierarchical regression analysis indicated that when all the three variables were considered concretely, only organizational commitment
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accounted for unique account of variance in organizational citizenship behaviour.

Pattanayak, et. al (1999), examined the nature of organizational commitment among 240 employees (1/2 executives and 1/2 non-executives), working in the Rourkela Steel Plant (India). Results revealed that there is a significant difference between executives and non-executives on organizational commitment. Executives revealed high commitment than non-executives. Employees in service units showed high organizational commitment than employees in production line.

Abdullah and Shaw (1999), studied the role of personal characteristics (nationality, gender, marital status, education, age, salary, tenure) in organizational commitment. 147 employees of Mental Health of UAE were taken as subjects. Results indicated significant relationship between personal characteristics and commitment. Gender, marital status, branch assignment were strongest predictors of commitment. Marital status, age, tenure were strongest predictors of affective commitment. Nationality interacts significantly with personal characteristics in predicting characteristics of commitment.

Rahim et. al (1999), compared the dimensionality and possession of power bases (coercive, reward, legitimate, expert and referent) and their relationship to effectiveness and organizational commitment in cross-cultural study of United States, South Korea, Bangladesh employees. Data were collected from each of three countries. Findings indicated similarities between Bangladesh and South Korea’s employees in relationship between coercive power base and effectiveness as well as between reward and legitimate power bases and commitment. The three countries were same on the relationship between legitimate power and commitment.

Abraham (1999), conducted a study of emotional dissonance on organizational commitment and intention to turnover. In the workplace emotional dissonance (ED) is the conflict between experienced emotions and emotions expressed to confirm to display rules. This study is an empirical examination of the impact of emotional dissonance on organizational criteria and its moderation by self-monitor and self-support. Emotional dissonance was theorized to stimulate turnover intentions, either solely through job dissatisfaction or through both job dissatisfaction and reduced organizational commitment. Job dissatisfaction was found to be sole mediator. Emotional dissonance resulted in job dissatisfaction, which in turn, stimulated withdrawal intentions. Self-monitoring and self-support extended moderator effects, albeit in opposing directions. Emotional dissonance aroused feelings of job dissatisfaction and reduced organizational commitment among high self
monitors. In contrast self-support lessened negative impact of emotional dissonance on organizational commitment.

Mishra and Srivastava (1999), aimed to find out the mental health as a moderator variable organizational commitment and job satisfaction relationship. Scales were administered upon a sample of 250 male physicians employed in a government medical college in Lucknow. Findings showed that mental health has a moderating effect on organizational commitment and job satisfaction relationship. The relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction is higher for doctors with high mental health rather than doctors with low mental health.

Vashishtha and Mishra (1999), made an attempt to explore the moderator effect of a tangible support on the occupational stress organizational commitment relationship. A sample of 200 factory supervisors was taken. Findings showed that tangible support has partially moderating effect on the occupational stress and organizational commitment relationship.

Vashishtha and Mishra (1999), examined the relationship between social support and organizational commitment of supervisors. 2000 supervisors aged (35-40 yrs) employed at Scooters India Limited, Lucknow, with 10-20 years of work experience were chosen. General Population Form of Interpersonal Support Education List was administered upon them. Results showed significant positive correlation between (1) affective commitment and overall organizational commitment with social support; (2) appraisal support and organizational commitment; (3) belonging support and organizational commitment (4) tangible support and organizational commitment. Results confirm that support have a positive and significant relationship with organizational commitment of supervisors.

Finegan (2000), explored the relationship between personal values and organizational commitment. 121 subjects from a large petrochemical company were taken as the subjects. 24 values were rated with respect to how important the value was to them and how important it was to organization. The results found that commitment was predicted by employee’s perception of organizational values. Further, affective; normative; continuance commitments were each predicted by different cluster of values. It is suggested that this study highlights the importance of recognizing that values are multidimensional and that each value cluster may affect behaviour differently.

Rai and Sinha (2000), examined the relationship of factor-analytically derived dimensions of transformational leadership with dimensions of organizational commitment, and moderating effect of organizational climate on the basis of
responses obtained from 261 middle-level male executives of banks. Results showed that subjects’ superior transformational leadership style had significant relationship with commitment. Further, it was found that facilitating climate enhanced the strength of association of leadership with commitment. Some of dimensions of transformational superior leadership and commitment were also found to be significantly correlated with aspects of subjects’ financial performance.

Kidd and Smewing (2001), investigated the relationship between supervisors support activities, their subordinates’ career, and organizational commitment. The findings suggested a positive linear relationship between supervisors support and organizational commitment for women but the association between supervisors support and organizational commitment seems to be less forward for men. The results indicated no relationship between supervisors support and career identity, career resilience or career planning.

Yousuf (2001), studied the moderating impacts of the Islamic work ethics on relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction. It was administered upon a sample of 425 Muslim employees in several organizations of UAE. The results indicated that Islamic work ethics directly influence organizational commitment and job satisfaction and it moderates the relationship between these two constructs. Results also revealed that national culture do not moderate the relationship between the Islamic work ethics and both organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The support of Islamic work ethics differ across age, education level, work experience, national culture, organization type (manufacturing or service) and ownership (private or public). Results also suggested that there is a positive and significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

STUDIES ON PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING

Psychological well-being basically is a concept of clinical psychology, but in the present study it has been studied in the context of organizational psychology. Studies relate psychological well-being to blood-pressure, cardiac arrests etc., which are a part and parcel of clinical psychology. However, here only the studies relevant to our research have been discussed.

Klitzman and Stellman (1989), examined the relationship between physical office environment and psychological well-being of office workers. 1830 non-managerial workers have been taken as subjects. Results indicated adverse environment conditions, especially poor air quality, noise, ergonomic conditions, lack of privacy are likely to affect worker’s satisfaction and mental health. Worker’s assessment of physical environment is different from their assessment of general working conditions such as workload, decision
making, attitude, and relationship with other people at work. Findings also support that stress which people generally experience at work may be due to combination of factors including physical working conditions under which they work.

Nazli, et al. (1990), studied the quality of employed women’s experience in the home-making role and its relationship to their psychological well-being and distress. All this was investigated using scale data from a random stratified sample of 403 women aged 25 to 55 years, who were employed as social workers or licensed practical nurses in Boston, Massachusetts. Results indicated that positive homemaking role experience is associated with increased psychological well-being and lower distress. Associations that are affected by the quality of subjects paid for their work experiences. This suggested that the relationship of homemaking-role quality to psychological outcomes is influenced by the effects to paid work-role quality.

Feldt (1997), investigated the role of the Sense of Coherence (SOC) as a main effect on well-being and its possible moderating role in relationship between work characteristics and well-being in 989 Finnish technical designers (aged 25-64 years). Results indicated strong support for the main effect model for stronger the sense of coherence, the lower the level of psychosomatic symptoms and emotional exhaustion. Some support for the moderating role of sense of coherence on relationship between perceived work characteristics and well-being was also found. The results show that strong sense of coherence’s subjects seemed better protected from the adverse effects of certain work characteristics. Furthermore, good social relations at work emphasized well-being among subjects with very weak sense of coherence, whereas these relations mattered less in determining well-being in subjects with a stronger sense of coherence.

Jamal and Preena (1998), conducted a study in which job stress was operationalized in terms of perceived experience at jobs which were chronic in nature. Employees’ well-being was operationalized in terms of organizational commitment, job involvement and job satisfaction. Results indicated that job stress was significantly related to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. There is no support for the role of gender as a moderator of the stress outcome relationships.

Jamal et al. (1998), examined the difference between moonlighters and non-moonlighters on job stress and well-being among 420 college teachers in Canada. Well-being was operationalized in terms of burnout, job stress, job involvement, and turnover intention and job performance. Findings supported the energy/opportunity of hypothesis of moonlighters than deprivation/constraints hypothesis. Low support for age, gender, teaching experience,
education and income as potential moderators of moonlighters’ status and outcomes of variables was found. Results are discussed in the light of previous empirical evidence on that job holding and quality of work and non-work life.

Christiansen et al. (1999), conducted a study on occupations and subjective well-being. The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between occupations and subjective well-being. The stress related with personal projects was significantly positively correlated with well-being. The strongest predictors of well-being were the composite project factors of stress and efficacy. Two personality traits, sensing and extraversion, interacted with project dimension of stress to emerge as significant predictors of well-being. Together, these four variables explained 42% of variance in well-being scores.

Epitropaki and Martin (1999), investigated the role of difference in age, organizational tenure, and gender between manager and employees leader-member exchanges (LMX) and related work outcomes. 73 (33 males, 40 females) employees (aged 21-60) of large academic institutions, were taken as the subjects, age and organizational difference was created by employees age and organizational tenure lines from that of their supervision. Results supported interaction effect of Member-Exchange organizational tenure, differences with Leader-Member-Exchange and outcome variables. Employees with high organizational tenure different from manager reported the worst work outcomes when they perceived LMX was of low quality, whereas when quality of LMX was high, they reported highest work attitudes and well-being. There was no support for moderating role of gender similarity.

Thakar and Misra (1999), studied the role of social support in daily hassles and well-being experiences of women. 196 employed and 54 unemployed married women have been taken as subjects considering the complexity of social support. 3 measures of social support were used. It was found that though the employed women experienced more hassles and received less support than their unemployed counterparts, yet they enjoyed better well-being. Employed women’s higher well-being speaks of the relative deprivation in house wives role and desire for opportunities to use their potentials for self-actualization and self-gratification. Resources generated by employment (e.g. income, status) appear adequate not only to cope with stresses emanating for multiple roles, but also to enhance well-being.

Chan and Joseph (2000), examined the association between personality, self-relevant intrinsic and extrinsic values and expectations, and psychological well-being. 40 male and 67 female college students (aged 18-37 years), completed the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire, aspiration index as well as
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measures of happiness, self-actualization, and self-esteem. Scores on the personality and aspiration scales were entered together in a regression equation to predict scores on happiness, self-actualization and self-esteem. It was found that greater extraversion and lower rated importance of financial success were associated with high scores on happiness, self-actualization and self-esteem. It was also found that likelihood of financial success was associated with higher scores on self-acceptance, likelihood of self-acceptance was associated with higher scores on self-actualization, and likelihood of community feeling was associated with higher scores on happiness.

Wright and Cronpanzano (2000), conducted a study on the happy productive work hypothesis. It has most often being examined in organizational research by correlating job satisfaction to performance. Recent research has expanded this to include measures of psychological well-being. However, to date, no field research has provided a comparative test of the relative contribution of job satisfaction and psychological well-being as predictors of employee performance. Two field studies that were taken together provided an opportunity simultaneously to examine the relative contribution of psychological well-being and job satisfaction on job performance. In study one, psychological well-being, but not job satisfaction, was predictive of job-performance for 47 human service workers. These findings were replicated in study 2 for 37 juvenile probation officers. These findings are discussed in terms of research on the happy-productive worker hypothesis.

Bruke (2000), examined the relationship of work alcoholism as indicator of psychological and physiological well-being. 530 male and female managers and professionals were used anonymously. Measures included work alcoholism types, work involvement, work enjoyment, psychological well-being, psychosomatic symptoms, life style behaviours, and emotional well-being. The results indicated a relationship between work alcoholism and poorer emotional and physical well-being.

Hypotheses of the Proposed Study

It is imperative to mention that while carrying out a scientific investigation, there is a need to formulate hypotheses in order to draw meaningful inferences regarding the sample under study. Keeping in view the objectives of the present research and in the light of the relevant research literature, the following null-hypotheses were formulated, concerning our investigation purpose. They are as follows:

$H_1$ Quality of working life will not influence perceived organizational commitment among various levels bank managers.
H2: Quality of working life will not influence psychological well-being among various levels bank managers.
H3: Role-stress will not influence perceived organizational commitment among various levels bank managers.
H4: Role-stress will not influence psychological well-being among various levels bank managers.
H5: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence affective commitment among overall various levels bank managers.
H6: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers.
H7: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers.
H8: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers.
H9: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence good mental health among overall various levels bank managers.
H10: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence poor mental health among overall various levels bank managers.
H11: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social support among overall various levels bank managers.
H12: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social stressor among overall various levels bank managers.
H13: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work support among overall various levels bank managers.
H14: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work stressor among overall various levels bank managers.
H15: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal support among overall various levels bank managers.
H16: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers.
H17: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers.
H18: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence affective commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
H19: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
H20: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
H21: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
H22: Quality of working life and role stress will not influence good mental health among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
H23 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence poor mental health among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
H24 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social support among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
H25 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social stressor among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
H26 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work support among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
H27 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work stressor among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
H28 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal support among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
H29 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
H30 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
H31 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence affective commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
H32 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
H33 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
H34 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
H35 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence good mental health among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
H36 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence poor mental health among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
H37 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social support among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
H38 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
H39 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work support among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
H40 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
H41 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal support among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
H42 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
H43 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
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H44 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence affective commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers.
H45 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence continuance commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers.
H46 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence normative commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers.
H47 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total organizational commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers.
H48 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence good mental health among overall scale-1 bank managers.
H49 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence poor mental health among overall scale-1 bank managers.
H50 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social support among overall scale-1 bank managers.
H51 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social stressor among overall scale-1 bank managers.
H52 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work support among overall scale-1 bank managers.
H53 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work stressor among overall scale-1 bank managers.
H54 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal support among overall scale-1 bank managers.
H55 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal stressor among overall scale-1 bank managers.
H56 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total psychological well-being among overall scale-1 bank managers.
H57 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence affective commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers.
H58 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence continuance commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers.
H59 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence normative commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers.
H60 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total organizational commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers.
H61 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence good mental health among overall scale-2 bank managers.
H62 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence poor mental health among overall scale-2 bank managers.
H63 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social support among overall scale-2 bank managers.
H64 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social stressor among overall scale-2 bank managers.
H65 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work support among overall scale-2 bank managers.
H\textsubscript{66} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work stressor among overall scale-2 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{67} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal support among overall scale-2 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{68} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal stressor among overall scale-2 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{69} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total psychological well-being among overall scale-2 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{70} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence affective commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{71} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence continuance commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{72} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence normative commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{73} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total organizational commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{74} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence good mental health among overall scale-3 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{75} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence poor mental health among overall scale-3 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{76} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social support among overall scale-3 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{77} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social stressor among overall scale-3 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{78} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work support among overall scale-3 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{79} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work stressor among overall scale-3 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{80} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal support among overall scale-3 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{81} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal stressor among overall scale-3 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{82} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total psychological well-being among overall scale-3 bank managers.

H\textsubscript{83} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence affective commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state.

H\textsubscript{84} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence continuance commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers of MP state.

H\textsubscript{85} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence normative commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers of MP state.

H\textsubscript{86} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total organizational commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers of MP state.

H\textsubscript{87} Quality of working life and role stress will not influence good mental health among overall scale-1 bank managers of MP state.
H_{85} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence poor mental health among overall scale-1 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{89} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social support among overall scale-1 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{90} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social stressor among overall scale-1 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{91} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work support among overall scale-1 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{92} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work stressor among overall scale-1 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{93} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal support among overall scale-1 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{94} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal stressor among overall scale-1 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{95} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total psychological well-being among overall scale-1 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{96} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence affective commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{97} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence continuance commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{98} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence normative commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{99} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total organizational commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{100} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence good mental health among overall scale-2 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{101} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence poor mental health among overall scale-2 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{102} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social support among overall scale-2 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{103} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social stressor among overall scale-2 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{104} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work support among overall scale-2 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{105} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work stressor among overall scale-2 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{106} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal support among overall scale-2 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{107} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal stressor among overall scale-2 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{108} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total psychological well-being among overall scale-2 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{109} \text{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence affective commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers of MP state.}
H_{110} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence continuance commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{111} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence normative commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{112} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total organizational commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{113} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence good mental health among overall scale-3 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{114} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence poor mental health among overall scale-3 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{115} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social support among overall scale-3 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{116} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social stressor among overall scale-3 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{117} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work support among overall scale-3 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{118} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work stressor among overall scale-3 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{119} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal support among overall scale-3 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{120} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal stressor among overall scale-3 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{121} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total psychological well-being among overall scale-3 bank managers of MP state.}

H_{122} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence affective commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state.}

H_{123} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence continuance commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers of UP state.}

H_{124} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence normative commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers of UP state.}

H_{125} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total organizational commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers of UP state.}

H_{126} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence good mental health among overall scale-1 bank managers of UP state.}

H_{127} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence poor mental health among overall scale-1 bank managers of UP state.}

H_{128} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social support among overall scale-1 bank managers of UP state.}

H_{129} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social stressor among overall scale-1 bank managers of UP state.}

H_{130} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work support among overall scale-1 bank managers of UP state.}

H_{131} \textit{Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work stressor among overall scale-1 bank managers of UP state.}
H132 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal support among overall scale-1 bank managers of UP state.

H133 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal stressor among overall scale-1 bank managers of UP state.

H134 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total psychological well-being among overall scale-1 bank managers of UP state.

H135 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence affective commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

H136 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence continuance commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

H137 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence normative commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

H138 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total organizational commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

H139 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence good mental health among overall scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

H140 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence poor mental health among overall scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

H141 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social support among overall scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

H142 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social stressor among overall scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

H143 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work support among overall scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

H144 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work stressor among overall scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

H145 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal support among overall scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

H146 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal stressor among overall scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

H147 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total psychological well-being among overall scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

H148 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence affective commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers of UP state.

H149 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence continuance commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers of UP state.

H150 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence normative commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers of UP state.

H151 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total organizational commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers of UP state.

H152 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence good mental health among overall scale-3 bank managers of UP state.

H153 Quality of working life and role stress will not influence poor mental health among overall scale-3 bank managers of UP state.
$H_{154}$ Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social support among overall scale-3 bank managers of UP state.

$H_{155}$ Quality of working life and role stress will not influence social stressor among overall scale-3 bank managers of UP state.

$H_{156}$ Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work support among overall scale-3 bank managers of UP state.

$H_{157}$ Quality of working life and role stress will not influence work stressor among overall scale-3 bank managers of UP state.

$H_{158}$ Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal support among overall scale-3 bank managers of UP state.

$H_{159}$ Quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal stressor among overall scale-3 bank managers of UP state.

$H_{160}$ Quality of working life and role stress will not influence total psychological well-being among overall scale-3 bank managers of UP state.
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Researches in social sciences are carried out as the sheer requirement of social sciences research is to control, predict, describe and explain the phenomenon with which they deal. Almost all behavioural sciences, especially the disciple of "Psychology", attempt to describe behaviour in the same manner. As recognized by all sciences, for any scientific endeavour to be carried on, observation is the key to answer queries of interest. Else, we may put together their zeal as the scientists ascertain facts and analyze them in an unbiased manner to draw conclusion (Festinger and Katz, 1953; Lindzey, 1954; Underwood, 1957; Selltiz et al, 1964; Shontz, 1965; and Megargee, 1966).

Research design plays a significant role in inference drawing. They use behavioural observations on a limited number of subjects, make decisions, predictions regarding the behaviour of the large group, represented by the subjects. Researches are designed to proceed in an orderly manner. They are carried on to control variance and to answer pertinent research questions (Lindquist, 1956). Basically, any research design stands for maximizing the effects of systematic variance, control of extraneous sources of variance and minimization of the error variance (Broota, 1989).

There are a number of methods developed, many designs created to carry on researches, but the selection of a particular research design depends upon peculiar nature of sample; types of tools and restraints regarding the major manipulation of variable being studied. Furthermore, the choice of methodology is guided through aims of study, variables under investigation and nature of the data, itself.

Review of relevant literature in the preceding chapter, that is, in chapter two, has given direction in explaining explicitly the objectives of study under investigation. Similarly, it also helped in selecting the methods adopted for carrying out the research. It was observed that Quality of Working Life was studied earlier as work enlargement, work enrichment; supervisory behaviour etc., but very few of them studied all these factors woven into one, which are the dimensions of Quality of Working Life. Hence, here we have selected a dimension wise study of Quality of Working Life and analyzed the concept under one umbrella. It has been selected as the first independent variable.

Likewise, Role Stress is taken as the second predictor variable. Stress is the cry of the day. This has lead to countless number of studies, surveys and researches, and will carry on doing so, until its haunting attitude reduces or eradicates. Thus, here "stress" arising out of "role" played by an individual is assessed.

Further, "Perceived Organizational Commitment" is the first criterion variable under study. It measures various aspects of commitment of employees, which plays a key role in carrying out each and every job. The second dependent variable is Psychological Well-Being. It is a rare instance, that this concept is being studied
under the name of organizational behaviour. We wanted to examine the psychological well-being of employees, that is, bank managers under various organizational stressors. Thus it has been chosen as the dependent criteria of our study.

**Sample**

It is always a difficult task faced by a researcher, particularly in social sciences regarding the method of drawing samples and deciding about the size of the sample. Though it is not possible for any investigator to cover the entire population of interest for the purpose of study, hence a representative sample from the population is always used. A sample is a small part of total existing events, objects or the information (Mohsin, 1984). It is a portion of a population or universe as to be representative of that population or universe (Kerlinger, 1983). This means that sampling is the process of drawing a small part of the population and assuming it to be representing characteristics of the whole population.

Further an appropriate sample size makes a study scientific as; the results so obtained may be reliable in making the inferences drawn and generalizations made appropriate about the population from which the sample is drawn. In the present endeavour, random sampling technique is used to select the sample because it was found suitable for the present research work.

The sample of present research comprises of three hundred (N=300) various levels bank managers from the central Indian state of Madhya Pradesh and secondly from the north Indian state of Uttar Pradesh. The banks were also selected randomly for the purpose of data collection. According to the aim of the research, one hundred and fifty (N=150) bank managers were taken from Madhya Pradesh (M.P.), and another one hundred and fifty (N=150) from the state of Uttar Pradesh (U.P.), irrespective of being rural or urban. Further each state’s bank managers were divided into three groups (N=50), namely, scale-1 bank managers; scale-2 bank managers and scale-3 bank managers respectively. Various banks from among which our sample is drawn are Allahabad Bank, Bank of Baroda, Canara Bank, Central Bank of India, Dena Bank, State Bank of India, Syndicate Bank, UCO Bank and Union Bank.

As the topic itself signifies, "various levels bank managers", the sample of bank managers is, divided among three sub-categories. The sub-categories into which the sample of bank managers are divided are: scale one managers of junior management level; scale two managers of middle management level and scale three managers of senior management level respectively. Thus, each of the sub-category had fifty subjects, (N= 50), making N = 150 in each state, and N = 300, by adding up both the state’s sample. This is how our final sample was selected, scales administered upon the subjects and finally the data was collected.
Tool(s)

In Behavioural sciences measurement has always been considered as a complex task but at the same time, an inevitable means to understand human experiences and behaviour. Among various methods which are used in Behavioural sciences, especially in Psychology, Questionnaire Method is considered as the best method to collect information. Hence, we have used the same in the present study.

In all four variables are examined in present study. They are Quality of Working Life; Role Stress; Perceived Organisational Commitment and last Psychological Well-Being. Former two are independent variables, while the later ones are dependent variables. Hence, four scales are used as tools of study. There description is as follows:

1. Quality of Working Life Scale

Quality of working life, as observed earlier is a multidimensional concept. Its measurement requires truly valid and reliable devices. The review of tests revealed that Shawkat and Ansari (2000) developed a scale to measure Quality of Working Life at AMU Aligarh. The scale was developed hardly half-a-decade back. Hence, it is the most accurate scale, touching all old as-well-as new aspects of Quality of Working Life.

Numerous dimensions which are studied are work itself; employee’s participation; physical working conditions; union management relations; organizational climate; inter-group relations; employees relations; autonomy at work; organizational commitment; supervisory relations; trust; clarity in organization; recognition; economic benefits; self-respect; employee’s health and promotion. In all, seventeen dimensions make up the scale.

There are forty-eight items in the scale. Two items have been negatively phrased; hence their scoring was done by reversing the scores. It is a five-point scale. The total scores of the scale ranges from 48 to 240. The higher the scores, the stronger the perception of quality of working life of employees working in the organization and vice-versa. The responses and their rating may be tabulated as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Response (s)</th>
<th>Score(s) Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>High Agreement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>High Disagreement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Its split half reliability \( r = 0.70 \), which is highly significant; and congruent validity was checked by comparing the scale with Porter’s (1972) j-satisfaction scale. The value which was obtained is \( r = 0.79 \), which confirms the validity of the scale. The added advantage is that this scale has been indigenously developed.

2. Role Stress Scale

Pareek’s (1977) role stress scale assessed the extent of role stress in ten different role dimensions in the present study. The dimensions are: inter-role distance; role stagnation; role expectation conflict; role erosion; role overload; role isolation; personal inadequacy; self-role distance; role ambiguity and resource inadequacy. The items relate to almost all relevant components of role generated stress. The scale comprises of twenty one items falling into ten categories. Its scoring is done on a five-point scale. So its scores ranged from 21 to 105. The measurement table is described as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Response(s)</th>
<th>Score(s) Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Very High efforts are being made</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>High efforts are being made</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Moderate efforts are being made</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Low efforts are being made</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Very Low efforts are being made</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity was determined by item-analysis. Test-retest reliability of scale has acceptable reliability. For total role stress the reliability is 0.73 and for dimensions of role stress it was found to be Self Role Distance 0.45; Inter Role Distance 0.58; Role Stagnation 0.63; Role Ambiguity 0.65; Role Overload 0.53, Role Erosion 0.37, Role Inadequacy 0.58 respectively.

3. Organizational Commitment Scale

Organizational commitment was measured by the scale developed by Shawkat and Ansari (2001). This scale is a seven point scale and consists of fifteen items with three dimensions. These dimensions are taken from Meyer and Allen (1991) framework of commitment. They are affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment respectively. Each dimension is measured on a seven point scale. Thus each item is rated from one to seven. It can be tabulated as:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option(s)</th>
<th>Score(s) assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So, the total range of score is 15 to 105. Two of the items are negatively phrased and their scoring was done by reversing the scores. The higher the scores obtained by the subjects, the more the commitment of the subjects and vice-versa. Split-half reliability coefficient \( r = 0.80 \) and congruent validity is 0.76.

4. Psychological Well-Being Scale

The Psychological Well-Being scale developed by Nishizawa (1996) is used to assess the psychological well-being of various levels managers. The scale comprises of forty items and is based on eight different dimensions of well-being. The items falling under various dimensions are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Dimension(s)</th>
<th>Item Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Good Mental Health</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Poor Mental Health</td>
<td>6, 7, 8, 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Social Stressor</td>
<td>16, 17, 18, 19, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Work Support</td>
<td>21, 22, 23, 24, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Work Stressor</td>
<td>26, 27, 28, 29, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Personal Support</td>
<td>31, 32, 33, 34, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Personal Stressor</td>
<td>36, 37, 38, 39, 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is a five-point scale, thus each item is rated from one to five. The scores and their corresponding qualitative categories are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Don’t apply at all</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Applies very slightly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Applies moderately</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Applies quite well</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Applies very well</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So, the lowest score can be 40 and highest 200. The range is 40 to 200. Its test re-test reliability is 0.79 and convergent validity is 0.83 respectively.

**Procedure**

The questionnaires were distributed individually to the subjects. A good rapport was established with them before requesting them to fill up the questionnaires. Great care was taken to remove any misconceptions regarding the proposed study.

Further subjects were assured of the confidentiality of their responses and were requested to extend their cooperation. For making the scales much easier to understand the instructions were invariably explained to the subjects. Each respondent on an average took thirty to forty minutes to fill up the questionnaires.

In order to record the background information of the respondents, the Biographical Information Blank (BIB) was prepared. It included the name of the organization; section; designation; work experience in years; number of promotions earned; special training, if any; age; marital status; educational level; number of dependents; total salary/month (in INR) and place of work respectively.

Finally, the questionnaires were collected from all the respondents, scoring done and further analysis was carried on.

**Statistical Analysis**

Statistics provides the strategy and methods for gathering the maximum amount of information for a given expenditure of time and other resources. Once the relevant information is obtained, the researcher requires methods to describe and summarize data so that results are interpretable and communicated (Mendenhall and Ramey, 1973). Investigations in behavioural sciences classify the nature of relationship between behaviour and its determinants. In this context, it can be stated that, these behavioural sciences, seek to examine the relationships between various Independent variable and the relevant Dependent variable.

The choice of statistical analysis is related to the type of data and the design of study. Reiterating to the objectives of the present study, it may be pointed out that here it is intended to investigate the Impact of Quality of Working Life and Role Stress on Perceived Organizational Commitment and Psychological Well-Being. Thus, it is perceptible that Quality of Working Life and Role Stress are Independent Variables whereas Perceived Organizational Commitment and Psychological Well-Being are Dependent Variables. In all there are two independent variables and two dependent variables.
Keeping in view the nature of present research work, step-wise multiple regression analysis is used to analyze the data. Regression is considered to be the most suitable and useful technique because it ascertains the influence of several independent variables on the dependent one (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1983). Multiple regression is quite time saving technique as through it we are not only able to find out which independent variables are the significant predictors of the criterion or the dependent variable but at the same time we do not have to select uncorrelated independent variables. This technique is effective as it not only gives the exact relationship between independent variables and dependent variables but also renders the nature of their relationship, that is, the contribution of predictors (independent variables) to criterion (dependent variables).

Generally there are three major analytic strategies in multiple regression, namely, Standard, Hierarchical and Stepwise, depending upon the way predictor variable entering the equation. Standard multiple regression is applied simply to assess relationships among variables and answer the basic question of multiple correlation. Whereas, hierarchical multiple regression is considered when the researcher controls the entry of variables into the regression equation on logical or theoretical basis. While in the stepwise multiple regression method, the order of entry of variables is based on statistical rather than theoretical criteria.

Present study incorporates the use of stepwise multiple regression for treatment of the data obtained. Here predictors enter into the equation stepwise, one after the other, on the basis of their highest simple correlation with criterion variables. This process continues until no more useful information is obtained from further addition of the predictors.

Objectives of the Proposed Study

- To study the impact of quality of working life on perceived organizational commitment among various levels of bank managers of MP and UP as-well-as among overall various levels of bank managers.

- To study the impact of quality of working life on psychological well-being among various levels of bank managers of MP and UP as-well-as among overall various levels of bank managers.

- To study the impact of role-stress on perceived organizational commitment among various levels of bank managers of MP and UP as-well-as among overall various levels of bank managers.

- To study the impact of role-stress on psychological well-being among various levels of bank managers of MP and UP as-well-as among overall various levels of bank managers.
Chapter Four

Result and Discussion
Chapter Four Result and Discussion

The present chapter shows the statistical analysis of the data obtained for the investigation, interpretation and discussion thereof. In the proposed study, there are two independent variables, namely, quality of working life and role stress, and two dependent variables, namely, organizational commitment and psychological well-being. The measurement of organizational commitment has been carried on with respect to three facets, namely, affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment respectively. Overall organizational commitment is also measured. Working on the same pattern, the second dependent variable, psychological well-being is measured. It has eight factors, namely, good mental health; poor mental health; social support; social stressor; work support; work stressor; personal support and personal stressor respectively. Overall psychological well-being is also measured. Keeping in view the main objectives of the research work, step-wise multiple regression analysis is used to analyze the data.

In all, the results are divided into twelve major comparisons groups. Each major comparison group starts with a table of descriptive statistics. It is followed by thirteen tables of regression statistics. In a single regression result, here two tables are taken into consideration according to the nature of research problem. They are the table of model summary and the table of coefficients respectively. Thus, each result consists of fourteen main tables in total, and twenty-seven tables in all.

Accordingly the computations were carried on in the computer. Computer yielded the entire analysis in various different steps. However, we have used only two tables, that is, table of model summary and table of coefficients respectively, revealing the number of best predictors entered to influence dependent variable, that too, in edited forms. The remaining tables like the ANOVA table and the list of excluded variables have not been entered here for the sake of convenience and mainly due to the presumption that except the independent variables that entered to the equation, the remaining independent variables will definitely be the part of the variables excluded or have not come to the equation.

An additional statistical analysis by applying t-test was done, in the end, in order to answer the questions raised earlier to interpret the results and observe significance of difference, if any, among various groups of subjects in their quality of working life; role stress; perceived organizational commitment and psychological well-being respectively.

Various abbreviations and short forms are used in tables and also in interpretation and discussion of the data. Before moving further their full forms are explained, dimension wise for the sake of understanding of the findings properly and accurately. They are as follows:
1. QWL: Quality of Working Life. Its dimensions are:

- WI/W Itself: Work Itself
- EM: Employee participation
- PWC: Physical Working Conditions
- UMR: Union Management Relations
- OLCL: Organizational Climate
- IGR: Inter Group Relations
- ER: Employee Relations
- AAW: Autonomy At Work
- OC: Organizational Commitment
- SR: Supervisory Relations
- Trust
- CIO: Clarity In Organization
- Recog: Recognition
- EB/Eco.Ben: Economic Benefits
- SER: Self Respect
- EH/Em.Hlth: Employee Health
- Promo
- Tqwl: Total quality of working life

2. RS: Role Stress. Its dimensions are:

- IRD: Inter Role Distance
- RSTGN: Role Stagnation
- REC: Role Expectation Conflict
- RE: Role Erosion
- RO: Role Overload
- RI: Role Isolation
1. PI  
   Personal Inadequacy

2. SRD  
   Self Role Distance

3. RA  
   Role Ambiguity

4. RIN  
   Role Inadequacy

5. Trs  
   Total role stress

3. OC: Organizational Commitment

   - AC /ac  
     Affective Commitment
   - CC/cc  
     Continuance Commitment
   - NC/nc  
     Normative Commitment
   - Toc  
     Total organizational commitment

4. PWB: Psychological Well-Being

   - GMH/Gmh  
     Good Mental Health
   - PMH/Pmh  
     Poor Mental Health
   - SSUP/Ssup  
     Social Support
   - SSTR/Sstr  
     Social Stressor
   - WSUP/Wsup  
     Work Support
   - WSTR/Wstr  
     Work Stressor
   - PSUP/Psup  
     Personal Support
   - PSTR/Pstr  
     Personal Stressor
   - Tpwb  
     Total psychological well-being

RESULTS

Now we will be dealing with the results. In the first major results section we have measured the impact of overall quality of working life and overall role stress on overall perceived organizational commitment and overall psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of MP and UP states. The section starts with the descriptive table describing the minimum scores; maximum scores; mean scores and standard deviation of all the variables and their respective factors (N=300). It is followed by the statistical findings of stepwise multiple regression. This first section of results starts from table number one and ends at table number thirteen respectively.
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.8700</td>
<td>2.03476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.5867</td>
<td>2.39756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.6733</td>
<td>2.30456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.0400</td>
<td>1.91065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.9400</td>
<td>2.13344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.8700</td>
<td>2.31176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.2500</td>
<td>1.76386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.8167</td>
<td>1.99407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.9067</td>
<td>2.46540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.7300</td>
<td>2.50025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.5067</td>
<td>1.08653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.8933</td>
<td>2.29482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.9567</td>
<td>2.34516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>11.6300</td>
<td>2.21875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.4033</td>
<td>2.46866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.4233</td>
<td>2.02925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.8367</td>
<td>2.06499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>239.00</td>
<td>178.3333</td>
<td>23.72816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.7967</td>
<td>1.89754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.7300</td>
<td>2.00428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.8300</td>
<td>2.34509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.4967</td>
<td>2.06985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.0033</td>
<td>1.73398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.8467</td>
<td>1.73586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.7800</td>
<td>1.81731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.9933</td>
<td>2.03480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.7567</td>
<td>2.28653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>8.9200</td>
<td>3.02944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>70.1533</td>
<td>18.94094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>26.6700</td>
<td>6.16396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>27.8600</td>
<td>6.08966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>26.7267</td>
<td>5.91511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toc</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>81.2567</td>
<td>15.74878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMH</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.0467</td>
<td>3.74494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMH</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>17.8900</td>
<td>4.00392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSUP</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.1433</td>
<td>3.87809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTb</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>17.8633</td>
<td>4.15880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSUP</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.2000</td>
<td>3.65758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSTR</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>18.1533</td>
<td>4.40467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSUP</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>21.8200</td>
<td>3.72117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTR</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>17.9033</td>
<td>4.31851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tpwb</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>160.0200</td>
<td>27.88665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1

Showing impact of QWL and RS on AC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall various levels bank managers

Table 1a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td></td>
<td>.711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td></td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td></td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td></td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td></td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td></td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, RE, PWC, RA, EB, Recog

Table 1 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on affective commitment among overall various levels bank managers. In all six independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; role erosion; physical working conditions; role ambiguity; economic benefit and recognition respectively.

Table 1a. shows the model summary indicating six predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .843 for total quality of working life; .866 for role erosion; .870 for physical working conditions; .872 for role ambiguity; .874 for economic benefits and .876 for recognition respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (affective commitment) came out as 71.1% for total quality of working life; 4% for role erosion; 0.6% for physical working conditions; 0.3% for role ambiguity; 0.3% for economic benefits and 0.4% for recognition respectively.
Table 1b.

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-27.016</td>
<td>2.670</td>
<td>-10.117</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>14.454</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>2.985</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>2.767</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>2.334</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>2.185</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-224</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-2.173</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: AC

Table 1b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences affective commitment of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=14.45 for Tqwl; t=2.98 for RE; t=2.76 for PWC; t=2.33 for RA; t=2.18 for EB and t=-2.17 for recognition respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (affective commitment). The correlation (partial) is r=.645 for Tqwl; r=.172 for RE; r=.160 for PWC; r=.135 for RA; r=.127 for EB and r=-.126 for recognition respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of affective commitment.

The t-value of recognition is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of recognition and criterion (affective commitment) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that recognition negatively influence the level of affective commitment of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of recognition increases the level of affective commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that affective commitment can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; RE; PWC; RA and EB respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H5 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence affective commitment among overall various levels bank managers.
Table 2

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on CC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall various levels bank managers**

Table 2a.

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.849*</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.853*</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.856*</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, IGR, RSTGN

Table 2 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; inter group relations and role stagnation.

Table 2a. shows the model summary indicating three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .849 for total quality of working life; .853 for inter group relations and .856 for role stagnation respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (continuance commitment) came out as 72.00% for total quality of working life; 0.8% for inter group relations and 0.5% for role stagnation respectively.
Table 2b.

Coefficients\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-16.441</td>
<td>2.613</td>
<td>-6.292</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>19.689</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>-.321</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-2.871</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>2.262</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Dependent Variable: CC

Table 2b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences continuance commitment of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, \(t=19.68\) for Tqwl; \(t= -2.87\) for IGR and \(t=2.26\) for RSTGN respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (continuance commitment). The correlation (partial) is \(r=.753\) for Tqwl; \(r= -.165\) for IGR; and \(r=.130\) for RSTGN respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of continuance commitment.

The t-value of inter group relations is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of inter group relations and criterion (continuance commitment) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that inter group relations negatively influence the level of continuance commitment of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of inter group relations increases the level of continuance commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that continuance commitment can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and RSTGN. Thus, the null-hypothesis \(H_6\) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers.
Table 3

Showing impact of QWL and RS on NC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall various levels bank managers

Table 3a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>K Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.833*</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.842*</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.846*</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, Trs, Recog

Table 3 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; inter group relations and role stagnation.

Table 3a. shows the model summary indicating three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .833 for total quality of working life; .842 for total role stress and .846 for recognition respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (normative commitment) came out as 69.4% for total quality of working life; 1.5% for total role stress and 0.8% for recognition respectively.
Table 3b.  
**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-23.512</td>
<td>3.834</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.6133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>17.225</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>3.615</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-.301</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-2.844</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: NC

Table 3b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences normative commitment of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=17.22 for Tqwl; t=3.61 for Trs and t=-2.84 for Recog respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (normative commitment). The correlation (partial) is r=.708 for Tqwl; r=.206 for Trs and r=-.163 for Recog respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of normative commitment.

The t-value of recognition is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of recognition and criterion (normative commitment) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that recognition negatively influence the level of normative commitment of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of recognition increases, the level of normative commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that normative commitment can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and Trs. Thus, the null-hypothesis H7 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers.
Table 4

Showing impact of QWL and RS on Toc among overall various levels bank managers

Table 4a

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.971 a</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.981 b</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.983 c</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.984 d</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.985 e</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.985 f</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.985 g</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.986 h</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.986 i</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.986 j</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.986 k</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.986 l</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.987 m</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

m Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, PWC, PI, EM, Trust, WI, SRD, RSTGN, ER, Recog, IGR

Table 4 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers. In all eleven independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; physical working conditions; personal inadequacy; employee participation; trust; work itself; self role distance; role stagnation; employee relations; recognition and inter group relations.

Table 4a. shows the model summary indicating eleven predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .971 for total quality of working life; .983 for physical working conditions; .984 for personal inadequacy; .985 for employee participation; .985 for trust; .985 for work itself; .986 for self role distance; .986 for role stagnation; .986 for employee relations; .986 for recognition and .987 for inter group relations respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (total organizational commitment) came out as 94.3% for total quality of working life; 0.4% for physical working conditions; 0.2 % for personal inadequacy; 0.1% for employee participation; 0.1% for trust; 0.1% for work itself;
0.1% for self role distance; 0.1% for role stagnation; 0.1% for employee relations; and 0.1% for inter group relations respectively.

Table 4b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Coefficients</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-67.687</td>
<td>2.987</td>
<td>-22.657</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>31.192</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>5.225</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>3.708</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>3.873</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-624</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-3.736</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>2.657</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>4.850</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>2.695</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>2.460</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-2.855</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>-.239</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-2.390</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: Toc

Table 4b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS in.7ueses total organizational commitment of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=31.19 for Tqwl; t=5.22 for PWC; t=3.70 for PI; t=3.87 for EM; t = -3.73 for Trust; t = 2.65 for WI; t = 4.85 for SRD; t = 2.69 for RSTGN; t = 2.46 for ER; t = -2.85 for Recog and t = -2.39 for IGR respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total organizational commitment). The correlation (partial) is r = .878 for Tqwl; r = .294 for PWC; r = .213 for PI; r = .222 for EM; r = -.215 for Trust; r = .155 for WI; r = .275 for SRD; r = .157 for RSTGN; r = .143 for ER; r = -.166 for Recog and r = -.139 for IGR respectively, showing that most of the predictors significantly influence the degree of total organizational commitment.

The t-values of trust; recognition and inter group relations are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Simi1arly the correlations of trust; recognition; inter group relations and criterion (total organizational commitment) shows significant negative relationship. It means that trust; recognition and inter group relations negatively influence the level of total organizational commitment of overall various levels bank managers. As the levels of trust; recognition and inter group relations increases, the level of total organizational commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total organizational commitment can be significantly predicted by Tqwl, PWC, PI, EM, WI, SRD, RSTGN and ER respectively. Thus, the null- hypothesis H₈ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life
and role stress influence total organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers.

Table 5

Showing impact of QWL and RS on GMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers

Table 5a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.861*</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.866*</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.870*</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.874*</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.876*</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.878*</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.880*</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.883*</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.885*</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.884*</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.883*</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

k Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, SER, OLCL, EM, RSTGN, RA, PI

Table 5 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on good mental health among overall various levels bank managers. In all seven independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; self respect; organizational climate; employee participation; role stagnation; role ambiguity and personal inadequacy.

Table 5a. shows the model summary indicating seven predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .861 for total quality of working life; .870 for self respect; .874 for organizational climate; .876 for employee participation; .880 for role stagnation; .883 for role ambiguity and .885 for personal inadequacy respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (good mental health) came out as 74.2% for total quality of working life; 0.6% for self respect; 0.7% for organizational climate; 0.4% for employee participation; 0.3% for role stagnation; 0.6% for role ambiguity and 0.3% for personal inadequacy respectively.
Table 5b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences good mental health of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=12.29 for Tqwl; t= -3.15 for SER; t= -1.90 for OC; t=2.10 for EM; t=2.28 for RSTGN; t= -3.86 for RA; and t=2.47 for PI respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (good mental health). The correlation (partial) is r =.584 for Tqwl; r=.181 for SER; r= -.111 for OLCL; r=.122 for EM; r=.132 for RSTGN; r= -.211 for RA and r=.143 for PI respectively, showing that most of the predictors significantly influence the degree of good mental health.

The t-values of self respect; organizational climate and role ambiguity are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of self respect; organizational climate and role ambiguity and criterion variable (good mental health) show a significant negative relationship. It means that self respect; organizational climate and role ambiguity negatively influence the level of good mental health overall various levels bank managers. As the levels of self respect; organizational climate and role ambiguity increases, the level of good mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that good mental health can be significantly predicted by Tqwl, SER, OLCL, EM, RSTGN, RA and PI, respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H0 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence good mental health among overall various levels bank managers.
Table 6

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers

Table 6a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, REC, SER, RIN

Table 6 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on poor mental health among overall various levels bank managers. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; role expectation conflict; self respect and role inadequacy.

Table 6a. shows the model summary indicating four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .887 for total quality of working life; .897 for role expectation conflict; .902 for self respect and .904 for role inadequacy respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (poor mental health) came out as 78.7% for total quality of working life; 1.8% for role expectation conflict; 0.8% for self respect and 0.4% for role inadequacy respectively.
Table 6b. Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>12.324</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>-.270</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>-3.689</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>3.632</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-2.596</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: PMH

Table 6b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences poor mental health of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=12.32 for Tqwl; t= -3.68 for REC; t=3.63 for self respect and t= -2.59 for role inadeqacy respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (poor mental health). The correlation (partial) is r=.583 for Tqwl; r= -.210 for REC; r=.207 for SER; and r= -.149 for RI respectively, showing that half of the predictors significantly influence the degree of poor mental health.

The t-values of role expectation conflict and role inadequacy are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of role expectation conflict and role inadequacy and criterion variables (poor mental health) show significant negative relationship. It means that role expectation conflict and role inadequacy negatively influence the level of poor mental health overall various levels bank managers. As the levels of role expectation conflict and role inadequacy increases, the level of poor mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that poor mental health can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and SER respectively. Thus, the null hypothesis H10 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence poor mental health among overall various levels bank managers.
Table 7

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers

Table 7a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.839*</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.856*</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.870*</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.878*</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.882*</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.886*</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.888*</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.890*</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.893*</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.895*</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.897*</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.899*</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.901*</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.903*</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.902*</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, PI, SER, AAW, WI, RI, RA, SRD, PWC, RSTGN, REC, Recog, CIO

Table 7 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social support among overall various levels bank managers. In all thirteen independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; personal inadequacy; self respect; autonomy at work; work itself; role isolation; role ambiguity; self role distance; physical working conditions; role stagnation; role expectation conflict; recognition and clarity in organization.

Table 7a. shows the model summary indicating all thirteen predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .839 for total quality of working life; .856 for personal inadequacy; .870 for self respect.899 for role expectation conflict; .878 for autonomy at work; .882 for work itself; .886 for role isolation; .890 for role ambiguity; .893 for self role distance; .895 for physical working conditions; .897 for role stagnation; .899 for role expectation conflict; .901 for recognition; and .903 for clarity in organization respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of...
criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (social support) came out as 70.4% for total quality of working life; 2.8% for personal inadequacy; 2.4% for self respect; 1.5% for autonomy at work; 0.7% for work itself; 0.7% for role isolation; 0.3% for role ambiguity; 0.6% for self role distance; 0.3% for physical working conditions; 0.4% for role stagnation; 0.4% for role expectation conflict; 0.4% for recognition and 0.3% for clarity in organization respectively.

Table 7b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-6.264</td>
<td>2.368</td>
<td>-2.645</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>10.449</td>
<td>.000 .526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>3.901</td>
<td>.000 .225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>-.273</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>-5.162</td>
<td>.000 -.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-3.170</td>
<td>.002 -.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>4.733</td>
<td>.000 .269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>-.495</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>-3.464</td>
<td>.001 -.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>-.355</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.209</td>
<td>-3.486</td>
<td>.001 -.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>3.153</td>
<td>.002 .183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-2.763</td>
<td>.006 -.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>3.491</td>
<td>.001 .202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>-.296</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>-2.952</td>
<td>.003 -.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>2.313</td>
<td>.021 .136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-2.542</td>
<td>.012 -.149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social support of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t=10.44$ for Tqwl; $t=3.90$ for PI; $t=-5.16$ for SER; $t=-3.17$ for AAW; $t=4.73$ for WI; $t=-3.46$ for RI; $t=-3.48$ for RA; $t=3.15$ for SRD; $t=-2.76$ for PWC; $t=3.49$ for RSTGN; $t=-2.95$ for REC; $t=2.31$ for Recog and $t=-2.54$ for CIO respectively. By having a look at the $t$-values, we may conclude that $t$-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social support). The correlation (partial) is $r=.526$ for Tqwl; $r=.225$ for PI; $r=-.292$ for SER; $r=-.184$ for AAW; $r=.269$ for WI; $r=-.201$ for RI; $r=-.202$ for RA; $r=.183$ for SRD; $r=-.161$ for PWC; $r=.202$ for RSTGN; $r=-.172$ for REC; $r=.136$ for Recog and $r=-.149$ for CIO respectively, showing that half of the predictors significantly influence the degree of poor mental health.
The t-values of self respect; autonomy at work; role isolation; role ambiguity; physical working conditions; role expectation conflict and clarity in organization are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of self respect; autonomy at work; role isolation; role ambiguity; physical working conditions; role expectation conflict and clarity in organization and criterion variable (social support) show significant negative relationship. It means that self respect; autonomy at work; role isolation; role ambiguity; physical working conditions; role expectation conflict and clarity in organization negatively influence the level of social support of overall various levels bank managers. As the levels of self respect; autonomy at work; role isolation; role ambiguity; physical working conditions; role expectation conflict and clarity in organization increases, the level of social support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social support can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; PI; WI; SRD; RSTGN and Recog respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( \text{H}_{11} \) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social support among overall various levels bank managers.

### Table 8

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.875*</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.884*</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.891*</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.896*</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.899*</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.901*</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, IRD, ER, Trust, WI, UMR

Table 8 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social stressor among overall various levels bank managers. In all six independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; inter role distance; employee participation; trust; work itself and union management relations respectively.
Table 8a. shows the model summary indicating all six predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .875 for total quality of working life; .884 for inter role distance; .891 for employee participation; .896 for trust; .899 for work itself and .901 for union management relations respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (social stressor) came out as 76.6% for total quality of working life; 1.5% for inter role distance; 1.2% for employee participation; 0.9% for trust; 0.6% for work itself and 0.3% for union management relations respectively.

Table 8b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social stressor of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t=12.95$ for Tqwl; $t=-3.46$ for IRD; $t=4.78$ for ER; $t=-3.85$ for Trust; $t=-3.15$ for WI and $t=-2.29$ for UMR respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social stressor). The correlation (partial) is $r=.603$ for Tqwl; $r=-.198$ for IRD; $r=.269$ for ER; $r=-.220$ for Trust; $r=-.181$ for WI and $r=-.133$ for UMR respectively, showing that half of the predictors significantly influence the degree of social stressor.

The t-values of inter role distance; trust; work itself and union management relations are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of inter role distance; trust; work itself and union management relations and criterion variable (social stressor) show significant negative relationship. It means that inter role distance; trust; work itself and union management relations negatively influence the level of social stressor of overall various levels bank managers. As the levels of inter role distance; trust; work itself and union management relations increases, the level of social stressor decreases.
From the results it may be interpreted that social stressor can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and ER respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{12}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social stressor among overall various levels bank managers.

Table 9

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers

Table 9a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R$ Square</th>
<th>Adjusted $R$ Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics $R$ Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.857*</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.872b</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.884c</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.890d</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.894e</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.898f</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.900g</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.903h</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.904i</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, PI, SER, EM, REC, RSTGN, CIO, AAW, OLCL

Table 9 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work support among overall various levels bank managers. In all nine independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; personal inadequacy; self respect; employee participation; role expectation conflict; role stagnation; clarity in organization; autonomy at work and organizational climate respectively.

Table 9a. shows the model summary indicating all nine predictors of the model. Multiple correlation ($R$) is found as .857 for total quality of working life; .872 for personal inadequacy; .884 for self respect; .890 for employee participation; .894 for role expectation conflict; .898 for role stagnation; .900 for clarity in organization; .903 for autonomy at work and .904 for organizational climate respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (work support)
came out as 73.4% for total quality of working life; 2.6% for personal inadequacy; 2.0% for self respect; 1.2% for employee participation; 0.6% for role expectation conflict; 0.8% for role stagnation; 0.4% for clarity in organization; 0.4% for autonomy at work and 0.3% for organizational climate respectively.

Table 9b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.138</td>
<td>1.780</td>
<td>-3.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td></td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>13.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>3.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SER</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.298</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-6.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td></td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>2.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REC</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.284</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-3.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td></td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>2.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIO</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-2.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAW</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-2.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-2.294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: WSUP

Table 9b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work support of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, \( t = 13.17 \) for Tqwl; \( t = -3.49 \) for PI; \( t = -6.35 \) for SER; \( t = 2.23 \) for EM; \( t = -3.86 \) for REC; \( t = 2.83 \) for RSTGN; \( t = -2.88 \) for CIO; \( t = -2.72 \) for AAW and \( t = -2.29 \) for OLCL respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work support). The correlation (partial) is \( r = .612 \) for Tqwl; \( r = -201 \) for PI; \( r = -350 \) for SER; \( r = .130 \) for EM; \( r = -222 \) for REC; \( r = .164 \) for RSTGN; \( r = -167 \) for CIO; \( r = -158 \) for AAW and \( r = -133 \) for OLCL respectively, showing that half of the predictors significantly influence the degree of work support.

The t-values of self respect; role expectation conflict; clarity in organization; autonomy at work and organizational climate are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of self respect; role expectation conflict; clarity in organization; autonomy at work and organizational climate and criterion variable (work support) show significant negative relationship. It means that self respect; role expectation conflict; clarity in organization; autonomy at work and organizational climate negatively influence the level of work support of overall various levels bank managers. As the levels of self respect; role expectation conflict; clarity in organization; autonomy at work and organizational climate increases, the level of work support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work support can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; PI; EM and RSTGN respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_{13} \) is rejected.
Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work support among overall various levels bank managers.

Table 10

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers**

Table 10a

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.864*</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.870^b</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.872^c</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, SRD, Recog

Table 10 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work stressor among overall various levels bank managers. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; self role distance and recognition respectively.

Table 10a. shows the model summary indicating all three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .864 for total quality of working life; .870 for self role distance and .872 for recognition respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (work stressor) came out as 74.6% for total quality of working life; 1.1% for self role distance and 0.4% for recognition respectively.
Table 10b.

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.076</td>
<td>2.195</td>
<td>-1.401</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>14.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>-.390</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-3.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-2.157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Dependent Variable: WSTR

Table 10b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work stressor of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=14.49 for Tqwl; t= -3.78 for SRD and t= -2.15 for Recog respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work stressor). The correlation (partial) is r=.644 for Tqwl; r= -.215 for SRD and r= -.124 for Recog respectively, showing that half of the predictors significantly influence the degree of work stressor.

The t-values of self role distance and recognition are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of self role distance and recognition and criterion variable (work stressor) show significant negative relationship. It means that self role distance and recognition negatively influence the level of work stressor of overall various levels bank managers. As the levels of self role distance and recognition increases, the level of work stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work stressor can be significantly predicted by Tqwl. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{14}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work stressor among overall various levels bank managers.
Table 11
Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers

Table 11a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.817ᵃ</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.832ᵇ</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.840ᶜ</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.850ᵈ</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.856ᵉ</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.863ᶠ</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ᵃ Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, SER, EM, IRD, RSTGN, PWC

Table 11 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal support among overall various levels bank managers. In all six independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; self respect; employee participation; inter role distance; role stagnation and physical working conditions respectively.

Table 11a. shows the model summary indicating all six predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .817 for total quality of working life; .832 for self respect; .840 for employee participation; .850 for inter role distance; .856 for role stagnation and .863 for physical working conditions respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (personal support) came out as 66.8% for total quality of working life; 2.3% for self respect; 1.4% for employee participation; 1.8% for inter role distance; 0.9% for role stagnation and 1.2% for physical working conditions respectively.
Table 11b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.314</td>
<td>1.977</td>
<td></td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td></td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>-.297</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td></td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>-.628</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.320</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td></td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>-.285</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: PSUP

Table 11b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal support of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=9.51 for Tqwl; t= -5.44 for SER; t=4.41 for EM; t= -5.31 for IRD; t=3.70 for RSTGN and t= -3.69 for PWC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal support). The correlation (partial) is r=.486 for Tqwl; r= -.303 for SER; r= .250 for EM; r= -.297 for IRD; r=.211 for RSTGN and r= -.211 for PWC respectively, showing that half of the predictors significantly influence the degree of personal support.

The t-values of self respect; inter role distance and physical working conditions are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of self respect; inter role distance and physical working conditions and criterion variable (personal support) show significant negative relationship. It means that self respect; inter role distance and physical working conditions negatively influence the level of personal support of overall various levels bank managers. As the levels of self respect; inter role distance and physical working conditions increases, the level of personal support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal support can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; EM and RSTGN respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H₁₅ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal support among overall various levels bank managers.
Table 12

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers

Table 12a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.805*</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.817*</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.825*</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.830*</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.833*</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, Trs, Promo, SR, Trust

Table 12 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; total role stress; promotion; supervisory relations and trust respectively.

Table 12a. shows the model summary indicating all five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .805 for total quality of working life; .817 for total role stress; .825 for promotion; .830 for supervisory relations and .833 for trust respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (personal stressor) came out as 64.8% for total quality of working life; 2.1% for total role stress; 1.3% for promotion; 0.8% for supervisory relations and 0.5% for trust respectively.
Table 12b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal stressor of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t=7.49$ for Tqwl; $t=-5.73$ for Trs; $t=-2.92$ for Promo; $t=-2.32$ for SR and $t=2.19$ for Trust respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal stressor). The correlation (partial) is $r= .400$ for Tqwl; $r=-.317$ for Trs; $r=-.168$ for Promo; $r=-.134$ for SR and $r=.127$ for Trust respectively, showing that half of the predictors significantly influence the degree of personal stressor.

The t-values of total role stress; promotion and supervisory relations are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; promotion and supervisory relations and criterion variable (personal stressor) show significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; promotion and supervisory relations negatively influence the level of personal stressor of overall various levels bank managers. As the levels role stress; promotion and supervisory relations of increases, the level of personal stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal stressor can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and Trust respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{16}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers.
Table 13

Showing impact of QWL and RS on Tpwb among overall various levels bank managers

Table 13a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.973*</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.976*</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.978*</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.980*</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.981*</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.981*</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.982*</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.982*</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.982*</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.983*</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, REC, EM, SER, PI, SRD, AAW, ER, RI, EB

Table 13 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers. In all ten independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; role expectation conflict; employee participation; self respect; personal inadequacy; self role distance; autonomy at work; employee relations; role isolation and economic benefits respectively.

Table 13a. shows the model summary indicating all ten predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .973 for total quality of working life; .976 for role expectation conflict; .978 for employee participation; .980 for self respect; .981 for personal inadequacy; .981 for self role distance; .982 for autonomy at work; .982 for employee relations; .982 for role isolation and .983 for economic benefits respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (total psychological well-being) came out as 94.6% for total quality of working life; 0.6% for role expectation conflict; 0.4% for employee participation; 0.3% for self respect; 0.2% for personal inadequacy; 0.1% for self role distance; 0.1% for autonomy at work; 0.1% for employee relations; 0.1% for role isolation and 0.1% for economic benefits respectively.
Table 13b. 
Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-3.926</td>
<td>7.395</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>21.106</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>-1.447</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-5.124</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>4.320</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>-.667</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-4.369</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>2.205</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>6.216</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>-1.376</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-3.381</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>-.541</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-2.196</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>3.202</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>-1.166</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>-2.660</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>2.418</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Tpwb

Table 13b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total psychological well-being of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=21.10 for Tqwl; t= -5.12 for REC; t= 4.32 for EM; t= -4.36 for SER; t= 6.21 for PI; t= -3.38 for SRD; t= -2.19 for AAW; t=3.20 for ER; t= -2.66 for RI and t=2.41 for EB respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total psychological well-being). The correlation (partial) is r=.779 for Tqwl; r= -.289 for REC; r= -.246 for EM; r= -.249 for SER; r=.343 for PI; r= -.195 for SRD; r= -.128 for AAW; r=.185 for ER; r= -.155 for RI and r=.141 for EB respectively, showing that half of the predictors significantly influence the degree of total psychological well-being.

The t-values of role expectation conflict; self respect; self role distance; autonomy at work and role isolation are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of role expectation conflict; self respect; self role distance; autonomy at work and role isolation and criterion variable (total psychological well-being) show significant negative relationship. It means that role expectation conflict; self respect; self role distance; autonomy at work and role isolation negatively influence the level of total psychological well-being of overall various levels bank managers. As the levels of role expectation conflict; self respect; self role distance; autonomy at work and role isolation increases, the level of total psychological well-being decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total quality of working life can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; EM; PI; ER and EB respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{17}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers.
In the second major results section we have measured the impact of quality of working life and role stress on perceived organizational commitment and psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of MP state. The section starts with the descriptive table describing the minimum scores; maximum scores; mean scores and standard deviation of all the variables and their respective factors (N=150). It is followed by the statistical findings of stepwise multiple regression. This second section of results starts from table number fourteen and ends at table number twenty-six respectively.
### Result and Discussion

#### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.7733</td>
<td>2.35491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.4867</td>
<td>2.50566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.6267</td>
<td>2.33889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.8400</td>
<td>1.74587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.8267</td>
<td>1.96529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.5600</td>
<td>2.35586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.6800</td>
<td>1.57719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.5333</td>
<td>2.17881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.4667</td>
<td>2.72120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.1333</td>
<td>2.40432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.9067</td>
<td>1.01232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.2333</td>
<td>2.12185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.2333</td>
<td>2.34997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>11.4200</td>
<td>2.15279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.3467</td>
<td>2.20733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.7133</td>
<td>1.84768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.3733</td>
<td>1.88083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>236.00</td>
<td>174.1533</td>
<td>26.18795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.9333</td>
<td>1.69748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.9067</td>
<td>1.84771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.0867</td>
<td>1.88579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.8533</td>
<td>1.90861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.5333</td>
<td>1.68159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.5333</td>
<td>1.57440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.8000</td>
<td>1.60954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRRD</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.1600</td>
<td>1.85038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.2533</td>
<td>1.88668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.9467</td>
<td>3.49455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>81.9067</td>
<td>18.13095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>26.9400</td>
<td>6.57148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>27.0200</td>
<td>6.47397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>26.5733</td>
<td>6.56955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toc</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>80.5333</td>
<td>17.07688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMH</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>21.2467</td>
<td>3.85985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMH</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>17.0000</td>
<td>4.18531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSUP</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>21.5600</td>
<td>4.00416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTR</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>17.0867</td>
<td>4.60367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSUP</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>21.7133</td>
<td>3.67531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSTR</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>17.4267</td>
<td>4.76755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSUP</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>20.7733</td>
<td>3.86196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTR</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>17.0267</td>
<td>4.76557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tpwb</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>153.8333</td>
<td>29.10786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

Showing impact of QWL and RS on AC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall various levels bank managers of MP state

Table 14a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.869a</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.880b</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl

Table 14 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on affective commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life and role overload respectively.

Table 14a. shows the model summary indicating all two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .869 for total quality cf working life and .880 for role overload respectively. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (affective commitment) came out as 75.6% for total quality of working life; 2.0% for role overload respectively.
Table 14b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant) 30.415</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>-5.345</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>13.957</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>3.573</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: AC

Table 14b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences affective commitment of overall various levels bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=13.95 for Tqwl and t=3.57 for RO respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (affective commitment). The correlation (partial) is r=.755 for Tqwl and r=.283 for RO respectively, showing that all of the predictors significantly influence the degree of affective commitment.

From the results it may be interpreted that affective commitment of overall various levels bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and RO respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H18 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence affective commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
Table 15

Showing impact of QWL and RS on CC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall various levels bank managers of MP state

Table 15a.
Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.835(^a)</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.843(^b)</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.850(^c)</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, Wl, IGR

Table 15 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; work itself and inter group relations respectively.

Table 15a. shows the model summary indicating all three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .835 for total quality of working life and .843 for work itself and .850 for inter group relations respectively. Further R\(^2\), which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R\(^2\) change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (affective commitment) came out as 69.8% for total quality of working life; 1.3% for work itself and 1.2% for inter group relations respectively.
Table 15b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-9.901</td>
<td>2.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>8.032</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.664</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>3.022</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.599</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>-.218</td>
<td>-2.463</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: CC

Table 15b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences continuance commitment of overall various levels bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, \( t=8.03 \) for Tqwl; \( t=3.02 \) for WI and \( t=-2.46 \) for IGR respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (continuance commitment). The correlation (partial) is \( r=.554 \) for Tqwl; \( r=.243 \) for WI and \( r=-.200 \) for IGR respectively, showing that majority of the predictors significantly influence the degree of continuance commitment.

The t-value of inter group relations is negative indicating negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation with the criterion (continuance commitment) came out to be negative, indicating significant negative relationship. It means that inter group relations negatively influence the level of continuance commitment of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of inter group relations increases, the level of continuance commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that continuance commitment of overall various levels bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and WI respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_19 \) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
Table 16

Showing impact of QWL and RS on NC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall various levels bank managers of MP state

Table 16a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, EM

Table 16 is showing the impact of quality of working life and role stress on normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life and employee participation respectively.

Table 16a. shows the model summary indicating all two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .852 for total quality of working life and .864 for employee participation respectively. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (normative commitment) came out as 72.7% for total quality of working life; 2.0% for employee participation respectively.

Table 16b.

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-9.108</td>
<td>1.894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>8.610</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>3.363</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: NC

Table 16b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences normative commitment of overall various levels bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=8.61 for Tqwl and t=3.36 for EM respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable.
(normative commitment). The correlation (partia') is \( r = .579 \) for Tqwl and \( r = .267 \) for EM respectively, showing that all of the predictors significantly influence the degree of normative commitment.

From the results it may be interpreted that normative commitment of overall various levels bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and EM respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_2 \) is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state and role stress will not influence normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

Table 17

Showing impact of QWL and RS on Toc among overall various levels bank managers of MP state

Table 17a. Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \text{Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, SRD, PWC, EM, WI, EB, AAW, PI} \)

Table 17 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state. In all eight independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; self role distance; physical working conditions; employee participation; work itself; economic benefits; autonomy at work and personal inadequacy respectively.

Table 17a. shows the model summary indicating all eight predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .979 for total quality of working life; .985 for self role distance; .987 for physical working conditions; .988 for employee participation; .989 for work itself; .989 for economic benefits; .989 for autonomy at work and .990 for personal inadequacy respectively. Further \( R^2 \), which represents the contribution of
criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (total organizational commitment) came out 95.9% for total quality of working life; 1.1% for self role distance; 0.5% for physical working conditions; 0.2% for employee participation; 0.1% for work itself; 0.1% for economic benefits; 0.1% for autonomy at work and 0.1% for personal inadequacy respectively.

Table 17b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-71.874</td>
<td>5.443</td>
<td>-13.204</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>1.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>5.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>3.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>3.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>2.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>2.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>2.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>2.390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Toc

Table 17b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total organizational commitment of overall various levels bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t=19.70$ for Tqwl; $t=5.32$ for SRD; $t=3.19$ for PWC; $t=3.45$ for EM; $t=2.68$ for WI; $t=2.99$ for EB; $t=2.52$ for AAW and $t=2.39$ for PI respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total organizational commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r=.857$ for Tqwl; $r=.409$ for SRD; $r=.313$ for PWC; $r=.270$ for EM; $r=.221$ for WI; $r=.245$ for EB; $r=.208$ for AAW and $r=.197$ for PI respectively, showing that all of the predictors significantly influence the degree of total organizational commitment.

From the results it may be interpreted that total organizational commitment of overall various levels bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; SRD; PWC; EM; WI; EB; AAW and PI respectively. Thus, the null hypothesis $H_{21}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
Table 18

Showing impact of QWL and RS on GMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of MP state

Table 18a. Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.892*</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.906*</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.911*</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.914*</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, RSTGN, EM, ER

Table 18 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on good mental health among overall various levels bank managers of MP state. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; role stagnation; employee participation and employee relations respectively.

Table 18a. shows the model summary indicating all four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .892 for total quality of working life; .906 for role stagnation; .911 for employee participation and .914 for employee relations respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (good mental health) came out 79.6% for total quality of working life; 2.5% for role stagnation; 0.1% for employee participation and 0.6% for employee relations respectively.
Table 18b.

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-13.644</td>
<td>2.843</td>
<td>-4.799</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>10.981</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>4.622</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>2.599</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>2.228</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: GMH

Table 18b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences good mental health of overall various levels bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t=10.98$ for Tqwl; $t=4.62$ for RSTGN; $t=2.59$ for EM and $t=2.22$ for ER respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-value is significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (good mental health). The correlation (partial) is $r=.674$ for Tqwl; $r=.358$ for RSTGN; $r=.211$ for EM and $r=.027$ for ER respectively, showing that all of the predictors significantly influence the degree of good mental health.

From the results it may be interpreted that good mental health of overall various levels bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; RSTGN; EM and ER respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{22}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence good mental health among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
Table 19

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on PMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of MP state**

Table 19a.

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.885a</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.905b</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.911c</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, SRD, CIO

Table 19 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on poor mental health among overall various levels bank managers of MP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; self role distance and clarity in organization respectively.

Table 19a. shows the model summary indicating all three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .885 for total quality of working life; .905 for self role distance and .911 for clarity in organization respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (poor mental health) came out 78.4% for total quality of working life; 3.5% for self role distance and 11.% for clarity in organization respectively.
Table 19b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences poor mental health of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, \( t = 6.33 \) for Tqwl; \( t = -4.85 \) for SRD and \( t = 3.07 \) for CIO respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (poor mental health). The correlation (partial) is \( r = .464 \) for Tqwl; \( r = -.373 \) for SRD and \( r = .247 \) for CIO respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of poor mental health.

The t-value of self role distance is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of self role distance and criterion (poor mental health) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that self role distance negatively influence the level of poor mental health of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of self role distance increases, the level of poor mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that poor mental health of overall various levels bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and CIO respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_{23} \) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence poor mental health among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
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Table 20

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of MP state

Table 20a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.839a</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.882b</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.894c</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.902d</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.905e</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.908f</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, SRD, WI, SER, SR, RA

Table 20 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social support among overall various levels bank managers of MP state. In all six independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; self role distance; work itself; self respect; supervisory relations and role ambiguity respectively.

Table 20a. shows the model summary indicating all six predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .839 for total quality of working life; .882 for self role distance; .894 for work itself; .902 for self respect; .905 for supervisory relations and .908 for role ambiguity respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (social support) came out 70.4% for total quality of working life; 7.4% for self role distance; 2.1% for work itself; 1.4% for self respect; 0.6% for supervisory relations and 0.6% for role ambiguity respectively.
Table 20b.

Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-16.137</td>
<td>3.074</td>
<td>-5.249</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>7.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>3.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>4.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>-2.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>2.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>2.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: SSUP

Table 20b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social support of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=7.58 for Tqwl; t=3.21 for SRD; t=4.44 for WI; t=-2.26 for SER; t=2.28 for SR and t=2.12 for RA respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social support). The correlation (partial) is r=.536 for Tqwl; r=.260 for SRD; r=.348 for WI; r=-.186 for SER; r=.188 for SR and r=.175 for RA respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social support.

The t-value of self respect is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of self respect and criterion (social support) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that self respect negatively influence the level of social support of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of self respect increases, the level of social support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social support of overall various levels bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; SRD; WI; SR and RA respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H24 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social support among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
Table 21

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of MP state

Table 21a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.878a</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.900b</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.909c</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.914d</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.917e</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, RE, CIO, RI, WI

Table 21 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social stressor among overall various levels bank managers of MP state. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; role erosion; clarity in organization; role isolation and work itself respectively.

Table 21a. shows the model summary indicating all five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .878 for total quality of working life; .900 for role erosion; .909 for clarity in organization; .914 for role isolation and .917 for work itself respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (social stressor) came out 77.1% for total quality of working life; 3.9% for role erosion; 1.6% for clarity in organization; 1.0% for role isolation and 0.5% for work itself respectively.
Table 21b.

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>14.237</td>
<td>4.462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>3.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>-.563</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>-2.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>4.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>-.773</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>-.265</td>
<td>-2.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>-2.211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: SSTR

Table 21b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social stressor of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t = 3.14$ for Tqwl; $t = -2.80$ for RE; $t = 4.09$ for CIO; $t = -2.91$ for RI; and $t = -2.21$ for WI respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social stressor). The correlation (partial) is $r = .253$ for Tqwl; $r = -.227$ for RE; $r = .323$ for CIO; $r = -.236$ for RI and $r = -.181$ for WI respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social stressor.

The t-values of role erosion; role isolation and work itself are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of role erosion; role isolation and work itself and criterion (social stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role erosion; role isolation and work itself negatively influence the level of social stressor of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of role erosion; role isolation and work itself increases, the level of social stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social stressor of overall various levels bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and CIO respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_25$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social stressor among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
Table 22

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of MP state

Table 22a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, SRD, EM, EH, ER, SR, AAW

Table 22 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work support among overall various levels bank managers of MP state. In all seven independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; self role distance; employee participation; employee health; employee relations; supervisory relations and autonomy at work respectively.

Table 22a. shows the model summary indicating all seven predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .874 for total quality of working life; .896 for self role distance; .912 for employee participation; .920 for employee health; .926 for employee relations; .930 for supervisory relations and .934 for autonomy at work respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (work support) came out 76.3% for total quality of working life; 40% for self role distance; 2.8% for employee participation; 1.4% for employee health; 1.1% for employee relations; 0.8% for supervisory relations and 0.7% for autonomy at work respectively.
Table 22b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work support of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=5.71 for Tqwl; t=6.05 for SRD; t=5.05 for EM; t=-3.88 for EH; t=2.99 for ER; t=3.40 for SR and t=2.80 for AAW respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work support). The correlation (partial) is r=.433 for Tqwl; r=.453 for SRD; r=.390 for EM; r=-.310 for EH; r=.244 for ER; r=.275 for SR and r=.229 for AAW respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work support.

The t-value employee health is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of employee health and criterion (work support) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that employee health negatively influence the level of work support overall various levels bank managers. As the level of employee health increases, the level of work support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work support of overall various levels bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; SRD; EM; ER; SR and AAW respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H26 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work support among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-10.307</td>
<td>2.456</td>
<td>-4.196</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>5.717</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>6.051</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>5.053</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.281</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>-3.884</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>2.993</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>3.402</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>2.807</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: WSUP
Table 23

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of MP state

Table 23a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>Change Statistics $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.847*</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.865*</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.877*</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.881*</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.885*</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.890*</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.888*</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.893*</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.897*</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, ClO, WI, IGR, IRD, SER, ER

Table 23 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work stressor among overall various levels bank managers of MP state. In all seven independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; clarity in organization; work itself; inter group relations; inter role distance; self respect and employee participation respectively.

Table 23a. shows the model summary indicating all seven predictors of the model. Multiple correlation ($R$) is found as .847 for total quality of working life; .865 for clarity in organization; .881 for work itself; .885 for inter group relations; .890 for inter role distance; .893 for self respect and .897 for employee participation respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (work stressor) came out 71.8% for total quality of working life; 3.0% for clarity in organization; 0.8% for work itself; 0.8% for inter group relations; 0.7% for inter role distance; 0.9% for self respect and 0.7% for employee participation work respectively.
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Table 23b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.878</td>
<td>4.128</td>
<td></td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>1.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>3.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>-.416</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td>-2.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>3.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>-.709</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>-3.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>2.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>2.301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: WSTR

Table 23b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work stressor of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, \( t = 1.70 \) for Tqwl; \( t = 3.44 \) for CIO; \( t = -2.95 \) for WI; \( t = 3.01 \) for IGR; \( t = -3.24 \) for IRD; \( t = 2.52 \) for SER and \( t = 2.30 \) for ER respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work stressor). The correlation (partial) is \( r = .142 \) for Tqwl; \( r = .277 \) for CIO; \( r = -.241 \) for WI; \( r = .245 \) for IGR; \( r = -.263 \) for IRD; \( r = .207 \) for SER and \( r = .190 \) for ER respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work stressor.

The t-values of work itself and inter role distance are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of work itself and inter role distance criterion (work stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that work itself and inter role distance negatively influence the level of work stressor of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of work itself and inter role distance increases, the level of work stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work stressor of overall various levels bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; CIO; IGR; SER and ER respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_{27} \) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work stressor among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
Table 24

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of MP state

Table 24a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.794*</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.826*</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.842*</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.849*</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.856*</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.861*</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, RA, SER, OL.CL, RE, SR

Table 24 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal support among overall various levels bank managers of MP state. In all six independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; role ambiguity; self respect; organizational climate; role erosion and supervisory roles respectively.

Table 24a. shows the model summary indicating all six predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .794 for total quality of working life; .826 for role ambiguity; .842 for self respect; .849 for organizational climate; .856 for role erosion and .861 for supervisory roles respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (personal support) came out 63.1% for total quality of working life; 5.1% for role ambiguity; 2.8% for self respect; 1.1% for organizational climate; 1.2% for role erosion and 0.7% for supervisory roles respectively.
Table 24b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Constant) -2.416</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>7.449</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>5.526</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>-.335</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>-3.169</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>-.399</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>-2.501</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>-.519</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>-2.598</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>2.014</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent Variable: PSUP*

Table 24b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal support of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=7.44 for Tqwl; t=5.52 for RA; t= -.16 for SER; t= -2.50 for OLCL; t= -2.59 for RE and t=2.01 for SR respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal support). The correlation (partial) is r=.529 for Tqwl; r=.419 for RA; r= -.256 for SER; r= -.205 for OLCL; r =-.212 for RE and r=.166 for SR respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal support.

The t-values of self respect; organizational climate and role erosion are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of self respect; organizational climate and role erosion and criterion (personal support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that self respect; organizational climate and role erosion negatively influence the level of personal support of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of self respect; organizational climate and role erosion increases, the level of personal support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal support of overall various levels bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; RA and SR respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H28 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal support among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
Table 25

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of MP state**

Table 25a.

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.803*</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.841b</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.848c</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.853d</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), Trs, OC, Trust, RIN

Table 25 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers of MP state. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; organizational commitment; trust and role inadequacy respectively.

Table 25a. shows the model summary indicating all four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .803 for total role stress; .841 for organizational commitment; .848 for trust and .853 for role inadequacy respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (personal stressor) came out 64.4% for total role stress; 6.2% for organizational commitment; 1.3% for trust and 0.8% for role inadequacy respectively.
Table 25b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>19.514</td>
<td>2.425</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.330</td>
<td>-2.616</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>4.214</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>2.717</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>-.323</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>-.237</td>
<td>-2.041</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: PSTR

Table 25b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal stressor of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= -2.61 for Trs; t=4.21 for OC; t=2.71 for Trust and t= -2.04 for RIN respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal support). The correlation (partial) is r= -.212 for Trs; r=.330 for OC; r=.220 for Trust and r= -.167 for RIN respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal stressor.

The t-values of total role stress and role inadequacy are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and role inadequacy and criterion (personal stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and role inadequacy negatively influence the level of personal stressor of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of total role stress and role inadequacy increases, the level of personal stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal stressor of overall various levels bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by OC and Trust respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H29 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
Table 26

Showing impact of QWL and RS on Tpwb among overall various levels bank managers of MP state

Table 26a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.983*</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.987*</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.989*</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.990*</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.990*</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.991*</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.992*</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.992*</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, Promo, RE, PWC, EH, ER, SER, OC

Table 26 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of MP state. In all eight independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; promotion; role erosion; physical working conditions; employee health; employee relations; self respect and organizational commitment respectively.

Table 26a. shows the model summary indicating all eight predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .983 for total quality of working life; .987 for promotion; .989 for role erosion; .990 for physical working conditions; .990 for employee health; .991 for employee relations; .992 for self respect and .992 for organizational commitment respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (total psychological well-being) came out 96.6% for total quality of working life; 0.8% for promotion; 0.3% for role erosion; 0.2% for physical working conditions; 0.2% for employee health; 0.1% for employee relations; 0.1% for self respect and 0.1% for organizational commitment respectively.
Table 26b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.858</td>
<td>7.140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>26.929</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>-1.413</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-5.547</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>-1.749</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-5.010</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>-1.095</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.988</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>-.962</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-4.137</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>3.451</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>-.734</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>-3.389</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>-.586</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-2.513</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total psychological well-being of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=26.92 for Tqwl; t= -5.54 for Promo; t= -5.01 for RE; t= -4.98 for PWC; t= -4.13 for EH; t= 3.45 for ER; t= -3.34 for SER and t= -2.51 for OC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total psychological well-being). The correlation (partial) is r=.915 for Tqwl; r= -.423 for Promo; r= -.389 for RE; r= -.387 for PWC; r= -.329 for EH; r= -.279 for ER; r= -.274 for SER and r= -.207 for OC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total psychological well-being.

The t-values of promotion; role erosion; physical working conditions; employee health; self respect and organizational commitment are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of promotion; role erosion; physical working conditions; employee health; self respect and organizational commitment and criterion (total psychological well-being) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that promotion; role erosion; physical working conditions; employee health; self respect and organizational commitment negatively influence the level of total psychological well-being of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of promotion; role erosion; physical working conditions; employee health; self respect and organizational commitment increases, the level of total psychological well-being decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total psychological well-being of overall various levels bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and ER respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H₃₀ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
In the third major results section we have measured the impact of quality of working life and role stress on perceived organizational commitment and psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of UP state. The section starts with the descriptive table describing the minimum scores; maximum scores; mean scores and standard deviation of all the variables and their respective factors (N=150). It is followed by the statistical findings of stepwise multiple regression. This third section of results starts from table number twenty-seven and ends at table number thirty-nine respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W Itself</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.9667</td>
<td>1.65646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.6867</td>
<td>2.28839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.7200</td>
<td>2.27658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.2400</td>
<td>2.04867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.0533</td>
<td>2.29030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.1800</td>
<td>2.23177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.8200</td>
<td>1.83943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.1000</td>
<td>1.75228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.3467</td>
<td>2.09821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.3267</td>
<td>2.45905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.1067</td>
<td>1.01099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.5533</td>
<td>2.27781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.6800</td>
<td>2.11203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco.Ben.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.8400</td>
<td>2.27056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.4600</td>
<td>2.71122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em.Hlth.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.1333</td>
<td>1.95818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.3000</td>
<td>2.14179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>123.00</td>
<td>239.00</td>
<td>182.5133</td>
<td>20.21984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.6600</td>
<td>1.32011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.5533</td>
<td>1.36365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.5733</td>
<td>2.07363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>5.1400</td>
<td>1.11746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.4733</td>
<td>1.62488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.1600</td>
<td>1.61819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.7600</td>
<td>1.39356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.8267</td>
<td>1.46433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.2600</td>
<td>1.55624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>7.8933</td>
<td>2.02052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>59.3000</td>
<td>12.41062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ac</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>26.4000</td>
<td>5.73696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>28.7000</td>
<td>5.57529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nc</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>28.8800</td>
<td>5.19669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toc</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>81.5800</td>
<td>14.31921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gmh</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.8467</td>
<td>3.45777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pmh</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>18.7800</td>
<td>3.61368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ssup</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.7267</td>
<td>3.66902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sstr</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>18.6400</td>
<td>3.50700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsup</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.6867</td>
<td>3.58621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wstr</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>18.8800</td>
<td>3.89100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psup</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.8667</td>
<td>3.26599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pstr</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>18.7800</td>
<td>3.62850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tpwb</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>198.00</td>
<td>166.2067</td>
<td>25.22338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27

Showing impact of QWL and RS on AC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall various levels bank managers of UP state

Table 27a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), Trs, Eco.Ben., RO

Table 27 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on affective commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; economic benefits and role overload respectively.

Table 27a. shows the model summary indicating all three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .864 for total role stress; .873 for economic benefits and .877 for role overload respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (affective commitment) came out 74.7% for total role stress; 1.6% for economic benefits and 0.7% for role overload respectively.
Table 27b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences affective commitment of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t = -6.94$ for Trs; $t = 3.08$ for Eco.Ben. and $t = -2.10$ for RO respectively. By having a look at the $t$-values, we may conclude that $t$-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (affective commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r = -0.498$ for Trs; $r = 0.247$ for Eco.Ben. and $r = -0.171$ for RO respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of affective commitment.

The $t$-values of total role stress and role overload are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and role overload and criterion (affective commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and role overload negatively influence the level of affective commitment of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of total role stress and role overload increases, the level of affective commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that affective commitment of overall various levels bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Eco.Ben. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{31}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence affective commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
Table 28

Showing impact of QWL and RS on CC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall various levels bank managers of UP state

Table 28a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, RO, Recog, Ikd, Trust, Em.Par.

Table 28 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state. In all six independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; role overload; recognition; inter role distance; trust and employee participation respectively.

Table 28a. shows the model summary indicating all six predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .864 for total quality of working life; .875 for role overload; .882 for recognition; .890 for inter role distance; .894 for trust and .898 for employee participation respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (continuance commitment) came out 74.6% for total quality of working life; 2.0% for role overload; 1.2% for recognition; 1.4% for inter role distance; 0.7% for trust and 0.7% for employee participation respectively.
Chapter Four

Table 28b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (Constant)</td>
<td>-25.647</td>
<td>6.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>7.928</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>1.151</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>4.216</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>3.844</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>-.663</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-.503</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.231</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em.Par</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>2.305</td>
<td>-.190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: cc

Table 28b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences continuance commitment of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=7.92 for Tqwl; t=4.21 for RO; t=3.84 for Recog; t= -2.48 for IRD; t= -2.31 for Trust and t=2.30 for Em.Par. respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (continuance commitment). The correlation (partial) is r=.553 for Tqwl; r=.332 for RO; r=.306 for Recog; r= -.204 for IRD; r= -.190 for Trust and r=.189 for Em.Par. respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of continuance commitment.

The t-values of inter role distance and trust are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of inter role distance and trust and criterion (continuance commitment) are showing insignificant negative relationship. It means that inter role distance and trust negatively influence the level of continuance commitment of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of inter role distance and trust increases, the level of continuance commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that continuance commitment of overall various levels bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; RO; Recog and Em.Par. respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{32}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
Table 29

Showing impact of QWL and RS on NC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall various levels bank managers of UP state

Table 29a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Trs

Table 29 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state. In all a single independent variable emerged as predictor, namely, total role stress.

Table 29a. shows the model summary indicating a single predictor of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .836 for total role stress. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (normative commitment) came out 69.9% for total role stress.

Table 29b.

Coefficients^a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>47.638</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.350</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.836</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: nc

Table 29b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences normative commitment of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= -18.53 for Trs. By having a look at the t-value, we may conclude that t-value is significant for the predictor indicating a relationship between the predictor and criterion variable (normative commitment). The correlation (partial) is r= -.833 for Trs showing that predictor significantly influence the degree of normative commitment.
The t-value of total role stress is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of total role stress and criterion (normative commitment) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress negatively influences the level of normative commitment of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of total role stress increases, the level of normative commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that normative commitment of overall various levels bank managers of UP state cannot be predicted by any of the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis H33 is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life will not influence normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state and role stress influence normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

Table 30

Showing impact of QWL and RS on TOC among overall various levels bank managers of UP state

Table 30a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, Trs, RSTGN, PWC, RA, Eco.Ben.*

Table 30 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state. In all six independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; total role stress; role stagnation; physical working conditions; role ambiguity and economic benefits respectively.

Table 30a. shows the model summary indicating all six predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .982 for total quality of working life; .986 for total role stress; .987 for role stagnation; .988 for physical working conditions; .989 for role ambiguity and .989 for economic benefits respectively. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen.
Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (total organizational commitment) came out 96.4% for total quality of working life; 0.9% for total role stress; 0.3% for role stagnation; 0.2% for physical working conditions; 0.1% for role ambiguity and 1% for economic benefits respectively.

Table 30b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>70.662</td>
<td>13.110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>5.390</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.628</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>4.413</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>-7.971</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>2.066</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>-.653</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>3.698</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eco.Ben.</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>2.155</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Toc

Table 30b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total organizational commitment of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t=4.41$ for Tqwl; $t=-7.97$ for Trs; $t=2.06$ for RSTGN; $t=3.69$ for PWC; $t=-3.35$ for RA and $t=2.15$ for Eco.Ben. respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total organizational commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r=.346$ for Tqwl; $r=-.555$ for Trs; $r=-.170$ for RSTGN; $r=.295$ for PWC; $r=-.270$ for RA and $r=.177$ for Eco.Ben. respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total organizational commitment.

The t-values of total role stress and role ambiguity are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and role ambiguity and criterion (total organizational commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and role ambiguity negatively influence the level of total organizational commitment of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of total role stress and role ambiguity increases, the level of total organizational commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total organizational commitment of overall various levels bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; RSTGN; PWC and Eco.Ben. respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{34}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
Table 31

Showing impact of QWL and RS on GMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of UP state

Table 31a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.811 (^{a})</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.840 (^{b})</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.853 (^{c})</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.863 (^{d})</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.872 (^{e})</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.876 (^{f})</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{f}\) Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, PI, RSTGN, RE, RO, OLCL

Table 31 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on good mental health among overall various levels bank managers of UP state. In all six independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; personal inadequacy; role stagnation; role erosion; role overload and organizational climate respectively.

Table 31a. shows the model summary indicating all six predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .811 for total quality of working life; .840 personal inadequacy; .853 for role stagnation; .863 for role erosion; .872 for role overload and .876 for organizational climate respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (good mental health) came out 65.8% for total quality of working life; 4.8% for personal inadequacy; 2.2% for role stagnation; 1.7% for role erosion; 1.5% for role overload; and 0.7% for organizational climate respectively.
Table 31b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-31.233</td>
<td>-4.870</td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>1.433</td>
<td>13.866</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>1.946</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>2.560</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>2.439</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-2.061</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Gmh

Table 31b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences good mental health of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=13.88 for Tqwl; t=1.94 for PI; t=2.56 for RSTGN; t=3.92 for RE; t=2.43 for RO; t= -2.06 for OLCL respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (good mental health). The correlation (partial) is r=.758 for Tqwl; r=.161 for PI; r=.209 for RSTGN; r=.312 for RE; r=.200 for RO and r= -.170 for OLCL respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of good mental health.

The t-value of organizational climate is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of organizational climate and criterion (good mental health) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that organizational climate negatively influence the level of good mental health of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of organizational climate increases, the level of good mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that good mental health of overall various levels bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; PI; RSTGN; RE and RO respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{35}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence good mental health among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
Table 32

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of UP state

Table 32a

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.884*</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.894*</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.904*</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.910*</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.914*</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.917*</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.920*</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, SER, RIN, SR, RSTGN, ER, OC

Table 32 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on poor mental health among overall various levels bank managers of UP state. In all seven independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; self respect; role inadequacy; supervisory relations; role stagnation; employee relations and organizational commitment respectively.

Table 32a. shows the model summary indicating all seven predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .884 for total quality of working life; .894 for self respect; .904 for role inadequacy; .910 for supervisory relations; .914 for role stagnation; .917 for employee relations and .920 for organizational commitment respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (poor mental health) came out 78.2% for total quality of working life; 1.8% for self respect; 1.8% for role inadequacy; 1.0% for supervisory relations; 0.7% for role stagnation; 0.6% for employee relations and 0.5% for organizational commitment respectively.
Table 32b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>9.632</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>2.195</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>-.410</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-4.305</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-3.439</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>-.278</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>-2.534</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-2.823</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-2.141</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Pmh

Table 32b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences poor mental health of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=9.63 for Tqwl; t=2.19 for SER; t=-4.30 for RIN; t=-2.53 for SR; t=-2.82 for RSTGN; t=-2.141 for OC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (poor mental health). The correlation (partial) is r=.629 for Tqwl; r=.181 for SER; r=-.340 for RIN; r=-.277 for SR; r=-.208 for RSTGN; r=-.231 for ER and r=-.177 for OC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of good mental health.

The t-values of role inadequacy; supervisory relations; role stagnation; employee relations and organizational commitment are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of role inadequacy; supervisory relations; role stagnation; employee relations and organizational commitment and criterion (poor mental health) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role inadequacy; supervisory relations; role stagnation; employee relations and organizational commitment negatively influence the level of poor mental health of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of role inadequacy; supervisory relations; role stagnation; employee relations and organizational commitment increases, the level of poor mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that poor mental health of overall various levels bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and SR respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H36 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence poor mental health among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
Table 33

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of UP state

Table 33a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.837*</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.873b</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.890c</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.901d</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.910e</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.916f</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.921g</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.924h</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.928i</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, PI, RSTGN, RE, AAW, RO, SER, UMR, OLCL

Table 33 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social support among overall various levels bank managers of UP state. In all nine independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; personal inadequacy; role stagnation; role erosion; autonomy at work; role overload; self respect; union management relations and organizational climate respectively.

Table 33a. shows the model summary indicating all nine predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .837 for total quality of working life; .873 for personal inadequacy; .890 for role stagnation; .901 for role erosion; .910 for autonomy at work; .916 for role overload; .921 for self respect; .924 for union management relations and .928 for organizational climate respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (social support) came out 70.00% for total quality of working life; 6.2% for personal inadequacy; 3.0% for role stagnation; 2.0% for role erosion; 1.7% for autonomy at work; 1.1% for role overload; 0.9% for self respect; 0.6% for union management relations and 0.6% for organizational climate respectively.
Table 33b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(Constant) -33.885</td>
<td>4.170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>1.659</td>
<td>18.884</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>3.213</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>3.504</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>4.638</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>-.315</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>-3.771</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>-.397</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>2.315</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>-3.665</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>-2.735</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-2.496</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Ssup

Table 33b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social support of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 18.88 for Tqwl; t=3.21 for PI; t=3.50 for RSTGN; t=4.63 for RE; t= -3.77 for AAW; t=2.31 for RO; t= -3.66 for SER; t= -2.73 for UMR and t= -2.49 for OLCL respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social support). The correlation (partial) is r=.847 for Tqwl; r=.262 for PI; r=.284 for RSTGN; r=.365 for RE; r= -.304 for AAW; r=.192 for RO; r= -.296 for SER; r= -.225 for UMR and r= -.206 for OLCL respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social support.

The t-values of autonomy at work; self respect; union management relations and organizational climate are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of autonomy at work; self respect; union management relations and organizational climate and criterion (social support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that autonomy at work; self respect; union management relations and organizational climate negatively influence the level of social support of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of autonomy at work; self respect; union management relations and organizational climate increases, the level of social support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social support of overall various levels bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl PI; RSTGN; RE and RO respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H₃7 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social support among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
Table 34

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of UP state

Table 34a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.872a</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.885b</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.892c</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.899d</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.903e</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.906f</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.910g</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.912h</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h Predictors: (Constant), Trs, ER, Trust, Eco.Ben., IGR, CIO, SRD, RA

Table 34 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state. In all eight independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; employee relations; trust; economic benefits; inter group relations; clarity in organization; self role distance and role ambiguity respectively.

Table 34a. shows the model summary indicating all eight predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .872 for total role stress; .885 for employee relations; .892 for trust; .899 for economic benefits; .903 for inter group relations; .906 for clarity in organization; .910 for self role distance and .912 for role ambiguity respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (social stressor) came out 76.1% for total role stress; 2.3% for employee relations; 1.2% for trust; 1.3% for economic benefits; 0.7% for inter group relations; 0.6% for clarity in organization; 0.6% for self role distance and 0.5% for role ambiguity respectively.
Table 34b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>33.702</td>
<td>2.337</td>
<td>14.422</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.283</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-1.002</td>
<td>-.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-.546</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>-4.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eco.Ben.</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>2.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>-2.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>-.172</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-2.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>2.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>-.284</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-2.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Sstr

Table 34b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social stressor of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=-10.63 for Trs; t=4.46 for ER; t=-4.27 for Trust; t=2.98 for Eco.Ben.; t=-2.03 for IGR; t=-2.37 for CIO; t=2.91 for SRD and t=-2.02 for RA respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social stressor). The correlation (partial) is r=-.667 for Trs; r=.352 for ER; r=-.339 for Trust; r=.244 for Eco.Ben.; r=-.169 for IGR; r=-.196 for CIO; r=.238 for SRD and r=-.168 for RA respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social stressor.

The t-values of total role stress; trust; inter group relations; clarity in organization and role ambiguity are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; trust; inter group relations; clarity in organization and role ambiguity and criterion (social stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; trust; inter group relations; clarity in organization and role ambiguity negatively influence the level of social stressor of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of total role stress; trust; inter group relations; clarity in organization and role ambiguity increases, the level of social stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social stressor of overall various levels bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by ER; Eco.Ben.; and SRD respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{38}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
Table 35

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of UP state

Table 35a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, PI, RSTGN, AAW, SER, RO, RE, Eco.Ben.

Table 35 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work support among overall various levels bank managers of UP state. In all eight independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; personal inadequacy; role stagnation; autonomy at work; self respect; role overload; role erosion and economic benefits respectively.

Table 35a. shows the model summary indicating all eight predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .842 for total quality of working life; .877 for personal inadequacy; .893 for role stagnation; .904 for autonomy at work; .911 for self respect; .915 for role overload; .919 for role erosion and .923 for economic benefits respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (work support) came out 70.9% for total quality of working life; 6.0% for personal inadequacy; 2.8% for role stagnation; 1.9% for autonomy at work; 1.3% for self respect; 0.8% for role overload; 0.7% for role erosion and 0.7% for economic benefits respectively.
Table 35b. 

Coefficients\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-32.195</td>
<td>-7.878</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>1.451</td>
<td>16.174</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>4.168</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>2.607</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>-.315</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>-3.779</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-2.513</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>3.139</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>2.687</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco.Ben.</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>2.646</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Dependent Variable: Wsup

Table 35b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work support of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, \(t= 16.17\) for Tqwl; \(t=4.16\) for PI; \(t=2.60\) for RSTGN; \(t= -3.77\) for AAW; \(t= -2.51\) for SER; \(t=3.19\) for RO; \(t=2.68\) for RE and \(t=2.46\) for Eco.Ben. respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work support). The correlation (partial) is \(r=-.806\) for Tqwl; \(r=.331\) for PI; \(r=.214\) for RSTGN; \(r=-.303\) for AAW; \(r=-.207\) for SER; \(r=.256\) for RO; \(r=.221\) for RE and \(r=.218\) for Eco.Ben. respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work support.

The t-values of autonomy at work and self respect are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of autonomy at work and self respect and criterion (work support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that autonomy at work and self respect negatively influence the level of work support of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of autonomy at work and self respect increases, the level of work support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work support of overall various levels bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; PI; RSTGN; RO; RE and Eco.Ben. respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis \(H_39\) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work support among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
Table 36

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of UP state

Table 36a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.888a</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.893b</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.897c</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.901d</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.904e</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: R, R Square, and Adjusted R Square values are shown for each model. Change Statistics show the R Square change for each model.

e Predictors: (Constant), Trs, RA, RIN, Trust, Em.Hlth.

Table 36 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; role ambiguity; role inadequacy; trust and employee health respectively.

Table 36a. shows the model summary indicating all five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .888 for total role stress; .893 for role ambiguity; .897 for role inadequacy .901 for trust and .904 for employee health respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (work stressor) came out, 78.9% for total role stress; 1.0% for role ambiguity; 0.7% for role inadequacy; 0.7% for trust and 0.5% for employee health respectively.
Table 36b.

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (Constant)</td>
<td>30.986</td>
<td>1.626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.258</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.822</td>
<td>-11.228</td>
<td>-.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>-.404</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>-2.797</td>
<td>-.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>2.603</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>2.373</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em.Hlth.</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>2.069</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Wstr

Table 36b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work stressor of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= -11.22 for Trs; t= -2.79 for RA; t= 2.60 for RIN; t= 2.37 for Trust and t= 2.06 for Em.Hlth. respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work stressor). The correlation (partial) is r= -.683 for Trs; r= -.227 for RA; r=.212 for RIN; r= .194 for Trust and r= .170 for Em.Hlth. respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work stressor.

The t-values of total role stress and role ambiguity are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and role ambiguity and criterion (work stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and role ambiguity negatively influence the level of work stressor of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of total role stress and role ambiguity increases, the level of work stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work stressor of overall various levels bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Trs; Trust and Em.Hlth. respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H40 is rejected. Henc2, quality of working life and role stress influence work stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
Table 37

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of UP state

Table 37a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.843*</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.872b</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.888c</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.895d</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.901e</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.907f</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.910g</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.913h</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, PI, RSTGN, Em.Par., SER, PWC, RO, RE

Table 37 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal support among overall various levels bank managers of UP state. In all eight independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; personal inadequacy; role stagnation; employee participation; self respect; physical working conditions; role overload and role erosion respectively.

Table 37a. shows the model summary indicating all eight predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .843 for total quality of working life; .872 for personal inadequacy; .888 for role stagnation; .895 for employee participation; .901 for self respect; .907 for physical working conditions; .910 for role overload and .913 for role erosion respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (personal support) came out 71.1% for total quality of working life; 4.9% for personal inadequacy; 2.8% for role stagnation; 1.2% for employee participation; 1.0% for self respect; 1.2% for physical working conditions; 0.5% for role overload and 0.6% for role erosion respectively.
Table 37b. Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(Constant) -25.850</td>
<td>4.003</td>
<td>-6.457</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl .229</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>1.416</td>
<td>12.193</td>
<td>.000 .716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI .385</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>2.826</td>
<td>.005 .232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSTGN .431</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>3.993</td>
<td>.000 .319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Em.Par. .259</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>3.268</td>
<td>.001 .265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SER -.154</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>-2.992</td>
<td>.002 -.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC -.287</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>-3.116</td>
<td>.002 -.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RO .390</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>2.450</td>
<td>.016 .202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE .378</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>2.233</td>
<td>.027 .185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a Dependent Variable: Psup

Table 37b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influence personal support of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 12.19 for Tqwl; t=2.82 for PI; t=3.99 for RSTGN; t=3.26 for Em.Par.; t= -2.99 for SER; t= -3.11 for PWC; t=2.45 for RO and t= 2.23 for RE respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal support). The correlation (partial) is r=.716 for Tqwl; r=.232 for PI; r=.319 for RSTGN; r=.265 for Em.Par.; r= -.244 for SER; r= -.254 for PWC; r=.202 for RO; r=.185 for RE respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal support.

The t-values of self respect and physical working conditions are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of self respect and physical working conditions and criterion (personal support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that self respect and physical working conditions negatively influence the level of personal support of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of self respect and physical working conditions increases, the level of personal support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal support of overall various levels bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; PI; RSTGN; Em.Par.; RO and RE respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H_0 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal support among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
Table 38

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall various levels bank managers of UP state

Table 38a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.817$^a$</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.829$^b$</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, SR

Table 38 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life and supervisory relations respectively.

Table 38a. shows the model summary indicating both of the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .817 for total quality of working life and .829 for supervisory relations respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (personal stressor) came out, 66.8% for total quality of working life and 1.9% for supervisory relations respectively.
Table 38b.

Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-8.667</td>
<td>1.539</td>
<td>-5.631</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>15.619</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>-2.962</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Dependent Variable: Pstr

Table 38b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal stressor of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 15.61 for Tqwl and t= -2.96 for SR respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal stressor). The correlation (partial) is r=.790 for Tqwl and r= -.237 for SR respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal stressor.

The t-value of supervisory relations is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of supervisory relations and criterion (personal stressor) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that supervisory relations negatively influence the level of personal stressor of overall various levels bank managers. As the level of supervisory relations increases, the level of personal stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal stressor of overall various levels bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl. Thus, the null-hypothesis H42 is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state and role stress will not influence personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
Table 39

Showing impact of QWL and RS on Tpwb among overall various levels bank managers of UP state

Table 39a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.961*</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.972*</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.974*</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.975*</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.976*</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.977*</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.978*</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.979*</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.980*</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, PI, RSTGN, AAW, RE, RO, Trs, Eco.Ben., SR

Table 39 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of UP state. In all nine independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; personal inadequacy; role stagnation; autonomy at work; role erosion; role overload; total role stress; economic benefits and supervisory relations respectively.

Table 39a. shows the model summary indicating all eight predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .961 for total quality of working life; .972 for personal inadequacy; .974 for role stagnation; .975 for autonomy at work; .976 for role erosion; .977 for role overload; .978 for total role stress; .979 for economic benefits and .980 for supervisory relations respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (total psychological well-being) came out, 92.4% for total quality of working life; 2.0% for personal inadequacy; 0.4% for role stagnation; 0.2% for autonomy at work; 0.2% for role erosion; 0.2% for role overload; 0.2% for total role stress; 0.2% for economic benefits and 0.1% for supervisory relations respectively.
Table 39b. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>74.191</td>
<td>35.339</td>
<td>-2.043</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>9.836</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>2.305</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>4.196</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>2.415</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>-1.880</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-3.187</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>2.335</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>3.394</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>3.259</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.556</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>-.274</td>
<td>-2.632</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco.Ben.</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>2.588</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>-.489</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-2.134</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: Tpwb

Table 39b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total psychological well-being of overall various levels bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 9.83 for Tqwl; t=4.19 for PI; t=2.41 for RSTGN; t= -3.18 for AAW; t=3.39 for RE; t=3.25 for RO; t= -2.63 for Trs; t=2.58 for Eco.Ben. and t= -2.13 for SR respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total psychological well-being). The correlation (partial) is r=.639 for Tqwl; r=.334 for PI; r=.200 for RSTGN; r=- .260 for AAW; r=.276 for RE; r=.266 for RO; r=- .217 for Trs; r=-.214 for Eco.Ben and r= -.177 for SR respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total psychological well-being.

The t-values of autonomy at work; total role stress and supervisory relations are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of autonomy at work; total role stress and supervisory relations and criterion (total psychological well-being) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that autonomy at work; total role stress and supervisory relations negatively influence the level of total psychological well-being of overall various levels bank managers. As the levels of autonomy at work; total role stress and supervisory relations increases, the level of total psychological well-being decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total psychological well-being of overall various levels bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; PI; RSTGN; RE; RO and Eco.Ben. respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H43 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
In the fourth major results section we have measured the impact of quality of working life and role stress on perceived organizational commitment and psychological well-being among overall scale-1 bank managers. The section starts with the descriptive table describing the minimum scores; maximum scores; mean scores and standard deviation of all the variables and their respective factors (N=100). It is followed by the statistical findings of stepwise multiple regression. This fourth section of results starts from table number forty and ends at table number fifty-two respectively.
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.200</td>
<td>2.12726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>9.1900</td>
<td>2.11151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>9.6200</td>
<td>1.80784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.3900</td>
<td>1.84717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>9.2900</td>
<td>1.82184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.0300</td>
<td>2.00734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.6100</td>
<td>1.62614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.3100</td>
<td>1.65569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>8.6200</td>
<td>2.06354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>8.5200</td>
<td>1.90417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.1900</td>
<td>0.89550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.2100</td>
<td>2.41751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.3700</td>
<td>2.66157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>10.1100</td>
<td>2.41584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.2500</td>
<td>2.29349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.4700</td>
<td>2.00734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.5400</td>
<td>1.98693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>176.00</td>
<td>151.9200</td>
<td>16.15811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.3500</td>
<td>1.43108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.9200</td>
<td>1.89992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.8000</td>
<td>1.34089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.8400</td>
<td>2.18683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.6000</td>
<td>1.01504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.6200</td>
<td>0.80126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.8500</td>
<td>1.67196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.6100</td>
<td>1.42768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.0000</td>
<td>1.65755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.3100</td>
<td>2.20969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>85.9000</td>
<td>13.50832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>20.5100</td>
<td>5.30960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>21.6000</td>
<td>5.51948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>20.7800</td>
<td>5.82540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toc</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>62.8900</td>
<td>11.13906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM:1</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>17.9300</td>
<td>3.29755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMH</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>13.9000</td>
<td>2.91114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSUP</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>17.7400</td>
<td>3.52658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTR</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>13.6600</td>
<td>2.69012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSUP</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>17.9400</td>
<td>2.93643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSTR</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>13.6700</td>
<td>3.04729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSUP</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>17.7500</td>
<td>3.18258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTR</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>14.1000</td>
<td>3.45680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tpwb</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>162.00</td>
<td>126.8900</td>
<td>18.39076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Four

Result and Discussion

Table 40

Showing impact of QWL and RS on AC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall scale-1 bank managers

Table 40a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.645*</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.742b</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, RSTGN

Table 40 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on affective commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life and role stagnation respectively.

Table 40a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .645 for total quality of working life and .742 for role stagnation respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (affective commitment) came out, 41.6% for total quality of working life and 13.4% for role stagnation respectively.

Table 40b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences affective commitment of overall scale-1 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t=10.86$ for Tqwl and $t=5.38$ for RSTGN respectively. By having a
look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (affective commitment). The correlation (partial) is \( r = .741 \) for Tqwl and \( r = .479 \) for RSTGN respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of affective commitment.

From the results it may be interpreted that affective commitment of overall scale-1 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and RSTGN respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_{44} \) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence affective commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers.

Table 41

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on CC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall scale-1 bank managers**

Table 41a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on continuance commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life and role stagnation respectively.

Table 41a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .721 for total quality of working life and .739 for role stagnation respectively. Further \( R^2 \), which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered \( R^2 \) change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (continuance commitment) came out, 52.00% for total quality of working life and 2.6% for role stagnation respectively.
Table 41b.  
**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>25.851</td>
<td>5.549</td>
<td>-4.659</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>10.089</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>2.358</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: CC

Table 41b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences normative commitment of overall scale-1 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t=10.08$ for Tqwl and $t=2.35$ for RSTGN respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (continuance commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r=.716$ for Tqwl and $r=.233$ for RSTGN respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of continuance commitment.

From the results it may be interpreted that normative commitment of overall scale-1 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and RSTGN respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_45$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence continuance commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers.

Table 42  
**Showing impact of QWL and RS on NC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall scale-1 bank managers**

Table 42a.  
**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.604*</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.648b</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, Recog

Table 42 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on normative commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life and recognition respectively.
Table 42a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .604 for total quality of working life and .648 for recognition respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (normative commitment) came out, 36.5% for total quality of working life and 5.5% for recognition respectively.

Table 42b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences normative commitment of overall scale-1 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t= 7.61$ for Tqwl and $t= -3.03$ for Recog respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (normative commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r=.612$ for Tqwl and $r= -.294$ for Recog respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of normative commitment.

The t-value of recognition is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of recognition and criterion (normative commitment) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that recognition negatively influence the level of normative commitment of overall scale-1 bank managers. As the levels of recognition increases, the level of normative commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that normative commitment of overall scale-1 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{46}$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence normative commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers and role stress will not influence normative commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers.
Table 43

Showing impact of QWL and RS on ToC among overall scale-1 bank managers

Table 43a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.926*</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.978*</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.980*</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.982*</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.985*</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.986*</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, Trs, SRD, UMR, Promo, ER

Table 43 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total organizational commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers. In all six independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; total role stress; self role distance; union management relations; promotion and employees relations respectively.

Table 43a. shows the model summary indicating all the six predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .926 for total quality of working life; .978 for total role stress; .980 for self role distance; .982 for union management relations; .985 for promotion and .986 for employees relations respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (total organizational commitment) came out, 85.8% for total quality of working life; 9.8% for total role stress; 0.4% for self role distance; 0.4% for union management relations; 0.5% for promotion and 0.2% for employees relations respectively.
Table 43b. Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-94.826</td>
<td>4.253</td>
<td>-22.298</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>37.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>3.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>1.770</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>4.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>4.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>3.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>2.481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Toe

Table 43b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total organizational commitment of overall scale-1 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 37.13 for Tqwl; t= 3.06 for Trs; t= 4.36 for SRD; t= 4.10 for UMR; t= 3.95 for Promo and t= 2.48 for ER respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total organizational commitment). The correlation (partial) is r=.968 for Tqwl; r=.302 for Trs; r=.412 for SRD; r=.392 for UMR; r=.379 for Promo and r=.249 for ER respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total organizational commitment.

From the results it may be interpreted that total organizational commitment of overall scale-1 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; Trs; SRD; UMR; Promo and ER respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H47 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total organizational commitment among overall scale-1 bank managers.
Table 44

Showing impact of QWL and RS on GMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-1 bank managers

Table 44a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.785*</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.807b</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on good mental health among overall scale-1 bank managers. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life and inter role distance respectively.

Table 44a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .785 for total quality of working life and .807 for inter role distance respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (good mental health) came out, 61.6% for total quality of working life and 3.5% for inter role distance respectively.

Table 44b.

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-14.751</td>
<td>3.267</td>
<td>-4.515</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>12.546</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>3.118</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences good mental health of overall scale-1 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t=12.54 for Tqwl and t=3.11 for IRD respectively. By having a look
at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (good mental health). The correlation (partial) is $r=.787$ for Tqwl and $r=.302$ for IRD respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of good mental health.

From the results it may be interpreted that good mental health of overall scale-1 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and IRD respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{48}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence good mental health among overall scale-1 bank managers.

Table 45

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on PMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-1 bank managers**

Table 45a.

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R$ Square</th>
<th>Adjusted $R$ Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.687$^a$</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.747$^b$</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.767$^c$</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.782$^d$</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$d$ Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, REC, EB, Recog

Table 45 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on poor mental health among overall scale-1 bank managers. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; role expectation conflict; economic benefits and recognition respectively.

Table 45a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation ($R$) is found as .687 for total quality of working life; .747 for role expectation conflict; .767 for economic benefits and .782 for recognition respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (poor mental health) came out, 61.60% for total quality of working life and 35% for inter role distance respectively.
Table 45b.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>6.225</td>
<td>2.783</td>
<td>2.237</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>2.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REC</td>
<td>-.613</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>-.282</td>
<td>-3.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>2.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>2.430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: PMH

Table 45b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences poor mental health of overall scale-1 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 2.95 for Tqwl; t= -3.70 for REC; t=2.67 for EB and t=2.43 for Recog respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (poor mental health). The correlation (partial) is r=.290 for Tqwl; r= -.355 for REC; r=.264 for EB and r=.242 for Recog respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of poor mental health.

The t-value of role expectation conflict is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of role expectation conflict and criterion (poor mental health) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that role expectation conflict negatively influence the level of poor mental health of overall scale-1 bank managers. As the level of role expectation conflict increases, the level of poor mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that poor mental health of overall scale-1 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; EB and Recog respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{49}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence poor mental health among overall scale-1 bank managers.
Table 46:

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-1 bank managers

Table 46a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, RSTGN, REC, Wl, ER

Table 46 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social support among overall scale-1 bank managers. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; role stagnation; role expectation conflict; work itself and employee relations respectively.

Table 46a. shows the model summary indicating all the five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .767 for total quality of working life; .810 for role stagnation; .841 for role expectation conflict; .855 for work itself and .864 for employee relations respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (social support) came out, 58.9% for total quality of working life; 6.7% for role stagnation; 5.2% for role expectation conflict; 2.3% for work itself and 1.6% for employee relations respectively.
Table 46b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-11.285</td>
<td>2.978</td>
<td>-3.790</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>7.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>6.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REC</td>
<td>-.954</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.363</td>
<td>-4.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>3.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>2.457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: SSUP

Table 46b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social support of overall scale-1 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 7.82 for Tqwl; t= 6.69 for RSTGN; t= -4.81 for REC; t=3.33 for WI and t=2.45 for ER respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social support). The correlation (partial) is r=.628 for Tqwl; r= .568 for RSTGN; r= -.445 for REC; r=.326 for WI and r= .246 for ER respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social support.

The t-value of role expectation conflict is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of role expectation conflict and criterion (social support) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that role expectation conflict negatively influence the level of social support of overall scale-1 bank managers. As the level of role expectation conflict increases, the level of social support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social support of overall scale-1 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; RSTGN; WI and ER respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H₅₀ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social support among overall scale-1 bank managers.
Table 47

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-1 bank managers**

Table 47a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), Trs, EB, ER, Trust, WI, PWC, RI

Table 47 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social stressor among overall scale-1 bank managers. In all seven independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; economic benefits; employee relations; trust; work itself; physical working conditions and role isolation respectively.

Table 47a. shows the model summary indicating all the seven predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .703 for total role stress; .739 for economic benefits; .759 for employee relations; .783 for trust; .798 for work itself; .808 for physical working conditions and .817 for role isolation respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (social stressor) came out, 49.4% for total role stress; 5.3% for economic benefits; 3.0% for employee relations; 3.7% for trust; 2.4% for work itself; 1.5% for physical working conditions and 1.5% for role isolation respectively.
Table 47b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Constant)</td>
<td>19.661</td>
<td>2.892</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.798</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>- .914</td>
<td>-7.693</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>3.960</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>3.280</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-.621</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>-3.047</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>-.310</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.245</td>
<td>-3.139</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>2.558</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: SSTR

Table 47b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social stressor of overall scale-1 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 7.69 for Trs; t= 3.96 for EB; t= 3.28 for ER; t= -3.04 for Trust; t= -3.13 for WI; t=2.55 for PWC and t=2.04 for RI respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social stressor). The correlation (partial) is r=.382 for Trs; r=.382 for EB; r=.324 for ER; r= -.303 for Trust; r= -.311 for WI; r=.258 for PWC and r=.209 for RI respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social stressor.

The t-values of trust and work itself are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of trust and work itself and criterion (social stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that trust and work itself negatively influence the level of social stressor of overall scale-1 bank managers. As the level of trust and work itself increases, the level of social stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social stressor of overall scale-1 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Trs; EB; ER; PWC and RI respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H51 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social stressor among overall scale-1 bank managers.
Table 48

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-1 bank managers

Table 48a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.743*</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.791b</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.815c</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.831d</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.840e</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 48 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work support among overall scale-1 bank managers. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; role stagnation; role expectation conflict; employee relations and employee health respectively.

Table 48a. shows the model summary indicating all the five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .743 for total quality of working life; .791 for role stagnation; .815 for role expectation conflict; .831 for employee relations and .840 for employee health respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (work support) came out, 55.2% for total quality of working life; 7.3% for role stagnation; 3.9% for role expectation conflict; 2.6% for employee relations and 1.5% for employee health respectively.
Table 48b.  

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S$</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-6.956</td>
<td>2.718</td>
<td>-2.559</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>12.309</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>6.011</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>-.715</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>-.327</td>
<td>-3.867</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>3.033</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>-2.187</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: WSUP

Table 48b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work support of overall scale-1 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t=12.30$ for Tqwl; $t=6.01$ for RSTGN; $t=-3.86$ for REC; $t=3.03$ for ER and $t=-2.18$ for EH respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work support). The correlation (partial) is $r=.786$ for Tqwl; $r=.527$ for RSTGN; $r=-.370$ for REC; $r=.299$ for ER and $r=-.220$ for EH respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work support.

The t-values of role expectation conflict and employee health are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of role expectation conflict and employee health and criterion (work support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role expectation conflict and employee health negatively influence the level of work support of overall scale-1 bank managers. As the level of role expectation conflict and employee health increases, the level of work support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work support of overall scale-1 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; RSTGN and ER respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_2$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work support among overall scale-1 bank managers.
Table 49

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-1 bank managers

Table 49a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.591*</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.630*</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.654*</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), PI, RE, Recog

Table 49 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work stressor among overall scale-1 bank managers. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, personal inadequacy; role erosion and recognition respectively.

Table 49a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .591 for personal inadequacy; .630 for role erosion and .654 for recognition respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (work stressor) came out, 34.9% for personal inadequacy; 4.8% for role erosion and 3.0% for recognition respectively.

Table 49b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>18.860</td>
<td>2.311</td>
<td>8.162</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>-1.691</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>-.928</td>
<td>-.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: WSTR

Table 49b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work stressor of overall scale-1 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t=-4.95$ for PI; $t=2.98$ for RE and $t=2.25$ for Recog respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable.
Chapter Four

Result and Discussion

(work stressor). The correlation (partial) is $r = -0.451$ for PI; $r = 0.291$ for RE and $r = 0.224$ for Recog respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work stressor.

The t-value of personal inadequacy is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly, the correlation of personal inadequacy and criterion (work stressor) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that personal inadequacy negatively influence the level of work stressor of overall scale-1 bank managers. As the level of personal inadequacy increases, the level of work stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work stressor of overall scale-1 bank managers can be significantly predicted by RE and Recog respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H53$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work stressor among overall scale-1 bank managers.

Table 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-1 bank managers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal support among overall scale-1 bank managers. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; physical working conditions; organizational commitment; role ambiguity and role stagnation respectively.

Table 50a. shows the model summary indicating all the five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .682 for total quality of working life; .708 for physical working conditions; .738 for organizational commitment; .764 for role ambiguity and .785 for role stagnation respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable is also seen. Here we have
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considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (personal support) came out, 46.5% for total quality of working life; 3.7% for physical working conditions; 4.3% for organizational commitment; 3.9% for role ambiguity and 3.3% for role stagnation respectively.

Table 50b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.599</td>
<td>4.425</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>6.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>-.592</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>-3.37</td>
<td>-3.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>-.478</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-3.10</td>
<td>-3.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>-1.095</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>-5.70</td>
<td>-4.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>2.851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: PSUP

Table 50b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal support of overall scale-1 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t= 6.32$ for Tqwl; $t= -3.72$ for PWC; $t= -3.88$ for OC; $t= -4.18$ for RA and $t=2.85$ for RSTGN respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal support). The correlation (partial) is $r= .546$ for Tqwl; $r= -.359$ for PWC; $r= -.372$ for OC; $r= -.397$ for RA and $r=.282$ for RSTGN respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal support.

The t-values of physical working conditions; organizational commitment and role ambiguity are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of physical working conditions; organizational commitment and role ambiguity and criterion (personal support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that physical working conditions; organizational commitment and role ambiguity negatively influence the level of personal support of overall scale-1 bank managers. As the level of physical working conditions; organizational commitment and role ambiguity increases, the level of personal support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal support of overall scale-1 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and RSTGN respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{4}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal support among overall scale-1 bank managers.
Table 51

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-1 bank managers**

Table 51a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.647*</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.692*</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.710*</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.727*</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, Recog, ER, RIN

Table 51 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal stressor among overall scale-1 bank managers. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; recognition; employee relations and role inadequacy respectively.

Table 51a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .647 for total quality of working life; .692 for recognition; .710 for employee relations and .727 for role inadequacy respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (personal stressor) came out, 41.9% for total quality of working life; 6.0% for recognition; 2.5% for employee relations and 2.4% for role inadequacy respectively.
Table 51b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.4317</td>
<td>4.609</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>2.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>2.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>2.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>-.351</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>-2.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 51b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal stressor of overall scale-1 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 2.10 for Tqwl; t= 2.30 for Recog; t= 2.59 for ER and t= -2.17 for RIN respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal stressor). The correlation (partial) is r= .212 for Tqwl; r= .230 for Recog; r= .256 for ER and r= -.218 for RA respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal stressor.

The t-value of role inadequacy is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of role inadequacy and criterion (personal stressor) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that role inadequacy negatively influence the level of personal stressor of overall scale-1 bank managers. As the level of role inadequacy increases, the level of personal stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal stressor of overall scale-1 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; Recog and ER respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{ss}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal stressor among overall scale-1 bank managers.
Table 52

Showing impact of QWL and RS on Tpwb among overall scale-1 bank managers

Table 52a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.934³</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.946³</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.955³</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.958³</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.961³</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.963³</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.972³</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.977³</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.978³</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, ER, REC, EB, RIN, RA, RSTGN, RO, AAW

Table 52 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total psychological well-being among overall scale-1 bank managers. In all nine independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; employee relations; role expectation conflict; economic benefits; role inadequacy; role ambiguity; role stagnation; role overload and autonomy at work respectively.

Table 52a. shows the model summary indicating all the nine predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .934 for total quality of working life; .946 for employee relations; .955 for role expectation conflict, .958 for economic benefits; .961 for role inadequacy; .963 for role ambiguity; .972 for role stagnation; .977 for role overload and .978 for autonomy at work respectively. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (total psychological well-being) came out, 87.2% for total quality of working life; 2.2% for employee relations; 1.8% for role expectation conflict; 0.5% for economic benefits; 0.6% for role inadequacy; 0.4% for role ambiguity; 1.7% for role stagnation; 0.9% for role overload and 0.2% for autonomy at work respectively.
Table 52b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.117</td>
<td>13.974</td>
<td>6.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td></td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REC</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.262</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>-.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td></td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>-927</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>-.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.269</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>-.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.095</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RO</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.892</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>-.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAW</td>
<td></td>
<td>-823</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>-.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Tpwb

Table 52b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total psychological well-being of overall scale-1 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 10.24 for Tqwl; t= 3.47 for ER; t= 4.67 for REC; t= 3.98 for EB; t= 3.10 for RIN; t= 7.16 for RA; t= 6.48 for RSTGN; t= 4.61 for RO and t= 2.09 for AAW respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total psychological well-being). The correlation (partial) is r= .734 for Tqwl; r= .344 for ER; r= -.442 for REC; r= .387 for EB; r= -.311 for RIN; r= -.603 for RA; r= .565 for RSTGN; r= -.437 for RO and r= -.215 for AAW respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total psychological well-being.

The t-values of role expectation conflict; role inadequacy; role ambiguity; role overload and autonomy at work are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of role expectation conflict; role inadequacy; role ambiguity; role overload and autonomy at work and criterion (total psychological well-being) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role expectation conflict; role inadequacy; role ambiguity; role overload and autonomy at work negatively influence the level of total psychological well-being of overall scale-1 bank managers. As the level of role expectation conflict; role inadequacy; role ambiguity; role overload and autonomy at work increases, the level of total psychological well-being decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total psychological well-being of overall scale-1 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; ER; EB; and RSTGN respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{56}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total psychological well-being among overall scale-1 bank managers.
In the fifth major results section we have measured the impact of quality of working life and role stress on perceived organizational commitment and psychological well-being among overall scale-2 bank managers. The section starts with the descriptive table describing the minimum scores; maximum scores; mean scores and standard deviation of all the variables and their respective factors (N=100). It is followed by the statistical findings of stepwise multiple regression. This fifth section of results starts from table number fifty-three and ends at table number sixty-five respectively.
### Descriptive Statistics

**N=100**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.0500</td>
<td>1.14040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.1200</td>
<td>1.32024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.5600</td>
<td>1.53951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.8200</td>
<td>1.20922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.0100</td>
<td>1.67269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.1500</td>
<td>1.73132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.7900</td>
<td>1.68951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.5200</td>
<td>1.42400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.6600</td>
<td>2.01118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.3500</td>
<td>1.73715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4400</td>
<td>1.07609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.8200</td>
<td>1.62294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.3100</td>
<td>1.85153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.9600</td>
<td>1.37745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.8400</td>
<td>2.52950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.4400</td>
<td>1.98642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.0200</td>
<td>1.61420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>164.00</td>
<td>192.00</td>
<td>180.8900</td>
<td>7.30973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.8200</td>
<td>1.52673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.2800</td>
<td>.98555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.9200</td>
<td>2.02350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.7100</td>
<td>1.40198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.1100</td>
<td>.83961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>6.5900</td>
<td>1.12002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.2400</td>
<td>1.05524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.1800</td>
<td>1.74298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.1600</td>
<td>2.40252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.4600</td>
<td>2.38861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>72.4700</td>
<td>13.58881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>27.3900</td>
<td>3.54166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>29.0400</td>
<td>3.11374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>27.5200</td>
<td>3.62227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toe</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>83.9500</td>
<td>3.80424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMH</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>23.3700</td>
<td>2.11610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMH</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>17.8800</td>
<td>2.16156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSUP</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.1200</td>
<td>1.55232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTR</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>18.0100</td>
<td>2.73583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSUP</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>23.9000</td>
<td>1.82851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSTR</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>18.2100</td>
<td>3.16960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSUP</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>23.3900</td>
<td>2.16443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTR</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>17.5300</td>
<td>2.97958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tpwb</td>
<td>141.00</td>
<td>181.00</td>
<td>166.4100</td>
<td>9.90367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 53

Showing impact of QWL and RS on AC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall scale-2 bank managers

Table 53a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.320&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.462&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.510&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.554&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, RE, SRD, Promo

Table 53 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on affective commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; role erosion; self role distance and promotion respectively.

Table 53a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .320 for total quality of working life; .462 for role erosion; .510 for self role distance and .554 for promotion respectively. Further R<sup>2</sup>, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R<sup>2</sup> change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (affective commitment) came out, 10.2% for total quality of working life; 11.1% for role erosion; 4.6% for self role distance and 4.7% for promotion respectively.
Table 53b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-29.671</td>
<td>11.140</td>
<td>-2.664</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>5.430</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>2.487</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>3.916</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>-1.326</td>
<td>-.653</td>
<td>-2.589</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>-.532</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>-2.538</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 53b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influence affective commitment of overall scale-2 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t = 5.43 for Tqwl; t = 3.91 for RE; t = -2.58 for SRD and t = -2.53 for Promo respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (affective commitment). The correlation (partial) is r = .487 for Tqwl; r = .373 for RE; r = -.257 for SRD and r = -.252 for Promo respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of affective commitment.

The t-values of self role distance and promotion are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of self role distance and promotion and criterion (affective commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that self role distance and promotion negatively influence the level of affective commitment of overall scale-2 bank managers. As the level of self role distance and promotion increases, the level of affective commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that affective commitment of overall scale-2 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and RE respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H57 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence affective commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers.
Table 54

Showing impact of QWL and RS on CC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall scale-2 bank managers

Table 54a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.291*</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.352b</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), REC, RSTGN

Table 54 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on continuance commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, role expectation conflict and role stagnation respectively.

Table 54a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .291 for role expectation conflict and .352 for role stagnation respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (continuance commitment) came out, 8.5% for role expectation conflict and 3.9% for role stagnation respectively.

Table 54b.

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>28.035</td>
<td>2.234</td>
<td>12.550</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REC</td>
<td>-.673</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>-.437</td>
<td>-3.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>2.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: CC

Table 54b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences continuance commitment of overall scale-2 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t= -3.70$ for REC and $t= 2.08$ for RSTGN respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable.
(continuance commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r = -0.352$ for REC and $r = 0.207$ for RSTGN respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of continuance commitment.

The t-value of role expectation conflict is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of role expectation conflict and criterion (continuance commitment) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that role expectation conflict negatively influence the level of continuance commitment of overall scale-2 bank managers. As the level of role expectation conflict increases, the level of continuance commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that continuance commitment of overall scale-2 bank managers can be significantly predicted by RSTGN. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{5g}$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life will not influence continuance commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers and role stress influence continuance commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers.

Table 55

Showing impact of QWL and RS on NC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall scale-2 bank managers

Table 55a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.385*</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.470b</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, RIN

Table 55 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on normative commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life and role inadequacy respectively.

Table 55a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as 0.385 for total quality of working life and 0.470 for role inadequacy respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (normative commitment) came out, 14.8% for total quality of working life and 7.3% for role inadequacy respectively.
Table 55b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-31.214</td>
<td>11.380</td>
<td>-2.743</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>5.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>3.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: NC

Table 55b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences normative commitment of overall scale-2 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 5.23 for Tqwl and t= 3.01 for RIN respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (normative commitment). The correlation (partial) is r=.469 for Tqwl and r=.292 for RIN respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of normative commitment.

From the results it may be interpreted that normative commitment of overall scale-2 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and RIN respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H₉₉ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence normative commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers.
Table 56
Showing impact of QWL and RS on ToC among overall scale-2 bank managers

Table 56a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

j Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, RSTGN, Promo, OC, IRD, SR, Trs, REC

Table 56 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total organizational commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers. In all eight independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; role stagnation; promotion; organizational commitment; inter role distance; supervisory relations; total role stress and role expectation conflict respectively.

Table 56a. shows the model summary indicating all the eight predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .823 for total quality of working life; .951 for role stagnation; .957 for promotion; .964 for organizational commitment; .971 for inter role distance; .974 for supervisory relations; .975 for total role stress and .977 for role expectation conflict respectively. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (total organizational commitment) came out, 67.8% for total quality of working life; 22.7% for role stagnation; 1.2% for promotion; 1.2% for organizational commitment; 1.1% for inter role distance; 0.4% for supervisory relations; 0.3% for total role stress and 0.3% for role expectation conflict respectively.
Table 56b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-33.507</td>
<td>3.640</td>
<td>-9.206</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>33.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>5.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>-2.267</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-3.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>-2.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>-.625</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>-4.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-3.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>5.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REC</td>
<td>-.387</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>-2.370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent Variable: Toc

Table 56b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total organizational commitment of overall scale-2 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t = 33.89$ for Tqwl; $t = 5.97$ for RSTGN; $t = -3.97$ for Promo; $t = -2.48$ for OC; $t = -4.45$ for IRD; $t = -3.21$ for SR; $t = 5.58$ for Trs and $t = -2.37$ for REC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total organizational commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r = .963$ for Tqwl; $r = .530$ for RSTGN; $r = -.384$ for Promo; $r = -.252$ for OC; $r = -.423$ for IRD; $r = -.319$ for SR; $r = .505$ for Trs and $r = -.241$ for REC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total organizational commitment.

The t-values of promotion; organizational commitment; inter role distance; supervisory relations and role expectation conflict are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of promotion; organizational commitment; inter role distance; supervisory relations and role expectation conflict and criterion (total organizational commitment) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that promotion; organizational commitment; inter role distance; supervisory relations and role expectation conflict negatively influence the level of total organizational commitment of overall scale-2 bank managers. As the levels of promotion; organizational commitment; inter role distance; supervisory relations and role expectation conflict increases, the level of total organizational commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total organizational commitment of overall scale-2 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; RSTGN and Trs respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{0}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total organizational commitment among overall scale-2 bank managers.
Table 57

Showing impact of QWL and RS on GMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-2 bank managers

Table 57a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.710*</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.744b</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.758c</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Predictors: (Constant), Trs, SR, REC

Table 57 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on good mental health among overall scale-2 bank managers. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; supervisory relations and role expectation conflict respectively.

Table 57a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .710 for total role stress; .744 for supervisory relations and .758 for role expectation conflict respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (good mental health) came out, 50.4% for total role stress; 5.0% for supervisory relations and 2.0% for role expectation conflict respectively.

Table 57b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Dependent Variable: GMH

Table 57b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences good mental health of overall scale-2 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t=-5.53$ for Trs; $t=3.42$ for SR and $t=2.13$ for REC respectively. By
having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (good mental health). The correlation (partial) is $r=-.492$ for Trs; $r=.330$ for SR and $r=.213$ for REC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of good mental health.

The t-value of total role stress is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of total role stress and criterion (good mental health) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress negatively influence the level of good mental health of overall scale-2 bank managers. As the level of total role stress increases, the level of good mental decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that good mental health of overall scale-2 bank managers can be significantly predicted by SR and REC respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{61}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence good mental health among overall scale-2 bank managers.

| Table 58a. | Showing impact of QWL and RS on PMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-2 bank managers |

<p>| Model Summary |
|---------------|---------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.474&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.577&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.655&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.695&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>d</sup> Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, SER, Trust, PWC

Table 58 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on poor mental health among overall scale-2 bank managers. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; self respect; trust and physical working conditions respectively.

Table 58a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .474 for total quality of working life; .577 for self respect; .655 for trust and .695 for physical working conditions respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is
also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (poor mental health) came out, 22.5% for total quality of working life; 10.8% for self respect; 9.6% for trust and 5.4% for physical working conditions respectively.

Table 58b.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-2.933</td>
<td>4.234</td>
<td>-0.593</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>3.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>5.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-0.587</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>-0.292</td>
<td>-3.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>3.146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 58b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences poor mental health of overall scale-2 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t = 3.52 for Tqwl; t = 5.27 for SER; t = -3.90 for Trust and t = 3.14 for PWC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (poor mental health). The correlation (partial) is r = .340 for Tqwl; r = .476 for SER; r = -.372 for Trust and r = .307 for PWC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of poor mental health.

The t-value of trust is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of trust and criterion (poor mental health) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that trust negatively influence the level of poor mental health of overall scale-2 bank managers. As the level of trust increases, the level of poor mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that poor mental health of overall scale-2 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; SER and PWC respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_6$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence poor mental health among overall scale-2 bank managers and role stress will not influence poor mental health among overall scale-2 bank managers.
Table 59

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-2 bank managers

Table 59a.

Model Summary

| Model | R    | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Change Statistics R Square | Change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, SER, SR, WI, CIO, RIN, OLCL, PWC

Table 59 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social support among overall scale-2 bank managers. In all eight independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; self respect; supervisory relations; work itself; clarity in organization; role inadequacy; organizational climate and physical working conditions respectively.

Table 59a. shows the model summary indicating all the eight predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .532 for total quality of working life; .640 for self respect; .671 for supervisory relations; .721 for work itself; .736 for clarity in organization; .752 for role inadequacy; .765 for organizational climate and .773 for physical working conditions respectively. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (social support) came out, 28.3% for total quality of working life; 12.7% for self respect; 4.0% for supervisory relations; 2.8% for work itself; 2.1% for clarity in organization; 2.4% for role inadequacy; 0.2% for organizational climate and 0.2% for physical working conditions respectively.
Table 59b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social support of overall scale-2 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, \( t = 5.15 \) for Tqwl; \( t = -4.71 \) for SER; \( t = 2.60 \) for SR; \( t = 2.38 \) for WI; \( t = -4.06 \) for CIO; \( t = -3.41 \) for RIN; \( t = -2.56 \) for OLCL and \( t = -2.14 \) for PWC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social support). The correlation (partial) is \( r = .475 \) for Tqwl; \( r = -.443 \) for SER; \( r = .212 \) for SR; \( r = .243 \) for WI; \( r = -.392 \) for CIO; \( r = -.337 \) for RIN; \( r = -.260 \) for OLCL and \( r = -.219 \) for PWC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social support.

The t-values of self respect; clarity in organization; role inadequacy; organizational climate and physical working conditions are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of self respect; clarity in organization; role inadequacy; organizational climate and physical working conditions and criterion (social support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that self respect; clarity in organization; role inadequacy; organizational climate and physical working conditions negatively influence the level of social support of overall scale-2 bank managers. As the level of self respect; clarity in organization; role inadequacy; organizational climate and physical working conditions increases, the level of social support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social support of overall scale-2 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; SR and WI respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_{63} \) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social support among overall scale-2 bank managers.
Table 60

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-2 bank managers**

Table 60a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6331</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6633</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6973</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7514</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.7725</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*e Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, UMR, CIO, SRD, PWC*

Table 60 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social stressor among overall scale-2 bank managers. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; union management relations; clarity in organization; self role distance and physical working conditions respectively.

Table 60a. shows the model summary indicating all the five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .633 for total quality of working life; .663 for union management relations; .697 for clarity in organization; .751 for self role distance and .772 for physical working conditions respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (social stressor) came out, 40.1% for total quality of working life; 3.8% for union management relations; 4.6% for clarity in organization; 7.9% for self role distance and 3.2% for physical working conditions respectively.
Table 60b. clearly indicates that QWIL and RS influences social stressor of overall scale-2 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 9.20 for Tqwl; t= -4.65 for UMR; t= 4.48 for CIO; t= 5.03 for SRD and t= 2.72 for PWC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social stressor). The correlation (partial) is r= .688 for Tqwl; r= -.433 for UMR; r= .419 for CIO; r= .461 for SRD; and r= .270 for PWC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social stressor.

The t-value of union management relations is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of union management relations and criterion (social stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that union management relations negatively influence the level of social stressor of overall scale-2 bank managers. As the level of union management relations increases, the level of social stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social stressor of overall scale-2 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; CIO SRD and PWC respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H64 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social stressor among overall scale-2 bank managers.
Table 61

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-2 bank managers

Table 61a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.617*</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.720*</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.767*</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.794*</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.813*</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.821*</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.839*</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, SER, ClO, OLCL, PWC, Recog, IRD

Table 61 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work support among overall scale-2 bank managers. In all seven independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; self respect; clarity in organization; organizational climate; physical working conditions; recognition and inter role distance respectively.

Table 61a shows the model summary indicating all the seven predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .617 for total quality of working life; .720 for self respect; .767 for clarity in organization; .794 for organizational climate; .813 for physical working conditions; .831 for recognition and .839 for inter role distance respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (work support) came out, 38.1% for total quality of working life; 13.8% for self respect; 6.9% for clarity in organization; 4.3% for organizational climate; 2.9% for physical working conditions; 3% for recognition and 1.4% for inter role distance respectively.
Table 61b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>3.899</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>10.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>-.412</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.570</td>
<td>-.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>-.456</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.405</td>
<td>-.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>-.226</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>-.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>-.272</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>-.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>-.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>-2.117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: WSUP

Table 61b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work support of overall scale-2 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 10.83 for Tqwl; t= -7.93 for SER; t= -5.84 for CIO; t= -3.25 for OLCL; t= -3.70 for PWC; t= -2.72 for Recog and t= -2.11 for IRD respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work support). The correlation (partial) is r= .749 for Tqwl; r= -.637 for SER; r= -.520 for CIO; r= -.322 for OLCL; r= -.361 for PWC; r= -.274 for Recog and r= -.216 for IRD respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work support.

The t-values of self respect; clarity in organization; organizational climate; physical working conditions; recognition and inter role distance are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of self respect; clarity in organization; organizational climate; physical working conditions; recognition and iner role distance and criterion (work support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that self respect; clarity in organization; organizational climate; physical working conditions; recognition and inter role distance negatively influence the level of work support of overall scale-2 bank managers. As the level of self respect; clarity in organization; organizational climate; physical working conditions; recognition and inter role distance increases, the level of work support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work support of overall scale-2 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_0$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work support among overall scale-2 bank managers.
Table 62

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-2 bank managers

Table 62a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.707*</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.736*</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, SER

Table 62a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .707 for total quality of working life and .736 for self respect respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (work stressor) came out, 50% for total quality of working life and 4.2% for self respect respectively.

Table 62b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work stressor of overall scale-2 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t = 8.71$ for Tqwl and $t = 2.97$ for SER respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work stressor). The
correlation (partial) is $r = .663$ for Tqwl and $r = .289$ for SER respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work stressor.

From the results it may be interpreted that work stressor of overall scale-2 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and SER respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{66}$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence work stressor among scale-2 bank managers of MP state and role stress will not influence work stressor among overall scale-2 bank managers.

Table 63

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-2 bank managers**

Table 63a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.581*</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.638*</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.667*</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.690*</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple correlation (R) is found as .581 for role erosion; .638 for role overload; .667 for organizational commitment and .690 for union management relations respectively. Further, $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (personal support) came out, 33.8% for role erosion; 6.8% for role overload; 3.8% for organizational commitment and 3.2% for union management relations respectively.
Table 63b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant) 23.579</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE - .562</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.364</td>
<td>-4.02</td>
<td>-.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RO - .529</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
<td>-.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC .279</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>3.151</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMR .346</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>2.394</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 63b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal support of overall scale-2 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, \( t = -4.02 \) for RE; \( t = -2.17 \) for RO; \( t = 3.15 \) for OC and \( t = 2.39 \) for UMR respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal support). The correlation (partial) is \( r = -.381 \) for RE; \( r = -.217 \) for RO; \( r = .308 \) for OC and \( r = .239 \) for UMR respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal support.

The t-values of role erosion and role overload are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of role erosion and role overload and criterion (personal support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role erosion and role overload negatively influence the level of personal support of overall scale-2 bank managers. As the level of role erosion and role overload increases, the level of personal support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal support of overall scale-2 bank managers can be significantly predicted by OC and UMR respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_0 \) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal support among overall scale-2 bank managers.
Table 64

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-2 bank managers

Table 64a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.328a</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.446a</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.513a</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.546a</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), RE, Tqwl, Trus., EM

Table 64 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal stressor among overall scale-2 bank managers. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, role erosion; total quality of working life; trust and employee participation respectively.

Table 64a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .328 for role erosion; .446 for total quality of working life; .513 for trust and .546 for employee participation respectively. Further \( R^2 \), which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered \( R^2 \) change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (personal stressor) came out, 10.8% for role erosion; 9.1% for total quality of working life; 6.4% for trust and 3.5% for employee participation respectively.
Table 64b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influence personal stressor of overall scale-2 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, \( t = -5.73 \) for RE; \( t = -4.16 \) for Tqwl; \( t = 2.39 \) for Trust and \( t = 2.18 \) for EM respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal support). The correlation (partial) is \( r = -.507 \) for RE; \( r = -.393 \) for Tqwl; \( r = .239 \) for Trust and \( r = .219 \) for EM respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal stressor.

The t-values of role erosion and total quality of working life are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of role erosion and total quality of working life and criterion (personal stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role erosion and total quality of working life negatively influence the level of personal stressor of overall scale-2 bank managers. As the level of role erosion and total quality of working life increases, the level of personal stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal stressor of overall scale-2 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Trust and EM respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_{68} \) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal stressor among overall scale-2 bank managers.
Table 65

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on Tpwb among overall scale-2 bank managers**

Table 65a.

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.931&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.982&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.985&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.989&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.990&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.991&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.991&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.992&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.991&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.992&lt;sup&gt;j&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.992&lt;sup&gt;k&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.993&lt;sup;l&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.993&lt;sup&gt;m&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.994&lt;sup&gt;n&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, Trs, EM, SR, PWC, SER, RIN, PI, CIO, EB, OLCL, RA

Table 65 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total psychological well-being among overall scale-2 bank managers. In all twelve independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; total role stress; employee participation; supervisory relations; physical working conditions; self respect; role inadequacy; personal inadequacy; clarity in organization; economic benefits; organizational climate and role ambiguity respectively.

Table 65a. shows the model summary indicating all the twelve predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .931 for total quality of working life; .982 for total role stress; .985 for employee participation; .989 for supervisory relations; .990 for physical working conditions; .991 for self respect, .992 for role inadequacy; .992 for personal inadequacy; .992 for clarity in organization; .993 for economic benefits; .993 for organizational climate and .994 for role ambiguity respectively. Further R<sup>2</sup>, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R<sup>2</sup> change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (total psychological well-being) came out, 86.7% for total quality of working life;
9.7% for total role stress; 0.7% for employee participation; 0.8% for supervisory relations; 0.2% for physical working conditions; 0.1% for self respect, 0.1% for role inadequacy; 0.1% for personal inadequacy; 0.1% for clarity in organization; 0.1% for economic benefits; 0.1% for organizational climate and 0.1% for role ambiguity respectively.

Table 65b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total psychological well-being of overall scale-2 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 26.21 for Tqwl; t= -7.78 for Trs; t= 2.87 for EM; t= 3.15 for SR; t= -4.00 for PWC; t= -4.91 for SER; t= 3.36 for RIN; t= 3.65 for PI; t= -2.55 for CIO; t= -2.98 for EB; t= -2.49 for OLCL and t= 2.18 for RA respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total psychological well-being). The correlation (partial) is r= .942 for Tqwl; r= -.641 for Trs; r= .321 for EM; r= .395 for PWC; r= .466 for SER; r= .339 for RIN; r= .365 for PI; r= -.264 for CIO; r= -.305 for EB; r= -.285 for OLCL and r= .228 for RA respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total psychological well-being.

The t-values of total role stress; physical working conditions; self respect; clarity in organization; economic benefits and organizational climate are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; physical working conditions; self respect; clarity in organization; economic benefits and organizational climate and criterion (total psychological well-being) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; physical working conditions; self respect; clarity in organization; economic benefits and organizational climate negatively influence the level of total psychological well-being of overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>43.951</td>
<td>6.469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>26.21</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.575</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-7.78</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>3.156</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>-.389</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-4.008</td>
<td>-.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-4.918</td>
<td>-.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>3.363</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>3.655</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-2.558</td>
<td>-.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>-.304</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-2.982</td>
<td>-.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.307</td>
<td>-2.490</td>
<td>-.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>2.189</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Tpwb
scale-2 bank managers. As the level of total role stress; physical working conditions; self respect; clarity in organization; economic benefits and organizational climate increases, the level of total psychological well-being decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total psychological well-being of overall scale-2 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; EM; SR; RIN; PI and RA respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H69 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total psychological well-being among overall scale-2 bank managers.

In the sixth major results section we have measured the impact of quality of working life and role stress on perceived organizational commitment and psychological well-being among overall scale-3 bank managers. The section starts with the descriptive table describing the minimum scores; maximum scores; mean scores and standard deviation of all the variables and their respective factors (N=100). It is followed by the statistical findings of stepwise multiple regression. This sixth section of results starts from table number sixty-six and ends at table number seventy-eight respectively.
## Descriptive Statistics

**N=100**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>13.360</td>
<td>1.25947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>13.450</td>
<td>1.25025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>13.840</td>
<td>1.17825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.910</td>
<td>1.42201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>9.0C</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.520</td>
<td>1.53399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.430</td>
<td>1.77670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.350</td>
<td>1.43108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.590</td>
<td>1.30341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.440</td>
<td>1.35079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.320</td>
<td>2.08835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.890</td>
<td>1.16250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.650</td>
<td>1.20080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.190</td>
<td>1.37580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>13.720</td>
<td>1.80560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>13.200</td>
<td>1.45144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.360</td>
<td>1.63002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.950</td>
<td>1.82782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>239.00</td>
<td>202.190</td>
<td>9.98655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.220</td>
<td>1.24381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.990</td>
<td>1.66056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.770</td>
<td>1.58181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.940</td>
<td>1.36936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.300</td>
<td>1.35214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.330</td>
<td>1.27964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.250</td>
<td>1.52670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.190</td>
<td>1.21185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.110</td>
<td>1.67510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.990</td>
<td>1.54720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>52.090</td>
<td>11.44252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>32.110</td>
<td>2.29578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>32.940</td>
<td>2.18729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>31.880</td>
<td>2.46708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toc</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>96.930</td>
<td>3.78529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMH</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.840</td>
<td>.48659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMH</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>21.890</td>
<td>1.74017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSUP</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.570</td>
<td>1.04693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTR</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>21.920</td>
<td>1.73892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSUP</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.760</td>
<td>.75371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSTR</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.380</td>
<td>1.63781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSUP</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.320</td>
<td>1.21339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTR</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.080</td>
<td>1.76772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tpwt</td>
<td>171.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>186.689</td>
<td>6.33205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 66

Showing impact of QWL and RS on AC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall scale-3 bank managers

Table 66a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.504a</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.561b</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.618c</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.641d</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, IGR, PWC, RIN

Table 66 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on affective commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; inter group relations; physical working conditions and role inadequacy respectively.

Table 66a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .504 for total quality of working life; .561 for inter group relations; .618 for physical working conditions and .641 for role inadequacy respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (affective commitment) came out, 25.4% for total quality of working life; 6.1% for inter group relations; 6.7% for physical working conditions and 3.0% for role inadequacy respectively.
Table 66b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>13.035</td>
<td>4.822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>2.703</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>1.952</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>3.560</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>-.298</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>2.931</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: AC

Table 66b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences affective commitment of overall scale-3 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t = 1.95$ for Tqwl; $t = 3.56$ for IGR; $t = 2.93$ for PWC and $t = -2.19$ for RIN respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (affective commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r = .196$ for Tqwl; $r = .343$ for IGR; $r = .288$ for PWC and $r = -.219$ for RIN respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of affective commitment.

The t-value of role inadequacy is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of role inadequacy and criterion (affective commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role inadequacy negatively influence the level of affective commitment of overall scale-3 bank managers. As the level of role inadequacy increases, the level of affective commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that affective commitment of overall scale-3 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; IGR and PWC respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{70}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence affective commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers.
Chapter Four

Result and Discussion

Table 67

Showing impact of QWL and RS on CC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall scale-3 bank managers

Table 67a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.587&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.619&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>b</sup> Predictors: (Constant), Trs, Recog

Table 67 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on continuance commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress and recognition respectively.

Table 67a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .587 for total role stress and .619 for recognition respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (continuance commitment) came out, 34.5% for total role stress and 3.9% for recognition respectively.

Table 67b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences continuance commitment of overall scale-3 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t= -7.20$ for Trs and $t= -2.48$ for Recog respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (continuance commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r= .590$ for Trs and $r= -.244$ for
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Recog respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of continuance commitment.

The t-values of total role stress and recognition are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and recognition and criterion (continuance commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and recognition negatively influence the level of continuance commitment of overall scale-3 bank managers. As the level of total role stress and recognition increases, the level of continuance commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that continuance commitment of overall scale-3 bank managers cannot be significantly predicted by any of the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_{71} \) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence continuance commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers.

Table 68

Showing impact of QWL and RS on NC (dimension of organizational commitment) among overall scale-3 bank managers

Table 68a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.470a</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.527b</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), SER, PWC

Table 68 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on normative commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, self respect and physical working conditions respectively.

Table 68a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .470 for self respect and .527 for physical working conditions respectively. Further R\(^2\), which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R\(^2\) change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed
to the dependent variable (normative commitment) came out, 22% for self respect and 5.7% for physical working conditions respectively.

Table 68b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>15.183</td>
<td>2.970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.4995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>2.765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 68b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences normative commitment of overall scale-3 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 4.99 for SER and t= 2.76 for PWC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (normative commitment). The correlation (partial) is r= .452 for SER and r= .270 for PWC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of normative commitment.

From the results it may be interpreted that normative commitment of overall scale-3 bank managers can be significantly predicted by SER and PWC respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H72 is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence normative commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers and role stress will not influence normative commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers.
Table 69

Showing impact of QWL and RS on ToC among overall scale-3 bank managers

Table 69a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.836a</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.873b</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.893c</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.910d</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.926e</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.933f</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.939g</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.947h</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.950i</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.955j</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R, Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, PWC, PI, Recog, RJN, AAW, RSTGN, EH, IRD, RE

Table 69 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total organizational commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers. In all ten independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; physical working conditions; personal inadequacy; recognition; role inadequacy; autonomy at work; role stagnation; employee health; inter role distance and role erosion respectively.

Table 69a. shows the model summary indicating all the ten predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .836 for total quality of working life; .873 for physical working conditions; .893 for personal inadequacy; .910 for recognition; .926 for role inadequacy; .933 for autonomy at work; .939 for role stagnation; .947 for employee health; .950 for inter role distance and .955 for role erosion respectively.

Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (total organizational commitment) came out, 69.9% for total quality of working life; 6.4% for physical working conditions; 3.5% for personal inadequacy; 3.0% for recognition; 2.9% for role inadequacy; 1.4% for autonomy at work; 1.2% for role stagnation; 1.4% for employee health; 0.5% for inter role distance and 0.9% for role erosion respectively.
Table 69b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.714</td>
<td>5.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>13.773</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>6.673</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>-.581</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td>5.191</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-.466</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>-3.621</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>-.523</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>-3.797</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>2.848</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>-.611</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-4.887</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>-.384</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>-3.524</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>3.150</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>-.537</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>-.194</td>
<td>-3.077</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Toe

Table 69b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total organizational commitment of overall scale-3 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, \( t = 6.67 \) for Tqwl; \( t = 5.19 \) for PWC; \( t = -3.62 \) for PI; \( t = -3.79 \) for Recog; \( t = -5.37 \) for RIN; \( t = 2.48 \) for AAW; \( t = -4.88 \) for RSTGN; \( t = -3.52 \) for EH; \( t = 3.15 \) for IRD and \( t = -3.07 \) for RE respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total organizational commitment). The correlation (partial) is \( r = .577 \) for Tqwl; \( r = .482 \) for PWC; \( r = -.358 \) for PI; \( r = -.373 \) for Recog; \( r = -.495 \) for RIN; \( r = .289 \) for AAW; \( r = -.460 \) for RSTGN; \( r = -.350 \) for EH; \( r = .317 \) for IRD and \( r = -.310 \) for RE respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total organizational commitment.

The t-values of personal inadequacy; recognition; role inadequacy; role stagnation; employee health; and role erosion are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of personal inadequacy; recognition; role inadequacy; role stagnation; employee health; and role erosion and criterion (total organizational commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that personal inadequacy; recognition; role inadequacy; role stagnation; employee health; and role erosion negatively influence the level of total organizational commitment of overall scale-3 bank managers. As the level of personal inadequacy; recognition; role inadequacy; role stagnation; employee health; and role erosion increases, the level of total organizational commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total organizational commitment of overall scale-3 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; PWC; AAW and IRD respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_{73} \) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total organizational commitment among overall scale-3 bank managers.
Table 70

Showing impact of QWL and RS on GMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-3 bank managers

Table 70a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>Change Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.228*</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Trust

Table 70 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on good mental health among overall scale-3 bank managers. In all a single independent variable emerged as predictor, namely, trust.

Table 70a. shows the model summary indicating the single predictor of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .228 for trust. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (good mental health) came out, 5.2% for trust.

Table 70b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>25.211</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>150.892</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>-2.317</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: GMH

Table 70b. clearly indicates that QWL influences good mental health of overall scale-3 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t = -2.31$ for Trust. By having a look at the $t$-value, we may conclude that $t$-value is significant for the predictor indicating a relationship between the predictor and criterion variable (good mental health). The correlation (partial) is $r = - .228$ for Trust showing that predictor significantly influence the degree of good mental health.

The $t$-value of trust is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of trust and criterion (good mental health) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that trust negatively influence the level of
good mental health of overall scale-3 bank managers. As the level of trust increases, the level of good mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that good mental health of overall scale-3 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Trust. Thus, the null-hypothesis H34 is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence good mental health among overall scale-3 bank managers and role stress will not influence good mental health among overall scale-3 bank managers.

Table 71

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on PMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-3 bank managers**

Table 71a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), Trs, PWC, SER

Table 71 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on poor mental health among overall scale-3 bank managers. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; physical working conditions and self respect respectively.

Table 71a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .716 for total role stress; .754 for physical working conditions and .767 for self respect respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (poor mental health) came out, as 51.3% for total role stress; 5.5% for physical working conditions and 2.1% for self respect respectively.
Table 71b.

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.620</td>
<td>-8.656</td>
<td>-0.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>3.374</td>
<td>0.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>2.190</td>
<td>0.218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: PMH

Table 71b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences poor mental health of overall scale-3 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t = -8.65 for Trs; t = 3.37 for PWC and t = 2.19 for SER respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (poor mental health). The correlation (partial) is r = -0.662 for Trs; r = 0.326 for PWC and r = 0.218 for SER respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of poor mental health.

The t-value of total role stress is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of total role stress and criterion (poor mental health) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress negatively influence the level of poor mental health of overall scale-3 bank managers. As the level of total role stress increases, the level of poor mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that poor mental health of overall scale-3 bank managers can be significantly predicted by PWC and SER respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H75 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence poor mental health among overall scale-3 bank managers.
Table 72

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-3 bank managers

Table 72a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.504*</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.560*</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.589*</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.612*</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Predictors: (Constant), Trs, UMR, AAW, Promo |

Table 72 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social support among overall scale-3 bank managers. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; union management relations; autonomy at work and promotion respectively.

Table 72a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .504 for total role stress; .560 for union management relations; .589 for autonomy at work and .612 for promotion respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (social support) came out, as 25.4% for total role stress; 5.9% for union management relations; 3.3% for autonomy at work and 2.8% for promotion respectively.


Table 72b.

coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>35.571</td>
<td>2.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.986</td>
<td>-6.699</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>-0.218</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>-0.296</td>
<td>-2.577</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>-0.143</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
<td>-2.085</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>-0.278</td>
<td>-2.073</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: SSUP

Table 72b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social support of overall scale-3 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= -6.69 for Trs; t= -2.57 for UMR; t= -2.08 for AAW and t= -2.07 for Promo respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social support). The correlation (partial) is r= -.566 for Trs; r= -.256 for UMR; r= -.209 for AAW and r= -.208 for Promo respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social support.

The t-values of total role stress; union management relations; autonomy at work and promotion are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; union management relations; autonomy at work and promotion and criterion (social support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; union management relations; autonomy at work and promotion negatively influence the level of social support of overall scale-3 bank managers. As the levels of total role stress; union management relations; autonomy at work and promotion increases, the level of social support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social support of overall scale-3 bank managers can be significantly predicted by the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis H76 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social support among overall scale-3 bank managers.
Table 73

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-3 bank managers

Table 73a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.765^</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.805^</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.817^</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), Trs, Tqwl, Recog

Table 73 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social stressor among overall scale-3 bank managers. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; total quality of working life and recognition respectively.

Table 73a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .765 for total role stress, .805 for total quality of working life and .817 for recognition respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (social stressor) came out, as 58.5% for total role stress; 6.2% for total quality of working life and 2% for recognition respectively.
Table 73b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>15.022</td>
<td>3.891</td>
<td>3.860</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>5.845</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>4.517</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-.237</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-2.395</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: SSTR

Table 73b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social stressor of overall scale-3 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, \( t = -5.84 \) for Trs; \( t = 4.51 \) for Tqwl and \( t = -2.39 \) for Recog respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social stressor). The correlation (partial) is \( r = -0.512 \) for Trs; \( r = 0.419 \) for Tqwl and \( r = -0.237 \) for Recog respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social stressor.

The t-values of total role stress and recognition are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and recognition and criterion (social stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and recognition negatively influence the level of social stressor of overall scale-3 bank managers. As the level of total role stress and increases, the level of social stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social stressor of overall scale-3 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_77 \) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social stressor among overall scale-3 bank managers.
Table 74

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-3 bank managers

Table 74a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.410*</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.513*</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.551*</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.586*</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.611*</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Predictors: (Constant), Trs, UMR, RE, RO, Promo

Table 74 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work support among overall scale-3 bank managers. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; union management relations; role erosion; role overload and promotion respectively.

Table 74a. shows the model summary indicating all the five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .410 for total role stress; .513 for union management relations; .551 for role erosion; .586 for role overload and .611 for promotion respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (work support) came out, as 16.8% for total role stress; 9.6% for union management relations; 4.0% for role erosion; 3.9% for role overload and 3.0% for promotion respectively.
Table 74b.

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Constant)</td>
<td>31.644</td>
<td>1.353</td>
<td>22.386</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-6.449</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-3.132</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>2.504</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>2.387</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-2.133</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: WSUP

Table 74b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work support of overall scale-3 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= -6.44 for Trs; t= -3.13 for UMR; t= 2.50 for RE; t= 2.38 for RO and t= -2.13 for Promo respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work support). The correlation (partial) is r= -.554 for Trs; r= -.307 for UMR; r= .250 for RE; r= .239 for RO and r= -.215 for Promo respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work support.

The t-values of total role stress; union management relations and promotion are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; union management relations and promotion and criterion (work support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; union management relations and promotion negatively influence the level of work support of overall scale-3 bank managers. As the level of total role stress; union management relations and promotion increases, the level of work support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work support of overall scale-3 bank managers can be significantly predicted by RE and RO respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{78}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work support among overall scale-3 bank managers.
Table 75

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-3 bank managers**

**Table 75a.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.717$^a$</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.741$^b$</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.767$^c$</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.780$^d$</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$d$ Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, AAW, SRD, Recog

Table 75 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work stressor among overall scale-3 bank managers. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; autonomy at work; self role distance and recognition respectively.

Table 75a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .717 for total quality of working life; .741 for autonomy at work; .767 for self role distance and .780 for recognition respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (work stressor) came out, as 51.4% for total quality of working life; 3.6% for autonomy at work; 3.9% for self role distance and 1.9% for recognition total respectively.
Table 75b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.893</td>
<td>3.566</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>4.806</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>3.109</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>-.515</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-3.744</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-2.152</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: WSTR

Table 75b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work stressor of overall scale-3 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 4.80 for Tqwl; t= 3.10 for AAW; t= -3.74 for SRD and t= -2.15 for Recog respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work stressor). The correlation (partial) is r= .442 for Tqwl; r= .304 for AAW; r= -.359 for SRD and r= -.216 for Recog respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work stressor.

The t-values of self role distance and recognition are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of self role distance and recognition and criterion (work stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that self role distance and recognition negatively influence the level of work stressor of overall scale-3 bank managers. As the level of self role distance and recognition increases, the level of work stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work stressor of overall scale-3 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and AAW respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H79 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work stressor among overall scale-3 bank managers.
Table 76

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-3 bank managers

Table 76a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), IRD, Wl, RIN, RE

Table 76 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal support among overall scale-3 bank managers. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, inter role distance; work itself; role inadequacy and role erosion respectively.

Table 76a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .569 for inter role distance; .639 for work itself; .662 for role inadequacy and .685 for role erosion respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (personal support) came out, as 32.4% for inter role distance; 8.4% for work itself; 3% for role inadequacy and 3.1% for role erosion respectively.
Table 76b.  

**Coefficients***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.838</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>- .425</td>
<td>-.436</td>
<td>26.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td></td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>-3.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td></td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>-2.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>- .241</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: PSUP

Table 76b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal support of overall scale-3 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t = -4.13 for IRD; t = -3.24 for WI; t = 2.64 for RIN and t = -2.33 for RE respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal support). The correlation (partial) is r = - .390 for IRD; r = - .316 for WI; r = .261 for RIN and r = - .233 for RE respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal support.

The t-values of inter role distance; work itself and role erosion are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of inter role distance; work itself and role erosion and criterion (personal support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that inter role distance; work itself and role erosion negatively influence the level of personal support of overall scale-3 bank managers. As the level of inter role distance; work itself and role erosion increases, the level of personal support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal support of overall scale-3 bank managers can be significantly predicted by RIN respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H80 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal support among overall scale-3 bank managers.
Table 77

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among overall scale-3 bank managers

Table 77a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.693†</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.710&quot;</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.729&quot;</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.747&quot;</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, RIN, ER, IRD

Table 77 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal support among overall scale-3 bank managers. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; role inadequacy; employee relations and inter role distance respectively.

Table 77a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .693 for total quality of working life; .710 for role inadequacy; .729 for employee relations and .747 for inter role distance respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (personal support) came out, as 48% for total quality of working life; 2.4% for role inadequacy; 2.8% for employee relations and 2.7% for inter role distance respectively.
Table 77b. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Slg.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.382</td>
<td>3.549</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>7.487</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>-.269</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>-2.936</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-.308</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>-3.234</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>2.389</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: PSTR

Table 77b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal stressor of overall scale-3 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t = 7.48 for Tqwl; t = -2.93 for RIN; t = -3.23 for ER and t = 2.38 for IRD respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal stressor). The correlation (partial) is r = .609 for Tqwl; r = -.288 for RIN; r = -.315 for ER and r = .238 for IRD respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal stressor.

The t-values of role inadequacy and employee relations are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of role inadequacy and employee relations and criterion (personal stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role inadequacy and employee relations negatively influence the level of personal stressor of overall scale-3 bank managers. As the level of role inadequacy and employee relations increases, the level of personal stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal stressor of overall scale-3 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and IRD respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H81 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal stressor among overall scale-3 bank managers.
Table 78

Showing impact of QWL and RS on Tpwb among overall scale-3 bank managers

Table 78a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.945*</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.971*</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.974*</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.977*</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.979*</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.980*</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.981*</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.982*</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.983*</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.984*</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promo

Table 78 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total psychological well-being among overall scale-3 bank managers. In all ten independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; total quality of working life; recognition; employee health; physical working conditions; role erosion; employee relations; union management relations; economic benefits and promotion respectively.

Table 78a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .945 for total role stress; .971 for total quality of working life; .974 for recognition; .977 for employee health; .979 for physical working conditions; .980 for role erosion; .981 for employee relations; .982 for union management relations; .983 for economic benefits and .984 for promotion respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (total psychological well-being) came out, as 89.3% for total role stress; 4.9% for total quality of working life; 0.7% for recognition; 0.6% for employee health; 0.3% for physical working conditions; 0.3% for role erosion; 0.2% for employee relations; 0.2% for union management relations; 0.2% for economic benefits and 0.2% for promotion respectively.
Table 78b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>179.783</td>
<td>5.275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-5.47</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>-0.989</td>
<td>-34.085</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>10.475</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-.636</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>-5.345</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>-.359</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-3.032</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>2.430</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>3.210</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-.410</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>-3.498</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-2.207</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>-.254</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>-2.944</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-2.245</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Tpwb

Table 78b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total psychological well-being of overall scale-3 bank managers in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= -17.10 for Trs; t= 10.47 for Tqwl; t= -5.34 for Recog; t= -3.03 for EH; t= 2.43 for PWC; t= 3.21 for RE; t= -3.49 for ER; t= -2.20 for UMR; t= -2.94 for EB and t= -2.24 for Promo respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total psychological well-being). The correlation (partial) is r= -.877 for Trs; r= .745 for Tqwl; r= -.495 for Recog; r= -.308 for EH; r= .251 for PWC; r= .324 for RE; r= -.349 for ER; r= -.229 for UMR; r= -.299 for EB and r= -.233 for Promo respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total psychological well-being.

The t-values of total role stress; recognition; employee health; employee relations; union management relations; economic benefits and promotion are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; recognition; employee health; employee relations; union management relations; economic benefits and promotion and criterion (total psychological well-being) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; recognition; employee health; employee relations; union management relations; economic benefits and promotion negatively influence the level of total psychological well-being of overall scale-3 bank managers. As the level of total role stress; recognition; employee health; employee relations; union management relations; economic benefits and promotion increases, the level of total psychological well-being decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total psychological well-being of overall scale-3 bank managers can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; PWC and RE respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H82 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life
and role stress influence total psychological well-being among overall scale-3 bank managers.

In the seventh major results section we have measured the impact of quality of working life and role stress on perceived organizational commitment and psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. The section starts with the descriptive table describing the minimum scores; maximum scores; mean scores and standard deviation of all the variables and their respective factors (N=50). It is followed by the statistical findings of stepwise multiple regression. This seventh section of results starts from table number seventy-nine and ends at table number ninety-one respectively.
### Descriptive Statistics

**N=50**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>9.4800</td>
<td>2.14038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>8.7800</td>
<td>1.87671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>9.8800</td>
<td>1.75708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>9.3600</td>
<td>1.62581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>8.7800</td>
<td>1.52917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>8.2200</td>
<td>1.46092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6.8200</td>
<td>.97080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>8.4000</td>
<td>1.12486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>7.6400</td>
<td>1.82678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>7.7400</td>
<td>1.20898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.2400</td>
<td>.62466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>8.2800</td>
<td>1.73840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>7.8800</td>
<td>1.74543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>10.0200</td>
<td>1.87888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.0600</td>
<td>2.12286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>9.9000</td>
<td>1.55111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>9.6000</td>
<td>1.55183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>164.00</td>
<td>143.6800</td>
<td>14.96314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRD</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.6800</td>
<td>.51270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.7600</td>
<td>.51745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.7600</td>
<td>.47638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.8800</td>
<td>.32826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.2000</td>
<td>.40406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.2200</td>
<td>.46467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.2600</td>
<td>.44309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.8800</td>
<td>.32826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.3000</td>
<td>.46291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.7400</td>
<td>1.58835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>98.6800</td>
<td>2.61425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>20.4000</td>
<td>6.09784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>20.3400</td>
<td>5.85055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>19.8200</td>
<td>5.53338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>60.5600</td>
<td>12.90335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMH</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>17.0400</td>
<td>3.30096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM I</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>12.4200</td>
<td>1.89618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSUP</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>17.1000</td>
<td>3.59847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTR</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>12.0000</td>
<td>1.69031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSUP</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>17.4600</td>
<td>2.67422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSR</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>12.6600</td>
<td>2.52020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI P</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>16.4000</td>
<td>2.61081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTR</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>12.5200</td>
<td>2.63601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tpwb</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>117.6000</td>
<td>11.85112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 79

Showing impact of QWL and RS on AC (dimension of organizational commitment) among scale-1 bank managers of MP state

Table 79a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.784*</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 79a. shows the model summary indicating the single predictor of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .784 for total quality of working life. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (affective commitment) came out, as 61.5% for total quality of working life.

Table 79b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-25.508</td>
<td>5.274</td>
<td>-4.837</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>8.751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 79b. clearly indicates that QWL influences affective commitment of scale-1 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t=8.75$ for Tqwl. By having a look at the t-value, we may conclude that t-value is significant for the predictor indicating a relationship between the predictor and criterion variable (affective commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r=.784$ for Tqwl, showing that predictor significantly influences the degree of affective commitment.
From the results it may be interpreted that affective commitment of scale-1 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl. Thus, the null-hypothesis H₃ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence affective commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state and role stress will not influence affective commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state.

Table 80

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on CC (dimension of organizational commitment) among scale-1 bank managers of MP state**

Table 80a.

| Model Summary | | | | Change Statistics |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | R Square Change |
| 1 | .696a | .484 | .474 | .484 |

a Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl

Table 80 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on continuance commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. In all a single independent variable emerged as predictor, namely, total quality of working life.

Table 80a. shows the model summary indicating the single predictor of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .696 for total quality of working life. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (continuance commitment) came out, as 48.4% for total quality of working life.

Table 80b.

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-18.759</td>
<td>5.853</td>
<td>-3.205</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>6.715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: CC

Table 80b. clearly indicates that QWL influences continuance commitment of scale-1 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t = 6.71 for Tqwl. By having a look at the t-value, we may conclude that t-value is significant for the predictor indicating a relationship between the predictor and criterion variable (continuance commitment). The correlation (partial) is
r = .696 for Tqwl, showing that predictor significantly influences the degree of continuance commitment.

From the results it may be interpreted that continuance commitment of scale-1 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl. Thus, the null-hypothesis H₈₄ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence continuance commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state and role stress will not influence continuance commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state.

Table 81

Table 81 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on normative commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life and organizational commitment respectively.

Table 81a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .679 for total quality of working life and .755 for organizational commitment respectively. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (normative commitment) came out, as 46.1% for total quality of working life and 10.9% for organizational commitment respectively.
Table 81b. 

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-17.279</td>
<td>5.122</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>7.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>-1.144</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>-.377</td>
<td>-3.446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: NC

Table 81b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences normative commitment of scale-1 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t = 7.87$ for Tqwl and $t = -3.44$ for OC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (normative commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r = .754$ for Tqwl and $r = -.449$ for OC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of normative commitment.

The t-value of organizational commitment is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of organizational commitment and criterion (normative commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that organizational commitment negatively influence the level of normative commitment of scale-1 bank managers of MP state. As the level of organizational commitment increases, the level of normative commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that normative commitment of scale-1 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_0$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence normative commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state and role stress will not influence normative commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state.
Table 82

Showing impact of QWL and RS on ToC among scale-1 bank managers of MP state

Table 82a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.977*</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.984*</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.987*</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.990*</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.993*</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.995*</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.995*</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, Trs, Promo, Recog, EM

Table 82 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; total role stress; promotion; recognition and employee participation respectively.

Table 82a. shows the model summary indicating all the five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .977 for total quality of working life; .987 for total role stress; .990 for promotion; .993 for recognition and .995 for employee participation respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (total organizational commitment) came out, as 95.5% for total quality of working life; 0.6% for total role stress; 0.5% for promotion; 0.7% for recognition and 0.3% for employee participation respectively.
Table 82b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>171.63</td>
<td>27.733</td>
<td>6.189</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-1.906</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>-3.86</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-.851</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: Toc

Table 82b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total organizational commitment of scale-1 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t= 10.94$ for Tqwl; $t= -8.40$ for Trs; $t= 7.50$ for Promo; $t= -5.77$ for Recog and $t= 4.11$ for EM respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total organizational commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r= .855$ for Tqwl; $r= -.785$ for Trs; $r= .749$ for Promo; $r= -.657$ for Recog and $r= .527$ for EM respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total organizational commitment.

The t-values of total role stress and recognition are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and recognition and criterion (total organizational commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and recognition negatively influence the level of total organizational commitment of scale-1 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress and recognition increases, the level of total organizational commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total organizational commitment of scale-1 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; Promo and EM respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{86}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state.
Table 83

Showing impact of QWL and RS on GMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of MP state

Table 83a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.786*</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.844b</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.862a</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), Trs, RO, Recog

Table 83 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on good mental health among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; role overload and recognition respectively.

Table 83a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .786 for total role stress; .844 for role overload and .862 for recognition respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (good mental health) came out, as 61.8% for total role stress; 9.5% for role overload and 3.1% for recognition respectively.
Table 83b.

Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>133.364</td>
<td>12.707</td>
<td>10.496</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.869</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>-.688</td>
<td>-5.796</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>-2.961</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>-.362</td>
<td>-3.670</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-.422</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>-2.350</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Dependent Variable: GMH

Table 83b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences good mental health of scale-1 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= -5.79 for Trs; t= -3.67 for RO and t= -2.35 for Recog respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (good mental health). The correlation (partial) is r= -.650 for Trs; r= -.476 for RO and r= -.327 for Recog respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of good mental health.

The t-values of total role stress; role overload and recognition are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; role overload and recognition and criterion (good mental health) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; role overload and recognition negatively influence the level of good mental health of scale-1 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress; role overload and recognition increases, the level of good mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that good mental health of scale-1 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis H87 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence good mental health among scale-1 bank managers of MP state.
Table 84

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of MP state

Table 84a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.491*</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Trs

Table 84 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on poor mental health among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. In all a single independent variable emerged as predictor, namely, total role stress.

Table 84a. shows the model summary indicating the single predictor of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .491 for total role stress. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (poor mental health) came out, as 24.1% for total role stress.

Table 84b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>47.569</td>
<td>9.003</td>
<td>5.284</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.356</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.491</td>
<td>-3.906</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: PMH

Table 84b. clearly indicates that RS influences poor mental health of scale-1 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= -3.90 for Trs. By having a look at the t-value, we may conclude that t-value is significant for the predictor indicating a relationship between the predictor and criterion variable (poor mental health). The correlation (partial) is r= -.491 for Tqwl, showing that predictor significantly influences the degree of poor mental health.

The t-value of total role stress is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of total role stress and criterion (poor mental health) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress
negatively influence the level of poor mental health of scale-1 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress increases, the level of poor mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that poor mental health of scale-1 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{98}$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life will not influence poor mental health among scale-1 bank managers of MP state and role stress influence poor mental health among scale-1 bank managers of MP state.

Table 85

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of MP state**

Table 85a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^c\) Predictors: (Constant), Wi, Trs, Recog

Table 85 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social support among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, work itself; total role stress; and recognition respectively.

Table 85a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .796 for work itself; .836 for total role stress and .850 for recognition respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (social support) came out, as 63.4% for work itself; 6.4% for total role stress and 2.5% for recognition respectively.
Table 85b. Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.756</td>
<td>20.901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>4.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Trs    | -.720                       | .188                      | -.523| 4.248|.000         | .531
| Recog  | -.420                       | .208                      | -.204| -2.024|.049         | -.491

a Dependent Variable: SSUP

Table 85b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social support of scale-1 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 4.24 WI; t= -3.82 for Trs and t= -2.02 for Recog respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social support). The correlation (partial) is r= .531 for WI; r= -.491 for Trs and r= -.286 for Recog respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social support.

The t-values of total role stress and recognition are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and recognition and criterion (social support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and recognition negatively influence the level of social support of scale-1 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress and recognition increases, the level of social support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social support of scale-1 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by WI. Thus, the null-hypothesis H₉₉ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social support among scale-1 bank managers of MP state.
Table 86

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of MP state**

Table 86a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.403&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.489&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.570&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Predictors: (Constant), OC, Trust, RSTGN

Table 86 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social stressor among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, organizational commitment; trust and role stagnation respectively.

Table 86a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .403 for organizational commitment; .489 for trust and .570 for role stagnation respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (social stressor) came out, as 16.3% for organizational commitment; 7.6% for trust and 8.6% for role stagnation respectively.
Table 86b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Constant)</td>
<td>21.888</td>
<td>4.366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-.834</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>-.308</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>-.966</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>-.296</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: SSTR

Table 86b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social stressor of scale-1 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 2.55 for OC; t=-2.48 for Trust and t=-2.41 for RSTGN respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social stressor). The correlation (partial) is r=.352 for OC; r=-.344 for Trust and r=-.336 for RSTGN respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social stressor.

The t-values of trust and role stagnation are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of trust and role stagnation and criterion (social stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that trust and role stagnation negatively influence the level of social stressor of scale-1 bank managers of MP state. As the level of trust and role stagnation increases, the level of social stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social stressor of scale-1 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by OC. Thus, the null-hypothesis H90 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social stressor among scale-1 bank managers of MP state.
Table 87

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of MP state

Table 87a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.788а</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.821б</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.838с</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), WI, PWC, ER

Table 87 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work support among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, work itself; physical working conditions and employee relations respectively.

Table 87a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .788 for work itself; .821 for physical working conditions and .838 for employee relations respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (work support) came out, as 62.1% for work itself; 5.3% for physical working conditions and 2.9% for employee relations respectively.
Table 87b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.368</td>
<td>2.108</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>2.104</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: WSUP

Table 87b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work support of scale-1 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 3.50 for WI; t= 2.47 for PWC and t= 2.10 for ER respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work support). The correlation (partial) is r=.459 for WI; r=.342 for PWC and r=.296 for ER respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work support.

From the results it may be interpreted that work support of scale-1 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by WI; PWC and ER respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{91}$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence work support among scale-1 bank managers of MP state and role stress will not influence work support among scale-1 bank managers of MP state.
Table 88

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of MP state**

Table 88a.

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.326a</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.433b</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.572c</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.645d</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.714e</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.755f</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.784g</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.807h</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h Predictors: (Constant), IGR, WI, Tqwl, AAW, Trs, Promo, Trust, EB

Table 88 is showing the impact of quality of working life and role stress on work stressor among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. In all eight independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, inter group relations; work itself; total quality of working life; autonomy at work; total role stress; promotion; trust and economic benefits respectively.

Table 88a shows the model summary indicating all the eight predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .326 for inter group relations; .433 for work itself; .572 for total quality of working life; .645 for autonomy at work; .714 for total role stress; .753 for promotion; .784 for trust and .807 for economic benefits respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (work stressor) came out, as 10.6% for inter group relations; 8.1% for work itself; 14.0% for total quality of working life; 8.9% for autonomy at work; 9.5% for total role stress; 5.7% for promotion; 4.7% for trust and 3.6% for economic benefits respectively.
Table 88b. 
Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized</th>
<th>Standardized</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficients</td>
<td>Coefficients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-126.788</td>
<td>32.642</td>
<td>-3.884</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>2.045</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>5.540</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>-2.211</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>-1.878</td>
<td>-7.524</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>2.789</td>
<td>5.501</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>-1.764</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>-.787</td>
<td>-3.178</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>3.772</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>1.958</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-1.550</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>-.384</td>
<td>-2.792</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>-.556</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>-.415</td>
<td>-2.066</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: WSTR

Table 88b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work stressor of scale-1 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 5.54 for IGR; t= -7.52 for WI; t= 5.50 for Tqwl; t= -3.17 for AAW; t= 3.77 for Trs; t= 1.95 for Promo; t= -2.79 for Trust and t= -2.06 for EB respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work stressor). The correlation (partial) is r= .654 for IGR; r= -.762 for WI; r= .652 for Tqwl; r= -.445 for AAW; r= .508 for Trs; r= .292 for Promo; r= -.400 for Trust and r= -.307 for EB respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work stressor.

The t-values of work itself; autonomy at work; trust and economic benefits are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of work itself; autonomy at work; trust and economic benefits and criterion (work stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that work itself; autonomy at work; trust and economic benefits negatively influence the level of work stressor of scale-1 bank managers of MP state. As the level of work itself; autonomy at work; trust and economic benefits increases, the level of work stress or decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work stressor of scale-1 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by IGR; Tqwl; Trs and Promo respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H02 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work stressor among scale-1 bank managers of MP state.
Table 89

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of MP state

Table 89a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), RA

Table 89 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal support among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. In all a single independent variable emerged as predictor, namely, role ambiguity.

Table 89a. shows the model summary indicating the single predictor of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .490 for role ambiguity. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (personal support) came out as 24% for role ambiguity.

Table 89b.

Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>42.086</td>
<td>6.609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>-2.762</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>-490</td>
<td>-3.891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: PSUP

Table 89b. clearly indicates that RS influences personal support of scale-1 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= -3.89 for RA. By having a look at the t-value, we may conclude that t-value is significant for the predictor indicating a relationship between the predictor and criterion variable (personal support). The correlation (partial) is r= -.490 for RA, showing that predictor significantly influences the degree of personal support.
The t-value of role ambiguity is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of role ambiguity and criterion (personal support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role ambiguity negatively influence the level of personal support of scale-1 bank managers of MP state. As the level of role ambiguity increases, the level of personal support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal support of scale-1 bank managers of MP state cannot be significantly predicted by any of the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_9$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life will not influence personal support among scale-1 bank managers of MP state and role stress influence personal support among scale-1 bank managers of MP state.

Table 90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.662*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.787b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predicators: (Constant), Trs, PWC

Table 90 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal stressor among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress and physical working conditions respectively.

Table 90a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, 0.662 for total role stress and 0.787 for physical working conditions respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (personal stressor) came out, as 43.9% for total role stress and 18.1% for physical working conditions respectively.
Table 90b. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>136.830</td>
<td>15.235</td>
<td>8.982</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-1.162</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-1.153</td>
<td>-.0408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>-.974</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>-.649</td>
<td>-4.736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: PSTR

Table 90b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal stressor of scale-1 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is \( t = -8.40 \) for Trs and \( t = -4.73 \) for PWC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal stressor). The correlation (partial) is \( r = -.775 \) for Trs and \( r = -.568 \) for PWC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal stressor.

The t-values of total role stress and physical working conditions are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and physical working conditions and criterion (personal stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and physical working conditions negatively influence the level of personal stressor of scale-1 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress and physical working conditions increases, the level of personal stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal stressor of scale-1 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_{94} \) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal stressor among scale-1 bank managers of MP state.
Table 91

Showing impact of QWL and RS on Tpwb among scale-1 bank managers of MP state

Table 91a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Predictors: (Constant), Trs, IGR, EM, EB, Promo, Trust, PWC, SER, SR

Table 91 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. In all nine independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; inter group relations; employee participation; economic benefits; promotion; trust; physical working conditions; self respect and supervisory relations respectively.

Table 91a. shows the model summary indicating all the nine predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .959 for total role stress; .978 for inter group relations; .984 for employee participation; .987 for economic benefits; .989 for promotion; .991 for trust; .992 for physical working conditions; .993 for self respect and .994 for supervisory relations respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (total psychological well-being) came out, as 91.9% for total role stress; 3.8% for inter group relations; 1.1% for employee participation; 0.6% for economic benefits; 0.4% for promotion; 0.4% for trust; 0.3% for physical working conditions; 0.2% for self respect and 0.2% for supervisory relations respectively.
Table 9.1b. **Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>367.750</td>
<td>19.079</td>
<td>19.275</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-2.870</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>-633</td>
<td>-17.481</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>6.050</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>4.383</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>4.742</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-1.404</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-3.417</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>2.923</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>-.491</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-3.121</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>2.574</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Dependent Variable: Tpwb

Table 9.1b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total psychological well-being of scale-1 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= -17.48 for Trs; t= 2.29 for IGR; t= 6.05 for EM; t=4.38 for EB; t= 4.74 for Promo; t= -3.41 for Trust; t= 2.92 for PWC; t= -3.12 for SER and t= 2.57 for SR respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total psychological well-being). The correlation (partial) is r= -.940 for Trs; r= .341 for IGR; r= .691 for EM; r= .570 for EB; r= .600 for Promo; r= -.475 for Trust; r= .420 for PWC; r= -.442 for SER and r= .377 for SR respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total psychological well-being.

The t-values of total role stress; trust and self respect are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; trust and self respect and criterion (total psychological well-being) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; trust and self respect negatively influence the level of total psychological well-being of scale-1 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress; trust and self respect increases, the level of total psychological well-being decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total psychological well-being of scale-1 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by IGR; EM; EB; Promo; PWC and SR respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_0$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of MP state.
In the eighth major results section we have measured the impact of quality of working life and role stress on perceived organizational commitment and psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. The section starts with the descriptive table describing the minimum scores; maximum scores; mean scores and standard deviation of all the variables and their respective factors (N=50). It is followed by the statistical findings of stepwise multiple regression. This eighth section of results starts from table number ninety-two and ends at table number one hundred and four respectively.
**Descriptive Statistics**

N=50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.120</td>
<td>1.25584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.080</td>
<td>1.49612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.300</td>
<td>1.87355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.720</td>
<td>1.16128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.500</td>
<td>1.19949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.640</td>
<td>1.66304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.540</td>
<td>1.28110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.440</td>
<td>1.35767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.020</td>
<td>2.18987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.980</td>
<td>1.54510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>1.12486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.260</td>
<td>1.46817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCog</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.340</td>
<td>2.04650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.500</td>
<td>1.34392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.960</td>
<td>2.13771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.520</td>
<td>2.01261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.420</td>
<td>1.89618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>164.00</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>177.840</td>
<td>8.23720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.040</td>
<td>.75485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.100</td>
<td>.54398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.660</td>
<td>.62629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.960</td>
<td>.72731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.560</td>
<td>.88433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.420</td>
<td>.83520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.160</td>
<td>.50950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.660</td>
<td>.87155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.360</td>
<td>.87505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RN</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.400</td>
<td>1.70234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>85.320</td>
<td>4.46958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>27.900</td>
<td>3.64356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>28.460</td>
<td>3.41192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>27.820</td>
<td>4.07426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toc</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>84.180</td>
<td>3.66277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMH</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.020</td>
<td>1.81254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMH</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>17.260</td>
<td>2.28402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSUP</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>23.400</td>
<td>1.80882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTR</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>17.700</td>
<td>3.10530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSUP</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>23.160</td>
<td>2.06388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSTR</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>17.480</td>
<td>3.61539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSUP</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.280</td>
<td>2.50746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTR</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>16.440</td>
<td>3.16976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tpwb</td>
<td>141.00</td>
<td>171.00</td>
<td>159.780</td>
<td>8.70911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 92

Showing impact of QWL and RS on AC (dimension of organizational commitment) among scale-2 bank managers of MP state

Table 92a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 92 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on affective commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. In all a single independent variable emerged as predictor, namely, total role stress.

Table 92a. shows the model summary indicating the single predictor of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .438 for total role stress. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (affective commitment) came out, as 19.2% for total role stress.

Table 92b. clearly indicates that RS influences affective commitment of scale-2 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t = -3.37$ for Trs. By having a look at the t-value, we may conclude that t-value is significant for the predictor indicating a relationship between the predictor and criterion variable (affective commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r = -0.438$ for Trs, showing that predictor significantly influences the degree of affective commitment.
The t-value of total role stress is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of total role stress and criterion (affective commitment) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress negatively influence the level of affective commitment of scale-2 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress increases, the level of affective commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that affective commitment of scale-2 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis H96 is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life will not influence affective commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state and role stress influence affective commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state.

Table 93

Showing impact of QWL and RS on CC (dimension of organizational commitment) among scale-2 bank managers of MP state

Variables Entered/Removed$^a$

a. Dependent Variable: CC

None of the independent variables emerged as predictors of continuance commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. Thus, the null-hypothesis H97 is accepted. Hence, quality of working life and role stress will not influence continuance commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state.
Table 94a.

Showing impact of QWL and RS on NC (dimension of organizational commitment) among scale-2 bank managers of MP state

Table 94a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.512a</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.595b</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), RE, RO

Table 94 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on normative commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, role erosion and role overload respectively.

Table 94a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .512 for role erosion and .595 for role overload respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (normative commitment) came out, as 26.2% for role erosion and 9.2% for role overload respectively.

Table 94b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences normative commitment of scale-2 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is $t = -3.78$ for RE and $t = -2.58$ for RO respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (normative commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r = -0.483$ for RE and $r = -0.352$ for
RO respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of normative commitment.

The \( t \)-values of role erosion and role overload are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of role erosion and role overload and criterion (normative commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role erosion and role overload negatively influence the level of normative commitment of scale-2 bank managers of MP state. As the level of role erosion and role overload increases, the level of normative commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that normative commitment of scale-2 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_{98} \) is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life will not influence normative commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state and role stress influence normative commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state.

Table 95

Showing impact of QWL and RS on Toc among scale-2 bank managers of MP state

Table 95a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.984\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.990\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.991\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{c} Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, Trs, Recog

Table 95 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; total role stress and recognition respectively.

Table 95a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .984 for total quality of working life; .990 for total role stress and .991 for recognition respectively. Further \( R^2 \), which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered \( R^2 \) change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the
predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (total organizational commitment) came out, as 96.9% for total quality of working life; 1.0% for total role stress and 0.3% for recognition respectively.

Table 95b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>52.259</td>
<td>11.549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>4.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.312</td>
<td>8.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-2.671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Dependent Variable: Toc

Table 95b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total organizational commitment of scale-2 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= 8.72 for Tqwl; t= -3.97 for Trs and t= -2.67 for Recog respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total organizational commitment). The correlation (partial) is r= .789 for Tqwl; r= -.506 for Trs and r= -.366 for Recog respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total organizational commitment.

The t-values of total role stress and recognition are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and recognition and criterion (total organizational commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and recognition negatively influence the level of total organizational commitment of scale-2 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress and recognition increases, the level of total organizational commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total organizational commitment of scale-2 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl. Thus, the null-hypothesis H₉₉ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state.
Table 96

Showing impact of QWL and RS on GMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of MP state

Table 96a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.600a</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.658b</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Trs
b Predictors: (Constant), Trs, SR

Table 96 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on good mental health among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress and supervisory relations respectively.

Table 96a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, 0.600 for total role stress and 0.658 for supervisory roles respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (good mental health) came out, as 36% for total role stress and 7.3% for supervisory roles respectively.

Table 96b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>34.225</td>
<td>5.161</td>
<td>6.631</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.465</td>
<td>-.3.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>2.456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: GMH

Table 96b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences good mental health of scale-2 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is $t = -3.78$ for Trs and $t = 2.45$ for SR respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (good mental
The correlation (partial) is $r = -0.483$ for TRs and $r = 0.337$ for SR respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of good mental health.

The $t$-value of total role stress is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly, the correlation of total role stress and criterion (good mental health) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress negatively influence the level of good mental health of scale-2 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress increases, the level of good mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that good mental health of scale-2 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by SR. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{00}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence good mental health among scale-2 bank managers of MP state.

### Table 97

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on PMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of MP state**

Table 97a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.696$^a$</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.755$^b$</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.795$^c$</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.821$^d$</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d Predictors: (Constant), SER, REC, RE, SR

Table 97 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on poor mental health among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, self respect; role expectation conflict; role erosion and supervisory relations respectively.

Table 97a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, 0.696 for self respect; 0.755 for role expectation conflict; 0.795 for role erosion and 0.821 for supervisory relations respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude
of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (poor mental health) came out, as 48.4% for self respect; 8.6% for role expectation conflict; 6.3% for role erosion and 4.1% for supervisory relations respectively.

Table 97b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>34.335</td>
<td>5.061</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>6.784</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>5.110</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>-1.350</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>-.370</td>
<td>-3.879</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>-.962</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>-3.388</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>-3.17</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>-2.394</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: PMH

Table 97b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences poor mental health of scale-2 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= 5.11 for SER; t= -3.87 for REC; t= -3.38 for RE and t= -2.38 for SR respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (poor mental health). The correlation (partial) is r= .606 for SER; r= -.501 for REC; r= -.451 for RE and r= -.335 for SR respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of poor mental health.

The t-values of role expectation conflict; role erosion and supervisory relations are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of role expectation conflict; role erosion and supervisory relations and criterion (poor mental health) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role expectation conflict; role erosion and supervisory relations negatively influence the level of poor mental health of scale-2 bank managers of MP state. As the level of role expectation conflict; role erosion and supervisory relations increases, the level of poor mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that poor mental health of scale-2 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by SER. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{01}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence poor mental health among scale-2 bank managers of MP state.
Table 98

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of MP state

Table 98a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, Trs, SER, PI, RE

Table 98 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social support among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; total role stress; self respect; personal inadequacy and role erosion respectively.

Table 98a. shows the model summary indicating all the five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .432 for total quality of working life; .657 for total role stress; .702 for self respect; .743 for personal inadequacy and .772 for role erosion respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (social support) came out, as 18.7% for total quality of working life; 24.5% for total role stress; 6.0% for self respect; 6.0% for personal inadequacy and 4.4% for role erosion respectively.
Chapter Four

Result and Discussion

Table 98b. Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>2.277</td>
<td>5.396</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>1.389</td>
<td>3.209</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>-.304</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.359</td>
<td>-2.988</td>
<td>-.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>2.246</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>2.201</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: SSUP

Table 98b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social support of scale-2 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= 5.39 for Tqwl; t= 3.20 for Trs; t= -2.98 for SER; t= 2.24 for PI and t= 2.20 for RE respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social support). The correlation (partial) is r= .631 for Tqwl; t= .436 for Trs; r= -.411 for SER; r= .321 for PI and r= .315 for RE respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social support.

The t-value of self respect is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of self respect and criterion (social support) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that self respect negatively influence the level of social support of scale-2 bank managers of MP state. As the level of self respect increases, the level of social support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social support of scale-2 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; Trs; PI and RE respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H102 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social support among scale-2 bank managers of MP state.
Table 99

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of MP state**

Table 99a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.768*</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.792*</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d Predictors: (Constant), Trs, SER, RIN, OLCL

Table 99 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social stressor among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; self respect; role inadequacy and organizational climate respectively.

Table 99a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .768 for total role stress; .792 for self respect; .820 for role inadequacy and .844 for organizational climate respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (social stressor) came out, as 59% for total role stress; 3.7% for self respect; 4.6% for role inadequacy and 4.0% for organizational climate respectively.
### Table 99b.

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>41.452</td>
<td>8.061</td>
<td>5.142</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.482</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.693</td>
<td>-6.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>3.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>2.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>2.496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

a Dependent Variable: SSTR

Table 99b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social stressor of scale-2 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is $t = -6.24$ for Trs; $t = 3.08$ for SER; $t = 2.81$ for RIN and $t = 2.49$ for OLCL respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social stressor). The correlation (partial) is $r = -.681$ for Trs; $r = .418$ for SER; $r = .386$ for RIN and $r = .349$ for OLCL respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social stressor.

The t-value of total role stress is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of total role stress and criterion (social stressor) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress negatively influence the level of social stressor of scale-2 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress increases, the level of social stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social stressor of scale-2 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by SER; RIN and OLCL respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{103}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social stressor among scale-2 bank managers of MP state.
Table 100

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of MP state**

Table 100a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.577*</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.750*</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.807*</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), EM, SR, ER

Table 100 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work support among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, employee participation; self respect and employee relations respectively.

Table 100a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .577 for employee participation; .750 for self respect and .807 for employee relations respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (work support) came out, as 33.3% for employee participation; 22.9% for self respect and 8.9% for employee relations respectively.
Table 100b. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.702</td>
<td>2.038</td>
<td>2.307</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>5.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>4.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>3.423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: WSUP

Table 100b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work support of scale-2 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is $t = 5.94$ for EM; $t = 4.25$ for SR and $t = 3.42$ for ER respectively. By having a look at the $t$-values, we may conclude that $t$-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work support). The correlation (partial) is $r = .659$ for EM; $r = .531$ for SR and $r = .451$ for ER respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work support.

From the results it may be interpreted that work support of scale-2 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by EM; SR and ER respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{104}$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence work support among scale-2 bank managers of MP state and role stress will not influence work support among scale-2 bank managers of MP state.
Table 101

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of MP state.

Table 101a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.759*</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.804*</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.833*</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.850*</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d Predictors: (Constant), Trs, OC, RSTG, EM

Table 101 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work stressor among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; organizational commitment; role stagnation and employee participation respectively.

Table 101a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .759 for total role stress; .804 for organizational commitment; .833 for role stagnation and .850 for employee participation respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (work stressor) came out, as 57.6% for total role stress; 7.1% for organizational commitment; 4.7% for role stagnation and 2.9% for employee participation respectively.
Table 101b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.842</td>
<td>.7127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.528</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.653</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>-.386</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>-2.036</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>-.459</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>-.190</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: WSTR

Table 101b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work stressor of scale-2 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is $t = -7.46$ for Trs; $t = -2.86$ for OC; $t = -3.31$ for RSTGN and $t = -2.17$ for EM respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work stressor). The correlation (partial) is $r = -.744$ for Trs; $r = -.393$ for OC; $r = -.443$ for RSTGN and $r = -.309$ for EM respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work stressor.

The t-values of total role stress; organizational commitment; role stagnation and employee participation are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; organizational commitment; role stagnation and employee participation and criterion (work stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; organizational commitment; role stagnation and employee participation negatively influence the level of work stressor of scale-2 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress; organizational commitment; role stagnation and employee participation increases, the level of work stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work stressor of scale-2 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{105}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work stressor among scale-2 bank managers of MP state.
Table 102

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of MP state**

Table 102a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h Predictors: (Constant), UMR, RA, Trs, OLCL

Table 102 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal support among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, union management relations; role ambiguity; total role stress and organizational climate respectively.

Table 102a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .585 for union management relations; .623 for role ambiguity; .694 for total role stress and .729 for organizational climate respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (personal support) came out, as 9.1% for union management relations; 8.4% for role ambiguity; 9.4% for total role stress and 5.1% for organizational climate respectively.
Table 102b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>32.862</td>
<td>8.238</td>
<td>3.989</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>2.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>1.747</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>4.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.319</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.568</td>
<td>-4.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>-.696</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>-.333</td>
<td>-2.888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a Dependent Variable: PSUP |

Table 102b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal support of scale-2 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t = 2.81 for UMR; t = 4.92 for RA; t = -4.04 for Trs and t = -2.88 for OLCL respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal support). The correlation (partial) is r = .387 for UMR; r = .592 for RA; r = -.516 for Trs and r = -.395 for OLCL respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal support.

The t-values of total role stress and organizational climate are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and organizational climate and criterion (personal support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and organizational climate negatively influence the level of personal support of scale-2 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress and organizational climate increases, the level of personal support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal support of scale-2 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by UMR and RA respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{106}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal support among scale-2 bank managers of MP state.
Chapter Four

Result and Discussion

Table 103

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of MP state

Table 103a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.558 ( a )</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.647 ( b )</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.708 ( c )</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.752 ( d )</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( d \) Predictors: (Constant), SER, IRD, CIO, PWC

Table 103 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal stressor among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, self respect; inter role distance; clarity in organization and physical working conditions respectively.

Table 103a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .558 for self respect; .647 for inter role distance; .708 for clarity in organization and .752 for physical working conditions respectively. Further R\(^2\), which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R\(^2\) change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (personal stressor) came out, as 31.1% for self respect; 10.8% for inter role distance; 8.2% for clarity in organization and 6.4% for physical working conditions respectively.
Table 103b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>23.381</td>
<td>5.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>-.391</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>-2.172</td>
<td>-.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>1.386</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>3.260</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>-.875</td>
<td>-.405</td>
<td>-3.348</td>
<td>-.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>-.438</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>-2.584</td>
<td>-.360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 103b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal stressor of scale-2 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= -2.17 for SER; t= 3.26 for IRD; t= -3.34 for CIO and t= -2.58 for PWC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal stressor). The correlation (partial) is r= -.308 for SER; r= .437 for IRD; r= -.447 for CIO and r= -.360 for PWC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal stressor.

The t-values of self respect; clarity in organization and physical working conditions are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of self respect; clarity in organization and physical working conditions and criterion (personal stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that self respect; clarity in organization and physical working conditions negatively influence the level of personal stressor of scale-2 bank managers of MP state. As the level of self respect; clarity in organization and physical working conditions increases, the level of personal stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal stressor of scale-2 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by IRD. Thus, the null-hypothesis H_{07} is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal stressor among scale-2 bank managers of MP state.
Table 104

Showing impact of QWL and RS on Tpwb among scale-2 bank managers of MP state

Table 104a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.972*</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.982*</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.986*</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.988*</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.990*</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.991†</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, SER, RA, Recog, RIN, PWC

Table 104 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. In all six independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; self respect; role ambiguity; recognition; role inadequacy and physical working conditions respectively.

Table 104a. shows the model summary indicating all the six predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .972 for total quality of working life; .982 for self respect; .986 for role ambiguity; .988 for recognition; .990 for role inadequacy and .991 for physical working conditions respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (total psychological well-being) came out, as 94.6% for total quality of working life; 1.9% for self respect; 0.8% for role ambiguity; 0.5% for recognition; 0.2% for role inadequacy and 0.2% for physical working conditions respectively.
Table 104b. Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-50.736</td>
<td>8.087</td>
<td>-6.274</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>36.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>-.515</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-4.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>3.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-.328</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-3.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>2.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-2.070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: Tpwb

Table 104b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influence total psychological well-being of scale-2 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= .36.48 for Tqwl; t= -4.60 for SER; t= 3.66 for RA; t= -3.14 for Recog; t= 2.18 for RIN and t= -2.07 for PWC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total psychological well-being). The correlation (partial) is r= .984 for Tqwl; r= -.575 for SER; r= .488 for RA; r= -.432 for Recog; r= .316 for RIN and r= -.301 for PWC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total psychological well-being.

The t-values of self respect; recognition and physical working conditions are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of self respect; recognition and physical working conditions and criterion (total psychological well-being) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that self respect; recognition and physical working conditions negatively influence the level of total psychological well-being of scale-2 bank managers of MP state. As the level of self respect; recognition and physical working conditions increases, the level of total psychological well-being decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total psychological well-being of scale-2 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; RA and RIN respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H\textsubscript{08} is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of MP state.
In the ninth major results section we have measured the impact of quality of working life and role stress on perceived organizational commitment and psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. The section starts with the descriptive table describing the minimum scores; maximum scores; mean scores and standard deviation of all the variables and their respective factors (N=50). It is followed by the statistical findings of stepwise multiple regression. This ninth section of results starts from table number one hundred and five and ends at table number one hundred and seventeen respectively.
### Descriptive Statistics

**N=50**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W itself</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>13.7200</td>
<td>1.16128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>13.6000</td>
<td>.96890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>14.0000</td>
<td>.88063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMP</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.4400</td>
<td>1.37262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCI</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.2000</td>
<td>1.14286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.8200</td>
<td>1.08214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.0800</td>
<td>1.15776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.7600</td>
<td>1.27071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.7400</td>
<td>.80331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.6800</td>
<td>2.17068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.6800</td>
<td>.62073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.1600</td>
<td>.91160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.4800</td>
<td>1.03490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco.Ben.</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>12.7400</td>
<td>2.22976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.7200</td>
<td>1.02000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em.Hlth.</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.7200</td>
<td>1.47136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.1000</td>
<td>1.89790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>236.00</td>
<td>200.9400</td>
<td>10.00288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6.0800</td>
<td>1.14000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.8600</td>
<td>1.41436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.8400</td>
<td>1.36067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.7200</td>
<td>1.26233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.8400</td>
<td>1.37559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.9600</td>
<td>1.08722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.9800</td>
<td>1.31692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.9400</td>
<td>1.11410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6.1000</td>
<td>1.65677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.7000</td>
<td>1.78714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>59.0200</td>
<td>11.90865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ac</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>32.5200</td>
<td>2.12122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>32.2600</td>
<td>2.43118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nc</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>32.0800</td>
<td>2.22087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toc</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>96.8600</td>
<td>3.76888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gmh</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.6800</td>
<td>.65278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pmh</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>21.3200</td>
<td>1.98402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ssup</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.1400</td>
<td>1.35541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sstr</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>21.5600</td>
<td>2.17744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsup</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.5200</td>
<td>1.01499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wstr</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.1400</td>
<td>1.95886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psup</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>23.6400</td>
<td>1.42514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pstr</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.1200</td>
<td>2.12507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tpwb</td>
<td>171.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>183.9184</td>
<td>6.87640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 105

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on AC (dimension of organizational commitment) among scale-3 bank managers of MP state**

Table 105a.

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a Predictors: (Constant), RSTGN

Table 105 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on affective commitment being among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. In all a single independent variable emerged as predictor, namely, role stagnation.

Table 105a. shows the model summary indicating a single predictor of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .594 for role stagnation. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (affective commitment) came out, as 35.3% for role stagnation.

Table 105b.

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>37.743</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>-.891</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>-.594</td>
<td>-.594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a Dependent Variable: ac

Table 105b. clearly indicates that RS influences affective commitment of scale-3 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t= -5.11$ for RSTGN. By having a look at the t-value, we may conclude that t-value is significant for the predictor indicating a relationship between the predictor and criterion variable (affective commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r= -.594$ for RSTGN showing that predictor significantly influences the degree of affective commitment.
The t-value of role stagnation is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of role stagnation and criterion (affective commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role stagnation negatively influences the level of affective commitment of scale-3 bank managers of MP state. As the level of role stagnation increases, the level of affective commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that affective commitment of scale-3 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{109}$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life will not influence affective commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state and role stress influence affective commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state.

Table 106

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on CC (dimension of organizational commitment) among scale-3 bank managers of MP state**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.668$^a$</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.715$^b$</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Predictors: (Constant), PI, UMR

Table 106 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on continuance commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, personal inadequacy and union management relations respectively.

Table 106a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation ($R$) is found as, .668 for personal inadequacy and .715 for union management relations respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (continuance commitment) came out, as 44.6% for personal inadequacy and 6.5% for union management relations respectively.
Table 106b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>50.951</td>
<td>4.669</td>
<td>10.912</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>-1.788</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>-969</td>
<td>-6.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>-.699</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>-.395</td>
<td>-2.502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: cc

Table 106b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences continuance commitment of scale-3 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= -6.14 for PI and t= -2.50 for UMR respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (continuance commitment). The correlation (partial) is r= -.667 for PI and r= -.343 for UMR respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of continuance commitment.

The t-values of personal inadequacy and union management relations are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of personal inadequacy and union management relations and criterion (continuance commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that personal inadequacy and union management relations negatively influence the level of continuance commitment of scale-3 bank managers of MP state. As the level of personal inadequacy and union management relations increases, the level of continuance commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that continuance commitment of scale-3 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis H10 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence continuance commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state.
Table 107

Showing impact of QWL and RS on NC (dimension of organizational commitment) among scale-3 bank managers of MP state

Table 107a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), IRD

Table 107 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on normative commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. In all a single independent variable emerged as predictor, namely, inter role distance.

Table 107a. shows the model summary indicating a single predictor of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .462 for inter role distance. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (normative commitment) came out, as 21.3% for inter role distance.

Table 107b.

Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>37.553</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>-.900</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>-.462</td>
<td>-.462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: nc

Table 107b. clearly indicates that RS influences normative commitment of scale-3 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t = -3.61$ for IRD. By having a look at the t-value, we may conclude that t-value is significant for the predictor indicating a relationship between the predictor and criterion variable (normative commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r = -0.462$ for IRD showing that predictor significantly influences the degree of normative commitment.
The t-value of inter role distance is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of inter role distance and criterion (normative commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that inter role distance negatively influences the level of normative commitment of scale-3 bank managers of MP state. As the level of inter role distance increases, the level of normative commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that normative commitment of scale-3 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{111}$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life will not influence normative commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state and role stress influence normative commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state.

Table 108

Showing impact of QWL and RS on Toc among scale-3 bank managers of MP state

Table 108a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.953$^a$</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.969$^b$</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.978$^c$</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.980$^d$</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$d$ Predictors: (Constant), Trs, Promo, Eco.Ben., IRD

Table 108 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; promotion; economic benefits and inter role distance respectively.

Table 108a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .953 for total role stress; .969 for promotion; .978 for economic benefits and .980 for inter role distance respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (total...
organizational commitment) came out, as 90.9% for total role stress; 3.0% for promotion; 1.7% for economic benefits and 0.5% for inter role distance respectively.

Table 108b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total organizational commitment of scale-3 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is $t = -16.76$ for Trs; $t = -7.14$ for Promo; $t = -4.15$ for Eco.Ben. and $t = 2.28$ for IRD respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total organizational commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r = -0.928$ for Trs; $r = -0.729$ for Promo; $r = -0.527$ for Eco.Ben. and $r = 0.323$ for IRD respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total organizational commitment.

The t-values of total role stress; promotion and economic benefits are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; promotion and economic benefits and criterion (total organizational commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; promotion and economic benefits negatively influence the level of total organizational commitment of scale-3 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress; promotion and economic benefits increases, the level of total organizational commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total organizational commitment of scale-3 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by IRD. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{12}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state.
Table 109

Showing impact of QWL and RS on GMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of MP state

**Variables Entered/Removed**

a. Dependent Variable: Gmh

None of the independent variables emerged as predictors of good mental health among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{13}$ is accepted. Hence, quality of working life and role stress will not influence good mental health among scale-3 bank managers of MP state.

Table 110

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of MP state

Table 110a.

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), Trs, PWC

Table 110 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on poor mental health among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress and physical working conditions respectively.

Table 110a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .665 for total role stress and .737 for physical working conditions respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (poor mental health) came out, as 44.2% for total role stress and 10.2% for physical working conditions respectively.
Table 110b.  
Coefficient*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>16.341</td>
<td>3.694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-5.472</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>3.235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Pmh

Table 110b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influence poor mental health of scale-3 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is \( t = -5.47 \) for Trs and \( t = 3.23 \) for PWC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (poor mental health). The correlation (partial) is \( r = -0.624 \) for Trs and \( r = 0.427 \) for PWC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of poor mental health.

The t-value of total role stress is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of total role stress and criterion (poor mental health) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress negatively influence the level of poor mental health of scale-3 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress increases, the level of poor mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that poor mental health of scale-3 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by PWC. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_{14} \) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence poor mental health among scale-3 bank managers of MP state.
Table 111

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of MP state Table 111a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), RIN

Table 111 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social support among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. In all a single independent variable emerged as predictor, namely, role inadequacy.

Table 111a. shows the model summary indicating a single predictor of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .429 for role inadequacy. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (social support) came out, as 18.4% for role inadequacy.

Table 111b. clearly indicates that RS influences social support of scale-3 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= -3.28 for RIN. By having a look at the t-value, we may conclude that t-value is significant for the predictor indicating a relationship between the predictor and criterion variable (social support). The correlation (partial) is r= -.429 for RIN showing that predictor significantly influences the degree of social support.

The t-value of role inadequacy is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of role inadequacy and criterion (social support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role inadequacy
negatively influences the level of social support of scale-3 bank managers of MP state. As the level of role inadequacy increases, the level of social support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social support of scale-3 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{115}$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life will not influence social support among scale-3 bank managers of MP state and role stress influence social support among scale-3 bank managers of MP state.

Table 112

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of MP state**

Table 112a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R$ Square</th>
<th>Adjusted $R$ Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.839$^a$</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.856$^b$</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), Trs, PWC

Table 112 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social stressor among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress and physical working conditions respectively.

Table 112a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation ($R$) is found as, .839 for total role stress and .856 for physical working conditions respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (social stressor) came out, as 70.3% for total role stress and 3.0% for physical working conditions respectively.
Table 112b. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>23.745</td>
<td>3.098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-7.85</td>
<td>-9.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>2.300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent Variable: Sstr

Table 112b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social stressor of scale-3 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is \( t = -9.94 \) for Trs and \( t = 2.30 \) for PWC respectively. By having a look at the \( t \)-values, we may conclude that \( t \)-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social stressor). The correlation (partial) is \( r = -0.823 \) for Trs and \( r = 0.318 \) for PWC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social stressor.

The \( t \)-value of total role stress is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of total role stress and criterion (social stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress negatively influence the level of social stressor of scale-3 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress increases, the level of social stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social stressor of scale-3 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by PWC. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_{16} \) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social stressor among scale-3 bank managers of MP state.
Table 113

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of MP state

Table 113a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), RIN, OLCL, ER

Table 113 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work support among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, role inadequacy; organizational climate and employee relations respectively.

Table 113a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .464 for role inadequacy; .626 for organizational climate and .682 for employee relations respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (work support) came out, as 21.5% for role inadequacy; 17.7% for organizational climate and 7.4% for employee relations respectively.
Table 113b. Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>29.121</td>
<td>2.198</td>
<td>13.249</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>-.440</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.774</td>
<td>-5.851</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>-.364</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.410</td>
<td>-2.954</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>2.525</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Wsup

Table 113b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work support of scale-3 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t = -5.85 for RIN; t = -2.95 for OLCL and t = 2.52 for ER respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work support). The correlation (partial) is r = -.653 for RIN; r = -.399 for OLCL and r = .349 for ER respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work support.

The t-values of role inadequacy and organizational climate are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of role inadequacy and organizational climate and criterion (work support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role inadequacy and organizational climate negatively influence the level of work support of scale-3 bank managers of MP state. As the level of role inadequacy and organizational climate increases, the level of work support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work support of scale-3 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by ER. Thus, the null-hypothesis H\textsubscript{117} is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work support among scale-3 bank managers of MP state.
Table 114

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of MP state

Table 114a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), SRD, AAW

Table 114 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work stressor among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, self role distance and autonomy at work respectively.

Table 114a. shows the model summary indicating the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .707 for self role distance and .741 for autonomy at work respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (work stressor) came out, as 50% for self role distance and 5.0% for autonomy at work respectively.

Table 114b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work stressor of scale-3 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is $t= -4.39$ for SRD and $t= 2.28$ for AAW respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work stressor). The correlation (partial) is $r= -.539$ for SRD and $.317$ for AAW.
respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work stressor.

The t-value of self role distance is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of self role distance and criterion (work stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that self role distance negatively influence the level of work stressor of scale-3 bank managers of MP state. As the level of self role distance increases, the level of work stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work stressor of scale-3 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by AAW. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{118}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work stressor among scale-3 bank managers of MP state.

Table 115

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of MP state**

Table 115a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.364$^a$</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.465$^b$</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.568$^c$</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.566$^d$</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.638$^e$</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Predictors: (Constant), W Itself, IRD, Tqwl

Table 115 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal support among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictor, namely, work itself; inter role distance and total quality of working life respectively.

Table 115a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .465 for work itself; .568 for inter role distance and .638 for total quality of working life respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of
independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (personal support) came out, as 8.4% for work itself; 10.7% for inter role distance and 8.6% for total quality of working life respectively.

Table 115b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>54.928</td>
<td>7.963</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W Itself</td>
<td>-0.634</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>-0.516</td>
<td>-4.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>-1.179</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>-0.943</td>
<td>-4.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.539</td>
<td>-2.578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 115b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal support of scale-3 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= -4.29 for W Itself; t= -4.38 for IRD and r= -2.57 for Tqwl respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal support). The correlation (partial) is r= -.535 for W Itself; r= -.543 for IRD and r= -.355 for Tqwl respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal support.

The t-values of work itself; inter role distance and total quality of working life are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of work itself; inter role distance and total quality of working life and criterion (personal support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that work itself; inter role distance and total quality of working life negatively influence the level of personal support of scale-3 bank managers of MP state. As the level of work itself; inter role distance and total quality of working life increases, the level of personal support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal support of scale-3 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis H119 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal support among scale-3 bank managers of MP state.
Table 116

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of MP state

Table 116a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), RIN, ER

Table 116 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal stressor among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, role inadequacy and employee relations respectively.

Table 116a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .646 for role inadequacy and .753 for employee relations respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (personal stressor) came out, as 41.7% for role inadequacy and 14.9% for employee relations respectively.

Table 116b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.475</td>
<td>1.634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>-.650</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.547</td>
<td>-5.515</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-.732</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>-.399</td>
<td>-4.024</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Pstr

Table 116b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal stressor of scale-3 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is $t=-5.15$ for RIN and -4.02 for ER respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal...
stressor). The correlation (partial) is $r = -0.627$ for R1N and $r = -0.506$ for ER respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal stressor.

The t-values of role inadequacy and employee relations are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of role inadequacy and employee relations and criterion (personal stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role inadequacy and employee relations negatively influence the level of personal stressor of scale-3 bank managers of MP state. As the level of role inadequacy and employee relations increases, the level of personal stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal stressor of scale-3 bank managers of MP state cannot be significantly predicted by any of the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{120}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal stressor among scale-3 bank managers of MP state.
Table 117

Showing impact of QWL and RS on Tpwb among scale-3 bank managers of MP state

Table 117a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

k Predictors: (Constant), Trs, CIO, RIN, Pro, Tqwl, UMR, OLCL

Table 117 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. In all seven independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; clarity in organization; role inadequacy; promotion; total quality of working life; union management relations and organizational climate respectively.

Table 117a. shows the model summary indicating all the seven predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .978 for total role stress; .990 for clarity in organization; .991 for role inadequacy; .992 for promotion; .993 for total quality of working life; .993 for union management relations and .994 for organizational climate respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (total psychological well-being) came out, as 95.7% for total role stress; 0.2% for clarity in organization; 0.2% for role inadequacy; 0.2% for promotion; 0.1% for total quality of working life; 0.2% for union management relations and 0.2% for organizational climate respectively.
Table 117b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>188.098</td>
<td>8.526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.503</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.858</td>
<td>-11.778</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>-.522</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>-3.161</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>-1.009</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.269</td>
<td>-5.683</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>3.803</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>-.518</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-2.966</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>2.379</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Tpwb

Table 117b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total psychological well-being of scale-3 bank managers of MP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t = -11.77 for Trs; t = 2.80 for CIO; t = -3.16 for RIN; t = -5.68 for Promo; t = 3.80 for Tqwl; t = -2.96 for UMR and t = 2.37 for OLCL respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total psychological well-being). The correlation (partial) is r = -.879 for Trs; r = .401 for CIO; r = -.443 for RIN; r = -.664 for Promo; r = .511 for Tqwl; r = -.420 for UMR and r = .348 for OLCL respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total psychological well-being.

The t-values of total role stress; role inadequacy; promotion and union management relations are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; role inadequacy; promotion and union management relations and criterion (total psychological well-being) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; role inadequacy; promotion and union management relations negatively influence the level of total psychological well-being of scale-3 bank managers of MP state. As the level of total role stress; role inadequacy; promotion and union management relations increases, the level of total psychological well-being decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total psychological well-being of scale-3 bank managers of MP state can be significantly predicted by CIO; Tqwl and OLCL respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H121 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of MP state.
In the tenth major results section we have measured the impact of quality of working life and role stress on perceived organizational commitment and psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. The section starts with the descriptive table describing the minimum scores; maximum scores; mean scores and standard deviation of all the variables and their respective factors (N=50). It is followed by the statistical findings of stepwise multiple regression. This tenth section of results starts from table number one hundred and eig'een and ends at table number one hundred and thirty respectively.
Descriptive Statistics

N=50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.9200</td>
<td>1.87181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>9.6000</td>
<td>2.26779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>9.3600</td>
<td>1.83792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.4200</td>
<td>2.06121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>9.8000</td>
<td>1.95876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.8400</td>
<td>2.16050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.8000</td>
<td>2.08003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.2200</td>
<td>1.60725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>9.6000</td>
<td>1.81827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>9.3000</td>
<td>2.14999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.1400</td>
<td>1.10675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.1400</td>
<td>2.64968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.8600</td>
<td>2.59521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>10.2000</td>
<td>2.87139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.4400</td>
<td>2.45914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.0400</td>
<td>2.24935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.4800</td>
<td>2.35814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>123.00</td>
<td>176.00</td>
<td>160.1600</td>
<td>12.84660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.0200</td>
<td>.51468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6.0800</td>
<td>.34047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.8400</td>
<td>1.23487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>5.8000</td>
<td>1.03016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.0000</td>
<td>1.08797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.0200</td>
<td>.58867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.4400</td>
<td>1.18080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.3400</td>
<td>.84781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.7000</td>
<td>1.37396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.8800</td>
<td>1.78016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>73.1200</td>
<td>5.34003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>20.6200</td>
<td>4.44417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>22.8600</td>
<td>4.90735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>21.7400</td>
<td>3.81089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toc</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>65.2200</td>
<td>8.55067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMH</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>18.8200</td>
<td>3.07518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMH</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>15.3800</td>
<td>3.00944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSUP</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>18.3800</td>
<td>3.36786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTR</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>15.3200</td>
<td>2.47798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSUP</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>18.4200</td>
<td>3.13043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSTR</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>15.0800</td>
<td>3.06953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSUP</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>19.1000</td>
<td>3.15096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTR</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>15.6800</td>
<td>3.47845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tpwb</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>162.00</td>
<td>136.1800</td>
<td>19.15105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 118

Showing impact of QWL and RS on AC (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of UP state

Table 118a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.678(^a)</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.733(^b)</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.771(^c)</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(c\) Predictors: (Constant), Trs, RO, IRD

Table 118 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on affective commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; role overload and inter role distance respectively.

Table 118a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .678 for total role stress; .733 for role overload and .771 for inter role distance respectively. Further \(R^2\), which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered \(R^2\) change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (affective commitment) came out, as 46.0% for total role stress; 7.7% for role overload and 5.8% for inter role distance respectively.
Table 118b. Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>50.726</td>
<td>7.110</td>
<td>7.134</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.473</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-568</td>
<td>-.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>-1.341</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>-329</td>
<td>-2.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>2.165</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>2.562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: AC

Table 118b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences affective commitment of scale-1 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= -4.87 for Trs; t= -2.91 for RO and t= 2.56 for IRD respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (affective commitment). The correlation (partial) is r= -.584 for Trs; r= -.395 for RO and r= .353 for IRD respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of affective commitment.

The t-values of total role stress and role overload are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and role overload and criterion (affective commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and role overload negatively influence the level of affective commitment of scale-1 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of total role stress and role overload increases, the level of affective commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that affective commitment of scale-1 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by IRD. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{122}$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life will not influence affective commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state and role stress influence affective commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state.
Table 119

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on CC (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of UP state**

Table 119a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.759(^a)</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.792(^b)</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.816(^c)</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.835(^d)</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.853(^e)</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, Recog, RO, PWC, IGR

Table 119 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on continuance commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; recognition; role overload; physical working conditions and inter group relations respectively.

Table 119a. shows the model summary indicating all the five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .759 for total quality of working life; .792 for recognition; .816 for role overload; .835 for physical working conditions and .853 for inter group relations respectively. Further R\(^2\), which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R\(^2\) change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (continuance commitment) came out, as 57.6% for total quality of working life; 5.1% for recognition; 3.9% for role overload; 3.2% for physical working conditions and 2.9% for inter group relations respectively.
Table 119b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-34.261</td>
<td>8.272</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.142</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>6.238</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>3.217</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>2.799</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>-.666</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>-2.609</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>-.410</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>-2.162</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: CC

Table 119b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences continuance commitment of scale-1 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t = 6.23 for Tqwl; t = 3.21 for Recog; t = 2.79 for RO; t = -2.60 for PWC and t = -2.16 for IGR respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (continuance commitment). The correlation (partial) is r = .685 for Tqwl; r = .436 for Recog; r = .389 for RO; r = -.366 for PWC and r = -.310 for IGR respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of continuance commitment.

The t-values of physical working conditions and inter group relations are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of physical working conditions and inter group relations and criterion (continuance commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that physical working conditions and inter group relations negatively influence the level of continuance commitment of scale-1 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of physical working conditions and inter group relations increases, the level of continuance commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that continuance commitment of scale-1 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; Recog and RO respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H123 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence continuance commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state.
Table 120

Showing impact of QWL and RS on NC (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of UP state

Table 120a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.464*</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl

Table 120 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on normative commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. In all a single independent variable emerged as predictor, namely, total quality of working life.

Table 120a. shows the model summary indicating the single predictor of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .464 for total quality of working life. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (normative commitment) came out, as 21.6% for total quality of working life.

Table 120b. clearly indicates that QWL influences normative commitment of scale-1 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, t= 3.63 for Tqwl. By having a look at the t-value, we may conclude that t-value is significant for the predictor indicating a relationship between the predictor and criterion variable (normative commitment). The correlation (partial) is r= .464 for Tqwl, showing that predictor significantly influences the degree of normative commitment.

From the results it may be interpreted that normative commitment of scale-1 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl. Thus, the null-
hypothesis $H_{124}$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence normative commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state and role stress will not influence normative commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state.

Table 121

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on ToC among scale-1 bank managers of UP state**

Table 121a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, Trs, IGR, IFD, RO, Trust, OC

Table 121 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. In all seven independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; total role stress; inter group relations; inter role distance; role overload; trust and organizational commitment respectively.

Table 121a. shows the model summary indicating all the seven predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .992 for total quality of working life; .994 for total role stress; .995 for inter group relations; .996 for inter role distance; .996 for role overload; .997 for trust and .997 for organizational commitment respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (total organizational commitment) came out, as 98.5% for total quality of working life; 0.3% for total role stress; 0.2% for inter group relations; 0.2% for inter role distance; 0.1% for role overload; 0.1% for trust and 0.1% for organizational commitment respectively.
Table 121b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>31.612</td>
<td>13.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>2.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.622</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.388</td>
<td>-5.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-3.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>3.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>3.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-.379</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-2.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-2.093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 121b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total organizational commitment of scale-1 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is \( t = 11.77 \) for Tqwl; \( t = -5.97 \) for Trs; \( t = -3.65 \) for IGR; \( t = 3.12 \) for IRD; \( t = 3.48 \) for RO; \( t = -2.54 \) for Trust and \( t = -2.09 \) for OC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total organizational commitment). The correlation (partial) is \( r = .886 \) for Tqwl; \( r = -.678 \) for Trs; \( r = -.491 \) for IGR; \( r = .434 \) for IRD; \( r = .473 \) for RO; \( r = -.366 \) for Trust and \( r = -.307 \) for OC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total organizational commitment.

The t-values of total role stress; inter group relations; trust and organizational commitment are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; inter group relations; trust and organizational commitment and criterion (total organizational commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; inter group relations; trust and organizational commitment negatively influence the level of total organizational commitment of scale-1 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of total role stress; inter group relations; trust and organizational commitment increases, the level of total organizational commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total organizational commitment of scale-1 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; IRD and RO respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis \( H_{125} \) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state.
Chapter Four

Result and Discussion

Table 122

Showing impact of QWL and RS on GMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of UP state

Table 122a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl

Table 122 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on good mental health among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. In all a single independent variable emerged as predictor, namely, total quality of working life.

Table 122a. shows the model summary indicating the single predictor of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .619 for total quality of working life. Further \( R^2 \), which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered \( R^2 \) change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (good mental health) came out, as 61.9% for total quality of working life.

Table 122b.

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant) -11.352</td>
<td>3.425</td>
<td>-3.315</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl .188</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>8.838</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: GMH

Table 122b. clearly indicates that QWL influences good mental health of scale-1 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, \( t = 8.83 \) for Tqwl. By having a look at the t-value, we may conclude that t-value is significant for the predictor indicating a relationship between the predictor and criterion variable (good mental health). The correlation (partial) is \( r = .787 \) for Tqwl, showing that predictor significantly influences the degree of good mental health.
From the results it may be interpreted that good mental health of scale-1 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{26}$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence good mental health among scale-1 bank managers of UP state and role stress will not influence good mental health among scale-1 bank managers of UP state.

Table 123

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of UP state

Table 123a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, PI, CIO, SRD*

Table 123 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on poor mental health among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; personal inadequacy; clarity in organization and self role distance respectively.

Table 123a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .730 for total quality of working life; .804 for personal inadequacy; .831 for clarity in organization and .846 for self role distance respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (poor mental health) came out, as 53.2% for total quality of working life; 11.4% for personal inadequacy; 4.4% for clarity in organization and 2.6% for self role distance respectively.
Table 123b.

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-41.097</td>
<td>7.656</td>
<td>-5.368</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>9.335</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>1.845</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>-2.765</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 123b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influence poor mental health of scale-1 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that t = 9.33 for Tqwl; t = 1.84 for PI; t = -2.76 for CIO and t = 2.02 for SRD respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (poor mental health). The correlation (partial) is r = .812 for Tqwl; r = .265 for PI; r = -.381 for CIO and r = .289 for SRD respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of poor mental health.

The t-value of clarity in organization is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of clarity in organization and criterion (poor mental health) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that clarity in organization negatively influence the level of poor mental health of scale-1 bank managers of UP state. As the level of clarity in organization increases, the level of poor mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that poor mental health of scale-1 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; PI and SRD respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H₁₂₇ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence poor mental health among scale-1 bank managers of UP state.
Table 124

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of UP state

Table 124a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.880a</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.917b</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.925c</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.933d</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d Predictors: (Constant), Trs, REC, RI, OLCL

Table 124 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social support among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; role expectation conflict; role isolation and organizational climate respectively.

Table 124a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .880 for total role stress; .917 for role expectation conflict; .925 for role isolation and .933 for organizational climate respectively. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (social support) came out, as 77.4% for total role stress; 6.8% for role expectation conflict; 1.4% for role isolation and 1.4% for organizational climate respectively.
Table 124b.

Coefficients\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>62.713</td>
<td>3.545</td>
<td>17.690</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.606</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.960</td>
<td>-13.582</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>-.623</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>-4.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>2.341</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>-2.235</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Dependent Variable: SSUP

Table 124b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social support of scale-1 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is \(t = 13.58\) for Trs; \(t = -4.00\) for REC; \(t = 2.34\) for RI and \(t = -2.23\) for OLCL respectively. By having a look at the \(t\)-values, we may conclude that \(t\)-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social support). The correlation (partial) is \(r = .897\) for Trs; \(r = -.513\) for REC; \(r = .329\) for RI and \(r = -.316\) for OLCL respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social support.

The \(t\)-values of total role stress; role expectation conflict and organizational climate are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; role expectation conflict and organizational climate and criterion (social support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; role expectation conflict and organizational climate negatively influence the level of social support of scale-1 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of total role stress; role expectation conflict and organizational climate increases, the level of social support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social support of scale-1 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by PI. Thus, the null-hypothesis \(H_{128}\) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social support among scale-1 bank managers of UP state.
Table 125

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of UP state

Table 125a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.598a</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.646b</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.701c</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.779d</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.816e</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, Trust, ER, Clarity in Organization, WI

Table 125 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social stressor among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; trust; employee relations; clarity in organization and work itself respectively.

Table 125a. shows the model summary indicating all the five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .598 for total quality of working life; .646 for trust; .701 for employee relations; .779 for clarity in organization and .816 for work itself respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (social stressor) came out, as 35.7% for total quality of working life; 6.1% for trust; 7.3% for employee relations; 11.6% for clarity in organization and 5.9% for work itself respectively.
Table 125b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social stressor of scale-1 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is $t = 4.96$ for Tqwl; $t = -3.55$ for Trust; $t = 4.42$ for ER; $t = -4.23$ for CIO and $t = -2.78$ for WI respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social stressor). The correlation (partial) is $r = .599$ for Tqwl; $r = -.472$ for Trust; $r = .555$ for ER; $r = -.538$ for CIO and $r = -.387$ for WI respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social stressor.

The t-values of trust; clarity in organization and work itself are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of trust; clarity in organization and work itself and criterion (social stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that trust; clarity in organization and work itself negatively influence the level of social stressor of scale-1 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of trust; clarity in organization and work itself increases, the level of social stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social stressor of scale-1 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and ER respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{129}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social stressor among scale-1 bank managers of UP state.
Table 126

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of UP state

Table 126a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.866(^a)</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.887(^b)</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.915(^c)</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^c\) Predictors: (Constant), Trs, Recog, Rs "GN

Table 126 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work support among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; recognition and role stagnation respectively.

Table 126a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .866 for total role stress; .887 for recognition and .915 for role stagnation respectively. Further R\(^2\), which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R\(^2\) change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (work support) came out, as 75\% for total role stress; 3.6\% for recognition and 5.2\% for role stagnation respectively.
Table 126b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant) 31.307</td>
<td>5.523</td>
<td>5.669</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.456</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.777</td>
<td>-8.912</td>
<td>-.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>4.066</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>3.839</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: WSUP

Table 126b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influence work support of scale-1 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t = -8.91 for Trs; t = 4.06 for Recog and t = 3.83 for RSTGN respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work support). The correlation (partial) is r = -.796 for Trs; r = .514 for Recog and r = .493 for RSTGN respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work support.

The t-value of total role stress is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of total role stress and criterion (work support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress negatively influence the level of work support of scale-1 bank managers of UP state. As the level of total role stress increases, the level of work support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work support of scale-1 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Recog and RSTGN respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis Hno is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work support among scale-1 bank managers of UP state.
Table 127

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of UP state

Table 127a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.730*</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.770*</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), Trs, WI

Table 127 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work stressor among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress and work itself respectively.

Table 127a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .730 for total role stress and .770 for work itself respectively. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (work stressor) came out, as 53.3% for total role stress and 6.0% for work itself respectively.
Chapter Four

Result and Discussion

Table 127b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>36.151</td>
<td>5.372</td>
<td>6.729</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.354</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.616</td>
<td>-5.995</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>2.621</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent Variable: WSTR

Table 127b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work stressor of scale-1 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t = -5.99 for Trs and t = 2.62 for WI respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work stressor). The correlation (partial) is r = -.658 for Trs and r = .357 for WI respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work stressor.

The t-value of total role stress is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of total role stress and criterion (work stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress negatively influence the level of work stressor of scale-1 bank managers of UP state. As the level of total role stress increases, the level of work stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work stressor of scale-1 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by WI. Thus, the null-hypothesis H131 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work stressor among scale-1 bank managers of UP state.
Table 128

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of UP state

Table 128a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.838a</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.872a</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), Trs, PWC

Table 128 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal support among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress and physical working conditions respectively.

Table 128a. shows the model summary indicating L^th the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .838 for total role stress and .872 for physical working conditions respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (personal support) came out, as 70.2% for total role stress and 5.9% for physical working conditions respectively.

Table 128b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Dependent Variable: PSUP

Table 128b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal support of scale1 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= -11.97 for Trs and t= -3.406 for PWC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the
predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal support). The correlation (partial) is $r = -.868$ for Trs and $r = -.445$ for PWC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal support.

The t-value of total role stress is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of total role stress and criterion (personal support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress negatively influence the level of personal support of scale-1 bank managers of UP state. As the level of total role stress increases, the level of personal support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal support of scale-1 bank managers of UP state cannot be significantly predicted by any of the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{132}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal support among scale-1 bank managers of UP state.

Table 129

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-1 bank managers of UP state

Table 129a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.599a</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.655b</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.694c</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.691d</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.724e</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\text{e Predictors: (Constant), ER, RO, PWC}$

Table 129 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal stressor among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, employee relations; role overload and physical working conditions respectively.

Table 129a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .655 for employee relations; .694 for role overload and .724 for physical working conditions respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion
variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (personal stressor) came out, as 7.0% for employee relations; 5.3% for role overload and 4.6% for physical working conditions respectively.

Table 129b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>13.943</td>
<td>3.681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>4.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>-.977</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>-2.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>2.104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: PSTR

Table 129b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal stressor of scale-1 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is $t=4.36$ for ER; $t=-2.19$ for RO and $t=2.10$ for PWC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal stressor). The correlation (partial) is $r=.541$ for ER; $r=-.395$ for RO and $r=.296$ for PWC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal stressor.

The t-value of role overload is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly, the correlation of role overload and criterion (personal stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role overload negatively influence the level of personal stressor of scale-1 bank managers of UP state. As the level of role overload increases, the level of personal stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal stressor of scale-1 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by ER and PWC respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{133}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal stressor among scale-1 bank managers of UP state.
Table 130

Showing impact of QWL and RS on Tpwb among scale-1 bank managers of UP state

Table 130a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.971*</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.977*</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.983*</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.986*</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.988*</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.989*</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.991*</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.992*</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h Predictors: (Constant), Trs, REC, Tqwl, RSTGN, OLCL, ER, PI, CIO

Table 130 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. In all eight independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; role expectation conflict; total quality of working life; role stagnation; organizational climate; employee relations; personal inadequacy and clarity in organization respectively.

Table 130a. shows the model summary indicating all the eight predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .971 for total role stress; .977 for role expectation conflict; .983 for total quality of working life; .986 for role stagnation; .988 for organizational climate; .989 for employee relations; .991 for personal inadequacy and .992 for clarity in organization respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (total psychological well-being) came out, as 94.3% for total role stress; 1.2% for role expectation conflict; 1.1% for total quality of working life; 0.6% for role stagnation; 0.4% for organizational climate; 0.3% for employee relations; 0.3% for personal inadequacy and 0.3% for clarity in organization respectively.
Table 130b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>33.604</td>
<td>57.648</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-1.321</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>-.368</td>
<td>-3.206</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>-1.499</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-3.633</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>6.164</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>6.483</td>
<td>1.520</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>4.265</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>-.543</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-2.557</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>3.663</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>1.560</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>7.797</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>-.401</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-2.564</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Tpwb

Table 130b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total psychological well-being of scale-1 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= -3.206 for Trs; t= -3.63 for REC; t= 6.16 for Tqwl; t= 4.26 for RSTGN; t= -2.55 for OLCL; t= 3.66 for ER; t= 2.79 for PI and t= -2.56 for CIO respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total psychological well-being). The correlation (partial) is r=- .448 for Trs; r=- .493 for REC; r= .694 for Tqwl; r= .554 for RSTGN; r=- .371 for OLCL; r= .497 for ER; r= .400 for PI and r= -.372 for CIO respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total psychological well-being.

The t-values of total role stress; role expectation conflict; organizational climate and clarity in organization are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; role expectation conflict; organizational climate and clarity in organization (total psychological well-being) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; role expectation conflict; organizational climate and clarity in organization negatively influence the level of total psychological well-being of scale-1 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of total role stress; role expectation conflict; organizational climate and clarity in organization increases, the level of total psychological well-being decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total psychological well-being of scale-1 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; RSTGN; ER and PI respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{134}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of UP state.
In the eleventh major results section we have measured the impact of quality of working life and role stress on perceived organizational commitment and psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. The section starts with the descriptive table describing the minimum scores; maximum scores; mean scores and standard deviation of all the variables and their respective factors (N=50). It is followed by the statistical findings of stepwise multiple regression. This eleventh section of results starts from table number one hundred and thirty-one and ends at table number one hundred and forty-three respectively.
### Descriptive Statistics

**N=50**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W Itself</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>11.980</td>
<td>1.02000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>12.160</td>
<td>1.13137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>12.120</td>
<td>0.79898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.920</td>
<td>1.25909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCI</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>10.520</td>
<td>1.92979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.660</td>
<td>1.66120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>6.040</td>
<td>1.72568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>10.660</td>
<td>1.49298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>12.300</td>
<td>1.59399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>11.720</td>
<td>1.85208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.080</td>
<td>0.89989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>11.380</td>
<td>1.58938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>11.280</td>
<td>1.65418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco.Ben.</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.420</td>
<td>1.26314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.720</td>
<td>2.88586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em.Hlth.</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>12.360</td>
<td>1.48131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>11.620</td>
<td>0.96568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwi</td>
<td>176.00</td>
<td>192.00</td>
<td>183.940</td>
<td>4.59552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRD</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.600</td>
<td>1.04978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.460</td>
<td>1.54248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.180</td>
<td>1.30447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.460</td>
<td>1.50346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.660</td>
<td>1.47852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.760</td>
<td>0.65652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.320</td>
<td>0.51270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.700</td>
<td>0.95298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.960</td>
<td>1.00934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.520</td>
<td>0.97395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>59.620</td>
<td>4.01472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ac</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>26.880</td>
<td>3.39652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>29.620</td>
<td>2.69459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nc</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>27.220</td>
<td>3.11867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toc</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>83.720</td>
<td>3.96433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gmh</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.720</td>
<td>1.42914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pmh</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>18.500</td>
<td>1.85439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ssup</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.800</td>
<td>0.80812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sstr</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>18.320</td>
<td>2.29854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsup</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.640</td>
<td>1.17387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wstr</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>18.940</td>
<td>2.47774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psup</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.500</td>
<td>0.81441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pstr</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>18.620</td>
<td>2.33771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tpwb</td>
<td>162.00</td>
<td>181.00</td>
<td>173.040</td>
<td>5.71057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 131

Showing impact of QWL and RS on AC (dimension of organizational commitment) among scale-2 bank managers of UP state

Table 131a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.453 *</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.555 *</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.627 *</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.693 *</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.725 *</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e Predictors: (Constant), SRD, Trust, Promo, EM, PWC

Table 131 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on affective commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, self role distance; trust; promotion; employee participation and physical working conditions respectively.

Table 131a. shows the model summary indicating all the five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .453 for self role distance; .555 for trust; .627 for promotion; .693 for employee participation and .725 for physical working conditions respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (affective commitment) came out, .20.5% for self role distance; 10.3% for trust; 8.5% for promotion; 8.7% for employee participation and 4.5% for physical working conditions respectively.
Table 131b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>78.596</td>
<td>11.127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>-2.322</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>-651</td>
<td>-5.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>2.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>-1.321</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>-.376</td>
<td>-3.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>-1.107</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>-.369</td>
<td>-2.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>-1.017</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>-.239</td>
<td>-2.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: ac

Table 131b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences affective commitment of scale-2 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= -5.08 for SRD; t=2.02 for Trust; t= -3.45 for Promo; t= -2.89 for EM and t= -2.04 for PWC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (affective commitment). The correlation (partial) is r= -608 for SRD; r= .292 for Trust; r= -.462 for Promo; r= -.399 for EM and r= -.294 for PWC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of affective commitment.

The t-values of self role distance; promotion; employee participation and physical working conditions are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of self role distance; promotion; employee participation and physical working conditions and criterion (affective commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that self role distance; promotion; employee participation and physical working conditions negatively influence the level of affective commitment of scale-2 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of self role distance; promotion; employee participation and physical working conditions increases, the level of affective commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that affective commitment of scale-2 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Trust. Thus, the null-hypothesis H135 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence affective commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.
Table 132

Showing impact of QWL and RS on CC (dimension of organizational commitment) among scale-2 bank managers of UP state

Table 132a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.457^a</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.567^b</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.650^c</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), RSTGN, PWC, OC

Table 132 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on continuance commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, role stagnation; physical working conditions and organizational commitment respectively.

Table 132a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .457 for role stagnation; .567 for physical working conditions and .650 for organizational commitment respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (continuance commitment) came out, 20.9% for role stagnation; 11.3% for physical working conditions and 10.1% for organizational commitment respectively.
Table 132b.

Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.959</td>
<td>5.584</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>2.065</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>3.689</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>1.614</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>3.887</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>-.588</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>-.348</td>
<td>-2.842</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: cc

Table 132b clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences continuance commitment of scale-2 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= 3.68 for RSTGN; t= 3.88 for PWC and t= -2.84 for OC respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (continuance commitment). The correlation (partial) is r= .478 for RSTGN; r= .497 for PWC and r= -.386 for OC respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of continuance commitment.

The t-value of organizational commitment is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of organizational commitment and criterion (continuance commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that organizational commitment negatively influence the level of continuance commitment of scale-2 bank managers of UP state. As the level of organizational commitment increases, the level of continuance commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that continuance commitment of scale-2 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by RSTGN and PWC respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H136 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence continuance commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.
Table 133

Showing impact of QWL and RS on NC (dimension of organizational commitment) among scale-2 bank managers of UP state

Table 133a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), IRD

Table 133 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on normative commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. In all a single independent variable emerged as predictor, namely, inter role distance.

Table 133a. shows the model summary indicating the single predictor of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .434 for inter role distance. Further \( R^2 \), which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered \( R^2 \) change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (normative commitment) came out, as 18.8% for inter role distance.

Table 133b. clearly indicates that RS influences normative commitment of scale-2 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, \( t = -3.33 \) for IRD. By having a look at the \( t \)-value, we may conclude that \( t \)-value is significant for the predictor indicating a relationship between the predictor and criterion variable (normative commitment). The correlation (partial) is \( r = -0.434 \) for IRD, showing that predictor significantly influences the degree of normative commitment.

The \( t \)-value of inter role distance is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of inter role distance and criterion (normative
commitment) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that inter role
distance negatively influence the level of normative commitment of scale-2 bank
managers of UP state. As the level of inter role distance increases, the level of
normative commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that normative commitment of scale-2 bank
managers of UP state cannot be significantly predicted by any of the predictors. Thus,
the null-hypothesis $H_{137}$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life will not
influence normative commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state and role
stress influence normative commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

Table 134

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on ToC among scale-2 bank managers of UP state**

Table 134a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$c$ Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, CIO, SER

Table 134 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total
organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. In all three
independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life;
clarity in organization and self respect respectively.

Table 134a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the
model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .987 for total quality of working life; .991
for clarity in organization and .993 for self respect respectively. Further $R^2$, which
represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen.
Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion
variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of
independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (total
organizational commitment) came out, 97.4% for total quality of working life; 0.8%
for clarity in organization and 0.4% for self respect respectively.
Table 134b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Toe

Table 134b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total organizational commitment of scale-2 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= 44.99 for Tqwl; t= 6.08 for CIO and t= 3.92 for SER respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total organizational commitment). The correlation (partial) is r= .989 for Tqwl; r= .668 for CIO and r= .501 for SER respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total organizational commitment.

From the results it may be interpreted that total organizational commitment of scale-2 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl; CIO and SER respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{138}$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence total organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state and role stress will not influence total organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

Table 135

Showing impact of QWL and RS on GMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of UP state

Variables Entered/Removed*

a. Dependent Variable: Gmh

None of the independent variables emerged as predictors of good mental health among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{139}$ is accepted. Hence quality of working life and role stress will not influence good mental health among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.
Table 136

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of UP state

Table 136a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), SER, RI, SR

Table 136 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on poor mental health among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, self respect; role isolation and supervisory relations respectively.

Table 136a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .358 for self respect; .521 for role isolation and .593 for supervisory relations respectively. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (poor mental health) came out, 12.9% for self respect; 14.3% for role isolation and 8.0% for supervisory relations respectively.
Table 136b.  

Coefficients.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>12.785</td>
<td>2.587</td>
<td>4.943</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>2.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>3.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-.305</td>
<td>-2.387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Pmh

Table 136b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences poor mental health of scale-2 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that i s t= 2.48 for SER; t= 3.60 for RI and t= -2.38 for respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (poor mental health). The correlation (partial) is r= .344 for SER; r= .469 for RI and r= -.332 for SR respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of poor mental health.

The t-value of supervisory relations is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of supervisory relations and criterion (poor mental health) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that supervisory relations negatively influence the level of poor mental health of scale-2 bank managers of UP state. As the level of supervisory relations increases, the level of poor mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that poor mental health of scale-2 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by SER and RI respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H140 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence poor mental health among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.
Table 137

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of UP state

Table 137a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.681&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.782&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.836&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.869&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.904&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.916&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>f</sup> Predictors: (Constant), OC, Tqwl, Eco.Ben., SRD, SR, ER

Table 137 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social support among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. In all six independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, organizational commitment; total quality of working life; economic benefits; self role distance; supervisory relations and employee relations respectively.

Table 137a. shows the model summary indicating all the six predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .681 for organizational commitment; .782 for total quality of working life; .836 for economic benefits; .869 for self role distance; .904 for supervisory relations and .916 for employee relations respectively. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (social support) came out, 46.4% for organizational commitment; 14.8% for total quality of working life; 8.7% for economic benefits; 5.7% for self role distance; 6.1% for supervisory relations and 2.3% for employee relations respectively.
Table 137b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-5.156</td>
<td>3.292</td>
<td>-1.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>4.702</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>7.040</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco.Ben.</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>4.715</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>4.934</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>4.615</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>-2.466</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Dependent Variable: Ssup

Table 137b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social support of scale-2 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= 4.70 for OC; t= 7.04 for Tqwl; t= 4.71 for Eco.Ben.; t= 4.93 for SRD; t= 4.61 for SR and t= -2.46 for ER respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social support). The correlation (partial) is r= .583 for OC; r= .732 for Tqwl; r= .584 for Eco.Ben.; r= .601 for SRD; r= .576 for SR and r= -.352 for ER respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social support.

The t-value of employee relations is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of employee relations and criterion (social support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that employee relations negatively influence the level of social support of scale-2 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of employee relations increases the level of social support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social support of scale-2 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by OC; Tqwl; Eco.Ben.; SRD and SR respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H141 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social support among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.
Table 138

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of UP state

Table 138a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), ER, Eco.Ben., SRD, RA, UMR

Table 138 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social stressor among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, employee relations; economic benefits; self role distance; role ambiguity and union management relations respectively.

Table 138a. shows the model summary indicating all the five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .563 for employee relations; .769 for economic benefits; .812 for self role distance; .850 for role ambiguity and .873 for union management relations respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (social stressor) came out, 31.7% for employee relations; 6.2% for economic benefits; 6.7% for self role distance; 6.4% for role ambiguity and 4.0% for union management relations respectively.
### Table 138b. Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>14.629</td>
<td>2.912</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.024</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>5.121</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eco.Ben.</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>3.828</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>1.442</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>4.925</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>-2.038</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>-.895</td>
<td>-7.494</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>-.392</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.215</td>
<td>-2.712</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: Sstr

Table 138b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social stressor of scale-2 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= 5.12 for ER; t= 3.82 for Eco.Ben; t= 4.92 for SRD; t= -7.49 for RA and t= -2.71 for UMR respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (social stressor). The correlation (partial) is r= .611 for ER; r= .500 for Eco.Ben.; r= .596 for SRD; r= -.749 for RA and r= -.378 for UMR respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social stressor.

The t-values of role ambiguity and union management relations are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of role ambiguity and union management relations and criterion (social stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role ambiguity and union management relations negatively influence the level of social stressor of scale-2 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of role ambiguity and union management relations increases, the level of social stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social stressor of scale-2 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by ER; Eco.Ben. and SRD respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H_{142} is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social stressor among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.
Table 139

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of UP state**

Table 139a.

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.495*</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.651*</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.716*</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.789*</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.811*</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Predictors: (Constant), OC, Trs, ER, PWC, W Itself

Table 139 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work support among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, organizational commitment; total role stress; employee relations; physical working conditions and work itself respectively.

Table 139a. shows the model summary indicating all the five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .495 for organizational commitment; .651 for total role stress; .716 employee relations; .789 for physical working conditions and .811 for work itself respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (work support) came out, 24.5% for organizational commitment; 17.9% for total role stress; 8.9% for employee relations; 10.9% for physical working conditions and 3.5% for work itself respectively.
Table 139b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>22.096</td>
<td>3.961</td>
<td>5.579</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>7.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>-1.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>4.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>-.494</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>-.336</td>
<td>-3.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Itself</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>2.126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: Wsup

Table 139b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work support of scale-2 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= 7.30 for OC; t= -1.87 for Trs; t= 4.83 for ER; t= -3.25 for PWC and t= 2.16 for W Itself respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work support). The correlation (partial) is r= .740 for OC; r= -.272 for Trs; r= .589 for ER; r= -.440 for PWC and r= .305 for W itself respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work support.

The t-values of total role stress and physical working conditions are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and physical working conditions and criterion (work support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and physical working conditions negatively influence the level of work support of scale-2 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of total role stress and physical working conditions increases, the level of work support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work support of scale-2 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by OC; ER and W Itself respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H143 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work support among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.
Table 140

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of UP state

Table 140a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.614*</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td></td>
<td>.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.694*</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td></td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.755*</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td></td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.786*</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td></td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.781*</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.806*</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td></td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f Predictors: (Constant), Em.Hlth., RI, RE-J, RO

Table 140 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work stressor among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, employee health; role isolation; role expectation conflict and role overload respectively.

Table 140a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .694 for employee health; .755 for role isolation; .786 for role expectation conflict and .806 for role overload respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (work stressor) came out, 10.5% for employee health; 8.9% for role isolation; 4.7% for role expectation conflict and 3.9% for role overload respectively.
Table 140b. Coefficients\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>34.507</td>
<td>4.536</td>
<td>7.607</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Em.Hlth.</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>2.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>-1.621</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>-.429</td>
<td>-4.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REC</td>
<td>-1.070</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>-.563</td>
<td>-5.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>-1.054</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>-2.234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Dependent Variable: Wstr

Table 140b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work stressor of scale-2 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is \(t= 7.60\) for Em.Hlth.; \(t= -4.39\) for RI; \(t= -5.01\) for REC and \(t= -2.23\) for RO respectively. By having a look at the \(t\)-values, we may conclude that \(t\)-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work stressor). The correlation (partial) is \(r= .397\) for Em.Hlth; \(r= -.548\) for RI; \(r= -.598\) for REC and \(r= -.316\) for RO respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work stressor.

The \(t\)-values of role isolation; role expectation conflict and role overload are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of role isolation; role expectation conflict and role overload and criterion (work stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that role isolation; role expectation conflict and role overload negatively influence the level of work stressor of scale-2 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of role isolation; role expectation conflict and role overload increases, the level of work stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work stressor of scale-2 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Em.Hlth. Thus, the null-hypothesis \(H_{144}\) is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work stressor among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.
Table 141

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of UP state

Table 141a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.646*</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.716*</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.749*</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.781*</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Summary

Table 141 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal support among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. In all four independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; employee participation; role isolation and trust respectively.

Table 141a. shows the model summary indicating all the four predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .646 for total role stress; .716 for employee participation; .749 for role isolation and .781 for trust respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (personal support) came out, 41.7% for total role stress; 9.5% for employee participation; 4.9% for role isolation and 4.8% for trust respectively.
Table 141b.

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>22.718</td>
<td>2.353</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.380</td>
<td>-3.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>3.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>3.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>2.347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Psup

Table 141b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal support of scale-2 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= -3.40 for Trs; t= 3.27 for EM; t= 3.23 for RI and t= 2.34 for Trust respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal support). The correlation (partial) is r= -.453 for Trs; r= .438 for EM; r= .435 for RI and r=.330 for Trust respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal support.

The t-value of total role stress is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly, the correlation of total role stress and criterion (personal support) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress negatively influence the level of personal support of scale-2 bank managers of UP state. As the level of total role stress increases, the level of personal support decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal support of scale-2 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by EM; RI and Trust respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H145 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal support among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.
Table 142

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-2 bank managers of UP state

Table 142a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.480*</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.548*</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.598*</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), SER, CIO, OLCL

Table 142 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal stressor among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, self respect; clarity in organization and organizational climate respectively.

Table 142a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .480 for self respect; .548 for clarity in organization and .598 for organizational climate respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (personal stressor) came out, 23% for self respect; 7.0% for clarity in organization and 5.8% for organizational climate respectively.
Table 142b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.915</td>
<td>4.531</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>4.696</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>3.009</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.033</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Pstr

Table 142b, clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal stressor of scale-2 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= 4.69 for SER; t= 3.00 for CIO and t= 2.03 for OLCL respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal stressor). The correlation (partial) is r= .569 for SER; r= .405 for CIO and r= .287 for OLCL respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal stressor.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal stressor of scale-2 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by SER; CIO and OLCL respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H_{146} is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life influence personal stressor among scale-2 bank managers of UP state and role stress will not influence personal stressor among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.
Table 143

Showing impact of QWL and RS on Tpwb among scale-2 bank managers of UP state

Table 143a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Predictors: (Constant), Trs, SR, Em.Hlth., IGR, Promo*

Table 143 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. In all five independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; supervisory relations; employee health; inter group relations and promotion respectively.

Table 143a. shows the model summary indicating all the five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .979 for total role stress; .985 for supervisory relations; .989 for employee health; .990 for inter group relations and .991 for promotion respectively. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (total psychological well-being) came out, 95.7% for total role stress; 1.2% for supervisory relations; 0.8% for employee health; 0.4% for inter group relations and 0.2% for promotion respectively.
Chapter Four

Result and Discussion

Table 143b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>250.888</td>
<td>3.183</td>
<td>78.820</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-1.339</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.941</td>
<td>-41.86</td>
<td>-.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>3.502</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em.Hlth.</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>5.030</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>-.273</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-3.408</td>
<td>-.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>-.261</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-2.099</td>
<td>-.302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Tpwb

Table 143b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total psychological well-being of scale-2 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicate, that is t= -41.86 for Trs; t= 3.50 for SR; t= 5.03 for Em.Hlth; t= -3.40 for IGR and t = -2.09 for Promo respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total psychological well-being). The correlation (partial) is r= -.988 for Trs; r= .467 for SR; r= .604 for Em.Hlth; r= -.457 for IGR and r= -.302 for Promo respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total psychological well-being.

The t-values of total role stress; inter group relations and promotion are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; inter group relations and promotion and criterion (total psychological well-being) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; inter group relations and promotion negatively influence the level of total psychological well-being of scale-2 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of total role stress; inter group relations and promotion increases, the level of total psychological well-being decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total psychological well-being of scale-2 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by SR and Em.Hlth. respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H147 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

In the twelfth and the last major results section we have measured the impact of quality of working life and role stress on perceived organizational commitment and psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. The section starts with the descriptive table describing the minimum scores; maximum scores; mean scores and standard deviation of all the variables and their respective factors (N=50). It is followed by the statistical findings of stepwise multiple regression. This twelfth section of results starts from table number one hundred and forty-four and ends at table number one hundred and fifty-six respectively.
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W Itself</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>13.0000</td>
<td>1.26168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>13.3000</td>
<td>1.47427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>13.6800</td>
<td>1.40611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMR</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.8000</td>
<td>1.32311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLCL</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.8400</td>
<td>1.79977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.0400</td>
<td>2.21276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.6200</td>
<td>1.30759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.4200</td>
<td>1.32619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.1400</td>
<td>1.69043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.9600</td>
<td>1.80656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.1000</td>
<td>1.03510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>13.1400</td>
<td>1.26184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.9000</td>
<td>1.31320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco.Ben.</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.9000</td>
<td>1.26572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>13.2200</td>
<td>1.78760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em.Hlth.</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>13.0000</td>
<td>1.53862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.8000</td>
<td>1.29363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>192.00</td>
<td>239.00</td>
<td>203.4400</td>
<td>9.91219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.3600</td>
<td>.56279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.1200</td>
<td>1.42342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.7000</td>
<td>.93131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.1600</td>
<td>.97646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.7600</td>
<td>1.09842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.7000</td>
<td>1.14731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.5200</td>
<td>1.37381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.4400</td>
<td>.76024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.1200</td>
<td>.96129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.2800</td>
<td>1.21286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>45.1600</td>
<td>4.97077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ac</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>31.7000</td>
<td>2.40959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>33.6200</td>
<td>1.67685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nc</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>31.6800</td>
<td>2.69875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toc</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>97.0000</td>
<td>3.83858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gmh</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pmh</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.4600</td>
<td>1.23239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ssup</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sstr</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>22.2800</td>
<td>1.05056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wsup</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wstr</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.6200</td>
<td>1.21033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psup</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.0000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pstr</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.0400</td>
<td>1.33951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tpwb</td>
<td>181.00</td>
<td>198.00</td>
<td>189.4000</td>
<td>4.32364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 144

Showing impact of QWL and RS on AC (dimension of organizational commitment) among scale-3 bank managers of UP state

Table 144a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.592²</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.636⁸</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.683⁶</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), Trs, PWC, IGR

Table 144 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on affective commitment among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; physical working conditions and inter group relations respectively.

Table 144a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .592 for total role stress; .636 for physical working conditions and .683 for inter group relations respectively. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (affective commitment) came out, 35.1% for total role stress; 5.3% for physical working conditions and 6.3% inter group relations respectively.
Table 144b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (Constant)</td>
<td>26.993</td>
<td>6.085</td>
<td>4.436</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>-3.17</td>
<td>-2.289</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>2.675</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>2.323</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: ac

Table 144b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences affective commitment of scale-3 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t = -2.28 for Trs; t = 2.67 for PWC and t = 2.32 for IGR respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (affective commitment). The correlation (partial) is r = -.320 for Trs; r = .367 for PWC and r = .324 for IGR respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of affective commitment.

The t-value of total role stress is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of total role stress and criterion (affective commitment) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress negatively influence the level of affective commitment of scale-3 bank managers of UP state. As the level of total role stress increases, the level of affective commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that affective commitment of scale-3 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by PWC and IGR respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H_{148} is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence affective commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.
Chapter Four

Result and Discussion

Table 145

Showing impact of QWL and RS on CC (dimension of organizational commitment) among scale-3 bank managers of UP state

Table 145a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.368*</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 145 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on continuance commitment among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. In all a single independent variable emerged as predictor, namely, role isolation.

Table 145a. shows the model summary indicating the single predictor of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as .368 for role isolation. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variable. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variable which contributed to the dependent variable (continuance commitment) came out, as 13.5% for role isolation.

Table 145b.

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>-.538</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>-.368</td>
<td>-.274</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 145b. clearly indicates that RS influences continuance commitment of scale-3 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is, $t=-2.74$ for RI. By having a look at the t-value, we may conclude that t-value is significant for the predictor indicating a relationship between the predictor and criterion variable (continuance commitment). The correlation (partial) is $r=-.368$ for RI, showing that predictor significantly influences the degree of continuance commitment.

The t-value of role isolation is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlation of role isolation and criterion (continuance...
commitment) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that role isolation negatively influence the level of continuance commitment of scale-3 bank managers of UP state. As the level of role isolation increases, the level of continuance commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that continuance commitment of scale-3 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{149}$ is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life will not influence continuance commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state and role stress influence continuance commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.

### Table 146

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on NC (dimension of organizational commitment) among scale-3 bank managers of UP state**

Table 146a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.608*</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.652*</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.699*</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$c$ Predictors: (Constant), Trs, SER, IGR

Table 146 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on normative commitment among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; self respect and inter group relations respectively.

Table 146a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .608 for total role stress; .652 for self respect and .699 for inter group relations respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (normative commitment) came out, 36.9% for total role stress; 5.5% for self respect and 6.5% inter group relations respectively.
Table 146b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>40.506</td>
<td>6.208</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.262</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.483</td>
<td>-3.296</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>-.342</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-.281</td>
<td>-2.414</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: nc

Table 146b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences normative commitment of scale-3 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= -3.29 for Trs; t= 2.50 for SER and t= -2.41 for IGR respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (normative commitment). The correlation (partial) is r= -.437 for Trs; r= .346 for SER and r= -.335 for IGR respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of normative commitment.

The t-values of t0tal role stress and inter group relations are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and inter group relations and criterion(normative commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and inter group relations negatively influence the level of normative commitment of scale-3 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of total role stress and inter group relations increases, the level of normative commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that normative commitment of scale-3 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by SER. Thus, the null-hypothesis H150 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence normative commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.
Table 147

Showing impact of QWL and RS on Toc among scale-3 bank managers of UP state

Table 147a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.907*</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.944*</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.955*</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.964*</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.972*</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.978*</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.981*</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g Predictors: (Constant), Trs, PI, PWC, Tqwl, AAW, Recog, RSTGN

Table 147 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. In all seven independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; personal inadequacy; physical working conditions; total quality of working life; autonomy at work; recognition and role stagnation respectively.

Table 147a. shows the model summary indicating all the seven predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .907 for total role stress; .944 for personal inadequacy; .955 for physical working conditions; .964 for total quality of working life; .972 for autonomy at work; .978 for recognition and .981 for role stagnation respectively. Further R^2, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R^2 change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (total organizational commitment) came out, 82.3% for total role stress; 6.8% for personal inadequacy; 2.1% for physical working conditions; 1.8% for total quality of working life; 1.6% for autonomy at work; 1.1% for recognition and 0.6% for role stagnation respectively.
Table 147b. Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>138.844</td>
<td>12.660</td>
<td>10.967</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.589</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.763</td>
<td>-5.963</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>-.791</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>-.283</td>
<td>-4.426</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.320</td>
<td>7.308</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.313</td>
<td>-2.756</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAW</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>5.289</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-3.051</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTGN</td>
<td>-.283</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-2.688</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dependent Variable: Toc

Table 147b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total organizational commitment of scale-3 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= -5.96 for Trs; t= -4.42 for PI; t= 7.30 for PWC; t= -2.75 for Tqwl; t= 5.28 for AAW; t= -3.05 for Recog and t= -2.68 for RSTGN respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total organizational commitment). The correlation (partial) is r= -.677 for Trs; r= -.564 for PI; r= .748 for PWC; r= -.391 for Tqwl; r= .632 for AAW; r= -.426 for Recog and r= -.383 for RSTGN respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total organizational commitment.

The t-values of total role stress; personal inadequacy; total quality of working life; recognition and role stagnation are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; personal inadequacy; total quality of working life; recognition and role stagnation and criterion (total organizational commitment) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; personal inadequacy; total quality of working life; recognition and role stagnation negatively influence the level of total organizational commitment of scale-3 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of total role stress; personal inadequacy; total quality of working life; recognition and role stagnation increases, the level of total organizational commitment decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total organizational commitment of scale-3 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by PWC and AAW respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{151}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state.
Table 148

Showing impact of QWL and RS on GMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of UP state

Variables Entered/Removed.
Dependent Variable: Gmh

None of the independent variables emerged as predictors of good mental health among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. Thus, the null-hypothesis H152 is accepted. Hence, quality of working life and role stress will not influence good mental health among scale-3 bank managers of UP state.

Table 149

Showing impact of QWL and RS on PMH (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of UP state

Table 149a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), Trs, RI

Table 149 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on poor mental health among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress and role isolation respectively.

Table 149a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .825 for total role stress and .844 for role isolation respectively. Further R², which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered R² change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (poor mental health) came out, 68.1% for total role stress and 31% for role stagnation respectively.
Table 149b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant) 30.791</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>-.623</td>
<td>31.779</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.269</td>
<td>-5.238</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>-.288</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-.269</td>
<td>-2.258</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Pmh

Table 149b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences poor mental health of scale-3 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= -5.23 for Trs and t= -2.25 for RI respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (poor mental health). The correlation (partial) is r= -.607 for Trs and r= -.313 for RI respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of poor mental health.

The t-values of total role stress and role isolation are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and role isolation and criterion (poor mental health) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and role isolation negatively influence the level of poor mental health of scale-3 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of total role stress and role isolation increases, the level of poor mental health decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that poor mental health of scale-3 bank managers of UP state cannot be significantly predicted by any of the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis H153 is partially accepted. Hence, quality of working life will not influence poor mental health among scale-3 bank managers of UP state and role stress influence poor mental health among scale-3 bank managers of UP state.
Table 150

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of UP state

Variables Entered/Removed
a. Dependent Variable: Ssup

None of the independent variables emerged as predictors of social support among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{154}$ is accepted. Hence, quality of working life and role stress will not influence social support among scale-3 bank managers of UP state.

Table 151

Showing impact of QWL and RS on SSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of UP state

Table 151a.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.751*</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.785*</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Predictors: (Constant), Trs, ER

Table 151 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on social stressor among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. In all two independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress and employee relations respectively.

Table 151a. shows the model summary indicating both the two predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .751 for total role stress and .785 for employee relations respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (social stressor) came out, 56.4% for total role stress and 5.2% for employee relations respectively.
Table 151b.

Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-30.969</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.763</td>
<td>-29.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>-2.533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Sstr

Table 151b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences social stressor of scale-3 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= -8.44 for Trs and t= -2.53 for ER respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relations.ip between the predictors and criterion variable (social stressor). The correlation (partial) is r= -.776 for Trs and r= -.347 for ER respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of social stressor.

The t-values of total role stress and employee relations are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress and employee relations and criterion (social stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress and employee relations negatively influence the level of social stressor of scale-3 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of total role stress and employee relations increases, the level of social stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that social stressor of scale-3 bank managers of UP state cannot be significantly predicted by any of the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis H155 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence social stressor among scale-3 bank managers of UP state.

Table 152

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of UP state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Entered/Removed*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Dependent Variable: Wsup</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the independent variables emerged as predictors of work support among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. Thus, the null-hypothesis H156 is accepted. Hence, quality of working life and role stress will not influence work support among scale-3 bank managers of UP state.
Table 153

Showing impact of QWL and RS on WSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of UP state

Table 153a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.858a</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.872b</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.887c</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), Trs, RO, Recog

Table 153 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on work stressor among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; role overload and recognition respectively.

Table 153a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .858 for total role stress; .872 for role overload and .887 for recognition respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (work stressor) came out, 73.6% for total role stress; 2.3% for role overload and 2.8% for recognition respectively.
Table 153b. 

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>33.915</td>
<td>1.324</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.661</td>
<td>-6.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>-0.372</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>-0.338</td>
<td>-3.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-0.174</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>-2.449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Wstr

Table 153b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences work stressor of scale-3 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is $t = -6.40$ for Trs; $t = -3.02$ for RO and $t = -2.53$ for Recog respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (work stressor). The correlation (partial) is $r = -0.686$ for Trs; $r = -0.407$ for RO and $r = -0.340$ for Recog respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of work stressor.

The t-values of total role stress; role overload and recognition are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress; role overload and recognition and criterion (work stressor) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress; role overload and recognition negatively influence the level of work stressor of scale-3 bank managers of UP state. As the levels of total role stress; role overload and recognition increases, the level of work stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that work stressor of scale-3 bank managers of UP state cannot be significantly predicted by the predictors. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{157}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence work stressor among scale-3 bank managers of UP state.
Table 154

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSUP (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of UP state**

*Variables Entered/Removed*

| Variables Entered/Removed | a. Dependent Variable: Psup |

None of the independent variables emerged as predictors of personal support among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{158}$ is accepted. Hence, quality of working life and role stress will not influence personal support among scale-3 bank managers of UP state.

Table 155

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on PSTR (dimension of psychological well-being) among scale-3 bank managers of UP state**

Table 155a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.921*</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td></td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.933*</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td></td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.941*</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>.879.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c Predictors: (Constant), Tqwl, ClO, Trs

Table 155 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on personal stressor among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. In all three independent variables emerged as predictors, namely, total quality of working life; clarity in organization and total role stress respectively.

Table 155a. shows the model summary indicating all the three predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .921 for total quality of working life; .933 for clarity in organization and .941 for total role stress respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (personal stressor) came out, 84.8% for total quality of working life; 2.3% for clarity in organization and 1.5% for total role stress respectively.
Table 155b. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>12.837</td>
<td>6.750</td>
<td>1.902</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tqwl</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>2.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>3.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-0.419</td>
<td>-2.437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Pstr

Table 155b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences personal stressor of scale-3 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= 2.43 for Tqwl; t= 3.18 for CIO and t= -2.43 for Trs respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (personal stressor). The correlation (partial) is r= .337 for Tqwl; r= .425 for CIO and r= -.338 for Trs respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of personal stressor.

The t-value of total role stress is negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly, the correlation of total role stress and criterion (personal stressor) is showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress negatively influence the level of personal stressor of scale-3 bank managers of UP state. As the level of total role stress increases, the level of personal stressor decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that personal stressor of scale-3 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by Tqwl and CIO respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis H139 is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence personal stressor among scale-3 bank managers of UP state.
Table 156

**Showing impact of QWL and RS on Tpwb among scale-3 bank managers of UP state**

Table 156a.

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.941*</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.949*</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.957*</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.964*</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.968*</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Predictors: (Constant), Trs, CIO, IRD, RO, Recog

Table 156 is showing impact of quality of working life and role stress on total psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. In all five independent variables; emerged as predictors, namely, total role stress; clarity in organization; inter role distance; role overload and recognition respectively.

Table 156a. shows the model summary indicating all the five predictors of the model. Multiple correlation (R) is found as, .941 for total role stress; .949 for clarity in organization; .957 for inter role distance; .964 for role overload and .968 for recognition respectively. Further $R^2$, which represents the contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables, is also seen. Here we have considered $R^2$ change, that is, the actual contribution of criterion variable to the predictor variables. Hence the real covariance, the magnitude of independent variables which contributed to the dependent variable (total psychological well-being) came out, 88.6% for total role stress; 1.5% for clarity in organization; 1.6% for inter role distance; 1.3% for role overload and 0.8% for recognition respectively.
Table 156b.  
**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>216.985</td>
<td>4.414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>-.620</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.713</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>49.161</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>1.132</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>3.763</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>-.962</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>-.244</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recog</td>
<td>-.341</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Dependent Variable: Tpwb*

Table 156b. clearly indicates that QWL and RS influences total psychological well-being of scale-3 bank managers of UP state in general. As the statistical value given in the table indicates, that is t= -11.81 for Trs; t= 2.22 for CIO; t= 3.76 for IRD; t= -3.75 for RO and t= -2.38 for Recog respectively. By having a look at the t-values, we may conclude that t-values are significant for all the predictors indicating a relationship between the predictors and criterion variable (total psychological well-being). The correlation (partial) is r= -.872 for Trs; r= .318 for CIO; r= .493 for IRD; r= -.492 for RO and r= -.339 for Recog respectively, showing that predictors significantly influence the degree of total psychological well-being.

The t-values of total role stress, role overload and recognition are negative indicating a negative relationship with the criterion. Similarly the correlations of total role stress, role overload and recognition and criterion (total psychological well-being) are showing significant negative relationship. It means that total role stress, role overload and recognition negatively influence the level of total psychological well-being of scale-3 bank managers of UP state. As the level of total role stress, role overload and recognition increases, the level of total psychological well-being decreases.

From the results it may be interpreted that total psychological well-being of scale-3 bank managers of UP state can be significantly predicted by CIO and IRD respectively. Thus, the null-hypothesis $H_{160}$ is rejected. Hence, quality of working life and role stress influence total psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of UP state.
ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

Here we have applied t-test as an additional statistical analysis in order to assess the significance of difference among the various comparison groups and also among various variables to examine whether groups differ on each variable or not.

Table-A

Showing t-value between the states of MP and UP among all variables among overall bank managers

(N=150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Variables(s)</th>
<th>State(s)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>174.15</td>
<td>26.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>182.51</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>4.25**</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>59.30</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>80.53</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>81.98</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>PWB</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>153.83</td>
<td>29.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>166.20</td>
<td>25.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level

** Significant at .01 level

Table-A is showing t-values for the states of MP and UP of all the variables among overall bank managers (N=150). For the first independent variable, that is, quality of working life, the overall bank managers of the state of UP scored higher mean value as compared to the state of MP. However, their t-value came out to be negligible for quality of working life indicating a non-significant difference between qualities of working life of overall bank managers of both the states. Similarly, for the second independent variable, role stress, overall bank managers of the state of MP scored a much higher mean value as compared to the overall bank managers of the state of UP. Their t-value came out quite high indicating a significant difference between the role stress experienced by the overall bank managers of the states of MP and UP. On the same lines, for the first dependent variable, namely, organizational commitment, the overall bank managers of the state of UP scored a slightly higher mean value as compared to the overall bank managers of the state of MP. Thus the t-value for them
came out to be negligible indicating a non-significant difference between the organizational commitments experienced by the overall bank managers of both the states. For the other dependent variable, namely, psychological well-being, the overall bank managers of the state of UP scored up a higher mean value as compared to the mean value scored by the overall bank managers of the state of MP. However, the t-value for overall bank managers of both the states came out to be negligible for psychological well-being indicating a non-significant difference between psychological well-being of overall bank managers of both the states.

Table-B

Showing t-value among various levels bank managers of MP and UP states for all variables

N=50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Variables(s)</th>
<th>Level of bank managers</th>
<th>State(s)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>143.68</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>5.25**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>160.16</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>177.84</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>183.94</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>200.94</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>203.44</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>98.68</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>73.12</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>85.32</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3.72**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>59.62</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>59.02</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>60.56</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>65.22</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table-B is showing t-value among various levels bank managers of MP and UP states for all variables. For the first independent variable, that is, quality of working life, all the three scales of bank managers of UP state scored higher mean values as compared to all the three scales of bank managers of MP state. The t-value for scale-1 bank managers came out quite high indicating a significant difference between quality of working life of scale-1 bank managers of the states of MP and UP. The t-values came out very low for scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers which indicate a non-significant difference between qualities of working life of scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers of both the states. For the second independent variable, that is, role stress, all the three scales of bank managers of MP state scored higher mean values as compared to all the three scales of bank managers of UP state. The t-value for scale-1 bank managers is low and there is a non-significant difference between the role stress of scale-1 bank managers of the states of MP and UP. For scale-2 managers, the t-value came out to be significant, whereas for scale-3 managers, the t-value came out to be non-significant. The first dependent variable, organizational commitment had the same scores pattern. Among all the three scales of bank managers, the state of UP scored higher mean values as compared to the state of MP. However, the differences among mean values are low; the t-values came out to be low and non-significant. This indicates that there is no difference among scale-1; scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers of both the states for the variable of organizational commitment. For the second dependent variable, that is, psychological well-being, all the three scales of bank managers of UP state scored higher mean values as compared to all the three scales of bank managers of MP state. The t-value for scale-1 bank managers is low and there is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>s-2</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>UP</th>
<th>84.18</th>
<th>3.66</th>
<th>0.54</th>
<th>n.s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>96.86</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table-B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PWB</th>
<th>s-1</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>UP</th>
<th>17.60</th>
<th>11.85</th>
<th>1.04</th>
<th>n.s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>159.78</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>5.54**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>184.12</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level
a non-significant difference between the psychological well-being of scale-1 bank managers of the states of MP and UP. For scale-2 managers, the t-value came out to be significant, whereas for scale-3 managers, the t-value came out to be non-significant.

Table-C

Showing t-value for various levels bank managers of both the states of all variables

N=100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Variables(s)</th>
<th>Level of bank managers</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>151.92</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>4.77**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>180.89</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>202.19</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>52.09</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>72.47</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>85.90</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>62.89</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>6.97**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>83.95</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.35*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>96.93</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table-C is showing t-value for various levels bank managers of both the states of all variables. For the first independent variable, that is, quality of working life, the mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-2 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-1 and scale-2 bank managers for quality of working life. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-1 and scale-3 bank managers for quality of working life. The mean value of scale-2 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers for quality of working life. For the second independent variable, that is, role stress, the mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-2 bank managers. Their t-value is non-significant indicating no difference between scale-1 and scale-2 bank managers for role stress. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-1 and scale-3 bank managers for role stress. The mean value of scale-2 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is non-significant indicating no difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers for role stress. The first dependent variable is organizational commitment. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-2 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-1 and scale-2 bank managers for organizational commitment. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-1 and scale-3 bank managers for organizational commitment. The mean value of scale-2 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers for organizational commitment. The mean value of scale-2 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers for organizational commitment.
significant difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers for organizational commitment. The second dependent variable is psychological well-being. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-2 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-1 and scale-2 bank managers for psychological well-being. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-1 and scale-3 bank managers for psychological well-being. The mean value of scale-2 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers for psychological well-being.

Table-D

Showing t-value among various levels bank managers of MP state for all variables

N=50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Variables(s)</th>
<th>Level of bank managers</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>143.68</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>5.24**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>177.84</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>143.68</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>200.94</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>177.84</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>5.88**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>200.94</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>98.68</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>4.65**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>85.32</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>98.68</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>59.02</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>85.32</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>59.02</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table-D is showing t-value among various levels bank managers of MP state for all variables. For the first independent variable, that is, quality of working life, the mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-2 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-1 and scale-2 bank managers of MP state for quality of working life. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is non-significant indicating no difference between scale-1 and scale-3 bank managers of MP state for quality of working life. The mean value of scale-2 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers of MP state for quality of working life. For the second independent variable, that is, role stress, the mean value of scale-1 bank managers is higher as compared to scale-2 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a difference between scale-1 and scale-2 bank managers of MP state for role stress. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is higher as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a difference between scale-1 and scale-3 bank managers of MP state for role stress. The mean value of scale-2 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers of MP state for role stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>60.56</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>7.02**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>84.18</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>60.56</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>96.86</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>84.18</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>7.02**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>96.86</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>117.60</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>2.55*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>159.78</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>117.60</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>3.28**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>184.12</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>159.78</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>184.12</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level

** Significant at .01 level
managers is higher as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is non-significant indicating no difference between scale-1 and scale-3 bank managers of MP state for role stress. The mean value of scale-2 bank managers is higher as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers of MP state for role stress. The first dependent variable is organizational commitment. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-2 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-1 and scale-2 bank managers of MP state for organizational commitment. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is non-significant indicating no difference between scale-1 and scale-3 bank managers of MP state for organizational commitment. The mean value of scale-2 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers of MP state for psychological well-being. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-2 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-1 and scale-2 bank managers of MP state for psychological well-being. The mean value of scale-2 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is non-significant indicating no difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers of MP state for psychological well-being.
### Table-E

**Showing t-value among various levels bank managers of UP state for all variables**

N=50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Variables(s)</th>
<th>Level of bank managers</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>160.16</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>3.03**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>183.94</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>160.16</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>2.19*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>203.44</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>183.94</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>8.65**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>203.44</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>73.12</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.62**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>59.62</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>73.12</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>3.49**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>59.62</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>9.59**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>65.22</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>87.72</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-1</td>
<td>65.22</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>6.97**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-2</td>
<td>87.72</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>5.26**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s-3</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table-E is showing t-value among various levels bank managers of UP state for all variables. For the first independent variable, that is, quality of working life, the mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-2 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-1 and scale-2 bank managers of UP state for quality of working life. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-1 and scale-3 bank managers of UP state for quality of working life. The mean value of scale-2 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers of UP state for quality of working life.

For the second independent variable, that is, role stress, the mean value of scale-1 bank managers is higher as compared to scale-2 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a difference between scale-1 and scale-2 bank managers of UP state for role stress. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is higher as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-1 and scale-3 bank managers of UP state for role stress. The mean value of scale-2 bank managers is higher as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers of UP state for role stress.

The first dependent variable is organizational commitment. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-2 bank managers. Their t-value is non-significant indicating no difference between scale-1 and scale-2 bank managers of UP state for organizational commitment. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is non-significant indicating no difference between scale-1 and scale-3 bank managers of UP state for organizational commitment. The mean value of scale-2 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers of UP state for organizational commitment.
significant difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers of UP state for organizational commitment. The second dependent variable is psychological well-being. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-2 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-1 and scale-2 bank managers of UP state for psychological well-being. The mean value of scale-1 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is significant indicating a significant difference between scale-1 and scale-3 bank managers of UP state for psychological well-being. The mean value of scale-2 bank managers is lower as compared to scale-3 bank managers. Their t-value is non-significant indicating no difference between scale-2 and scale-3 bank managers of UP state for psychological well-being.

DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION

Now, while the results are going to be discussed, it may be recalled that the aim of the present investigation is to find out relationship not only between various levels bank managers of MP and UP states as a whole, with respect to perceived organizational commitment and psychological well-being, but also to compare the various groups and sub-groups with each other. Division of various levels bank managers is carried out on the basis of their designation among various banking organizations taken for the proposed study.

Scale one bank managers belong to the junior management level. Henceforth they only assist other higher levels of bank managers. Scale two bank managers are of middle management level and are a link between junior and senior levels of bank managers. Third and the last category is of scale three bank managers who belong to the senior management level and are basically administrators who make other levels of bank managers to execute their orders.

In the present research, many new areas along with the old had been explored. So, in the present investigation, on one hand the researcher will be discussing the results in the light of previous empirical findings and at the other hand while dealing with the relational and comparative results of various levels bank managers of both the states (MP and UP), in the absence of previous researches, there are hardly any guiding principles to be followed.

The results of the study have been shown in one hundred and fifty-six tables, and further in five tables (table ‘A’ to table ‘E’) respectively, earlier in the running chapter. Initial results deal with the impact of overall quality of working life (dimensions wise) and overall role stress (dimensions wise) on overall perceived organizational commitment (dimensions wise) and overall psychological well-being (dimensions wise) among overall various levels bank managers of MP and UP states (table 1 to table 13). Secondly, the results of scale one; scale two and scale three bank managers had been examined (table 14 to table 78). The other half of the results deal with the relational study of scale one; scale two and scale three bank managers of the
state of MP and furthermore of the state of UP (table 79 to table 156). In the end, an additional comparative study has been carried out to assess the differences among various groups and sub-groups. Mostly the findings are in agreement with the previous researches.

Quality of working life plays a pivotal role in enhancing the commitment of employees which leads to organizational development (Robert, 1998), increased psychological well-being (Donaldson et al., 1999) and good employee health. Since, all these factors emerged as predictors of organizational commitment and psychological well-being, we may interpret that our results are in accordance with previous studies. Similarly positive organizational climate; autonomy at work; economic benefits which improves commitment towards the organization played positive role for the same in our findings (Payne and Pheysey, 1971; Costello and Sang, 1974; Lafollette and Sims, 1975; Schneider and Snyder, 1975; Rajappa, 1978; Sharma, 1983; Kornbluh, 1984; Gary, 1988; Srivastava, 1996; Venkatachalam et al., 1998). As the union management relations improves, quality of working life also improves (Graham, 1985). Economic benefits and employee health which emerged as predictors of organizational commitment also supports the same (Lan and May, 1998; Donaldson, 1999).

Stress of job life develops negative and positive attitudes about various aspects of job in the employee, which ultimately generate the feeling of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the employees. The state of MP experienced more role stress as compared to the state of UP. This may be attributed to the fact that mostly in the banks of UP, overstaffing is seen, whereas in MP state under staffing is exhibited. It lead to low organizational commitment of MP bank managers as compared to the bank managers of UP state (Kahn et al. 1964). All this lead to low psychological well-being of bank managers of MP state which is a but obvious and tested phenomenon (Jhonson, 1979; Rista and Cooper, 1998). Similarly it lead to perception of low quality of working life by the MP bank managers as compared to the bank managers of the state of UP. It was tested that due to the handicaps of education scale on and scale two managers will experience less role stress as compared to scale three managers (Sen, 1982; Akinnusi, 1994). Our findings supported the same and contradicted that junior levels executives (here scale one bank managers) experience high stress than their middle level (here scale two bank managers) counterparts (Singh, 1988; Mohan and Chauhan, 1999). Work and life support negatively correlated with work stress as high role stress is yielded by managers who experienced lower quality of working life.

Organizational commitment is a potent factor in determining the organizational health and the well-being of the employees. Quality of working life predicts organizational commitment which in turn is highly related to organizational health (Sharma and Pandey, 1995; Patel, 1998). Similarly economic benefits and employ participation which emerged as the major predictors of organizational commitment, is also in accorandance with the
previous findings (Brett et al., 1995; Knoop, 1995; Randell and O’ Driscoli, 1997).

Psychological well-being is the need of the hour. In the proposed study it is the dependent variable. Hence, we examined the relationship between stress of job life and impact of quality of working life on the same. It was seen that worker’s assessment of physical environment and psychological well-being are correlated. The better the quality of working life given to the managers, the better they performed, as scale three managers are given best quality of working life they had the highest psychological well-being scores (Klitzman and Stellman, 1989). Job stress was significantly related to organizational commitment. As one increased the other decreased and vice-versa (Jamal and Preena, 1998). The stress related with personal facets was found to have significant with well-being, which is again supported by the researches (Christiansen et al., 1999).

By assessing all the results in an objective manner, we may empirically state that as a healthy mind lives in a healthy body so a healthy working organization leads a high quality of working life to lower the role stress on the employee for the sake of fair organizational commitment and good psychological well-being.
Chapter Five
Conclusions and Recommendations
Examining the various types of organizational commitment (affective; continuance and normative) and psychological well-being (good mental health; poor mental health; social support; social stressor; work support; work stressor; personal support and personal stressor) varying results are obtained. Present study incorporated the use of stepwise multiple regression analysis, in order to analyse the data. This method had the power to isolate the predictor variables in the sequence which could have significant influence on employee’s total quality of working life and role stress and their various facets. Moving on the same lines, t-test has been applied in the later part of data-analysis to examine whether the various comparison groups differ on each variable or not. The results thus obtained from relational and comparative study of different groups are concluded as under:

- Overall quality of working life (QWL) significantly affected overall organizational commitment (OC) among overall various levels bank managers.
- Three factors of quality of working life, namely, recognition; economic benefits and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall affective commitment among overall various levels bank managers.
- Two factors of quality of working life, namely, intergroup relations and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers.
- Two factors of quality of working life, namely, recognition and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers.
- Eight factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself, employee participation, physical working conditions, intergroup relations, employee relations, trust, recognition and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers.
- Overall role stress (RS) significantly affected overall organizational commitment (OC) among overall various levels bank managers.
- Two factors of role stress, namely, role erosion and role ambiguity emerged predictors of overall affective commitment among overall various levels bank managers.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, role stagnation emerged predictor of overall continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of overall normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers.
• Three factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation, personal inadequacy and self role distance emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers.

• Overall quality of working life (QWL) significantly affected overall psychological well-being (PWB) among overall various levels bank managers.

• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation; organizational climate; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall good mental health among overall various levels bank managers.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall poor mental health among overall various levels bank managers.

• Seven factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself; physical working conditions; autonomy at work; clarity in organization; recognition; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall social support among overall various levels bank managers.

• Five factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself; union management relations; employee relations; trust and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall social stressor among overall various levels bank managers.

• Six factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation; organizational climate; autonomy at work; clarity in organization; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall work support among overall various levels bank managers.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, recognition and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall work stressor among overall various levels bank managers.

• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation; union management relations; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall personal support among overall various levels bank managers.

• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, self respect; trust; promotion and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers.

• Six factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation; employee relations; autonomy at work; economic benefits; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers.

• Overall role stress (RS) significantly affected overall psychological well-being (PWB) among overall various levels bank managers.

• Three factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation; personal inadequacy and role ambiguity emerged predictors of overall good mental health among overall various levels bank managers.
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- Two factors of role stress, namely, role expectation conflict and role inadequacy emerged predictors of overall poor mental health among overall various levels bank managers.

- Six factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation; role expectation conflict; role isolation; personal inadequacy; self role distance and role ambiguity emerged predictors of overall social support among overall various levels bank managers.

- A single factor of role stress, namely, inter role distance emerged predictor of overall social stressor among overall various levels bank managers.

- Three factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation; role expectation conflict and personal inadequacy emerged predictors of overall work support among overall various levels bank managers.

- A single factor of role stress, namely, self role distance emerged predictor of overall work stressor among overall various levels bank managers.

- Two factors of role stress, namely, inter role distance and role stagnation emerged predictors of overall personal support among overall various levels bank managers.

- A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of overall personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers.

- Four factors of role stress, namely, role expectation conflict; role isolation; personal inadequacy and self role distance emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers.

- Overall quality of working life (QWL) significantly affected overall organizational commitment (OC) among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

- A single factor of quality of working life, namely, total quality of working life emerged predictor of overall affective commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

- Three factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself; intergroup relations and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

- Two factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

- Six factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself; employee participation; physical working conditions; autonomy at work; economic benefits and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

- Overall role stress (RS) significantly affected overall organizational commitment (OC) among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
• A single factor of role stress, namely, role overload emerged predictor of overall affective commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictors of overall continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

• None of the factor of role stress emerged predictor of overall normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, personal inadequacy and self role distance emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

• Overall quality of working life (QWL) significantly affected overall psychological well-being (PWB) among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

• Three factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation; employee relations and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall good mental health among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, clarity in organization and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall poor mental health among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself; supervisory roles; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall social support among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

• Three factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself; clarity in organization and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall stressor among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

• Six factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation; employee relations; autonomy at work; supervisory roles; employee’s health and and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall work support among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

• Six factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself; intergroup relations; employee relations; clarity in organization; self respect and and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall work stressor among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, organizational climate; supervisory roles; self respect and and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall personal support among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, organizational commitment and trust emerged predictors of overall personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

• Seven factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions; employee relations; organizational commitment; self respect; employee health;
promotion and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.

- Overall role stress (RS) significantly affected overall psychological well-being (PWB) among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, role stagnation emerged predictor of overall good mental health among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, self role distance emerged predictor of overall poor mental health among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
- Two factors of role stress, namely, self role distance and role ambiguity emerged predictors of overall social support among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
- Two factors of role stress, namely, role erosion and role inadequacy emerged predictors of overall social stressor among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, self role distance emerged predictor of overall work support among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, inter role distance emerged predictor of overall work stressor among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
- Two factors of role stress, namely, role erosion and role ambiguity emerged predictors of overall personal support among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
- Two factors of role stress, namely, role ambiguity and role inadequacy emerged predictors of overall personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, role erosion emerged predictor of overall total psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
- Overall quality of working life (QWL) significantly affected overall organizational commitment (OC) among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
- A single factor of quality of working life, namely, economic benefits emerged predictor of overall affective commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
- Four factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation; trust; recognition and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
- None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictors of overall normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
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- Three factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions; economic benefits and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

- Overall role stress (RS) significantly affected overall organizational commitment (OC) among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

- Two factors of role stress, namely, role overload and total role stress emerged predictors of overall affective commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

- Two factors of role stress, namely, inter role distance and role overload emerged predictors of overall continuance commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

- A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of overall normative commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

- Three factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation; role ambiguity and, total role stress emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

- Overall quality of working life (QWL) significantly affected overall psychological well-being (PWB) among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

- Two factors of quality of working life, namely, organizational climate and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall good mental health among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

- Five factors of quality of working life, namely, employee relations; organizational commitment; supervisory relations; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall poor mental health among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

- Five factors of quality of working life, namely, union management relations; organizational climate; autonomy at work; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall social support among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

- Five factors of quality of working life, namely, inter group relations; employee relations; trust; clarity in organization and economic benefits emerged predictors of overall social stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

- Four factors of quality of working life, namely, autonomy at work; economic benefits; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall work support among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

- Two factors of quality of working life, namely, trust and employee health emerged predictors of overall work stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
• Four factors of quality of working life, namely employee participation; physical working conditions; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall personal support among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely. supervisory relations and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, autonomy at work; supervisory relations; economic benefits and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

• Overall role stress (RS) significantly affected overall psychological well-being (PWB) among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

• Four factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation; role erosion; role overload and personal inadequacy emerged predictors of overall good mental health among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation and role inadequacy emerged predictors of of overall poor mental health among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

• Four factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation; role erosion; role overload and personal inadequacy emerged predictors of overall social support among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

• Three factors of role stress, namely, self role distance; role ambiguity and total role stress emerged predictors of overall social stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

• Four factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation; role erosion; role overload and personal inadequacy emerged predictors of overall work support among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

• Three factors of role stress, namely, role ambiguity; role inadequacy and total role stress emerged predictors of of overall work stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

• Four factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation; role erosion; role overload and personal inadequacy emerged predictors of overall personal support among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictors of overall personal stressor among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

• Five factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation; role erosion; role overload; personal inadequacy and total role stress emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.

• Overall quality of working life (QWL) significantly affected overall organizational commitment (OC) among overall bank managers of scale-1.
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• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, total quality of working life emerged predictor of overall affective commitment among overall bank managers of scale-1.
• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, total quality of working life emerged predictor of overall continuance commitment among overall bank managers of scale-1.
• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, recognition and, total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall normative commitment among overall bank managers of scale-1.
• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, union management relations; employee relations; promotion and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment among overall bank managers of scale-1.
• Overall role stress (RS) significantly affected overall organizational commitment (OC) among overall bank managers of scale-1.
• A single factor of role stress, namely, role stagnation emerged predictor of overall affective commitment among overall bank managers of scale-1.
• A single factor of role stress, namely, role stagnation emerged predictor of overall continuance commitment among overall bank managers of scale-1.
• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictors of overall normative commitment among overall bank managers of scale-1.
• Two factors of role stress, namely, self role distance and total role stress emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment among overall bank managers of scale-1.
• Overall quality of working life (QWL) significantly affected overall psychological well-being (PWB) among overall bank managers of scale-1.
• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, total quality of working life emerged predictor of overall good mental health among overall bank managers of scale-1.
• Three factors of quality of working life, namely, recognition; economic benefits and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall poor mental health among overall bank managers of scale-1.
• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, employee relations and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall social support among overall bank managers of scale-1.
• Five factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself; physical working conditions; employee relations; trust and economic benefits emerged predictors of overall social stressor among overall bank managers of scale-1.
• Three factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions; organizational commitment and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall personal support among overall bank managers of scale-1.
• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, total quality of working life emerged predictor of overall personal stressor among overall bank managers of scale-1.

• Three factors of quality of working life, namely, employee relations; employee health and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall work support among overall bank managers of scale-1.

• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, recognition emerged predictor of overall work stressor among overall bank managers of scale-1.

• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, employee relations; autonomy at work; economic benefits and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall personal stressor among overall bank managers of scale-1.

• Overall role stress (RS) significantly affected overall psychological well-being (PWB) among overall bank managers of scale-1.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, inter role distance emerged predictor of overall good mental health among overall bank managers of scale-1.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, role expectation conflict emerged predictor of overall poor mental health among overall bank managers of scale-1.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation and role expectation conflict emerged predictors of overall social support among overall bank managers of scale-1.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role inadequacy and total role stress emerged predictors of overall social stressor among overall bank managers of scale-1.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation and role ambiguity emerged predictors of overall personal support among overall bank managers of scale-1.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of overall personal stressor among overall bank managers of scale-1.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation and role expectation conflict emerged predictors of overall work support among overall bank managers of scale-1.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role erosion and personal inadequacy emerged predictors of overall work stressor among overall bank managers of scale-1.

• Five factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation; role expectation conflict; role overload; role ambiguity and role inadequacy emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being among overall bank managers of scale-1.

• Overall quality of working life (QWL) significantly affected overall organizational commitment (OC) among overall bank managers of scale-2.
• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, promotion and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall affective commitment among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of overall continuance commitment among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, promotion and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall normative commitment among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Three factors of quality of working life, namely, organizational commitment; supervisory roles and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Overall role stress (RS) significantly affected overall organizational commitment (OC) among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role erosion and self role distance emerged predictors of overall affective commitment among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation and role expectation conflict emerged predictors of overall continuance commitment among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, role inadequacy emerged predictor of overall normative commitment among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Five factors of role stress, namely, inter role distance; role stagnation; role expectation conflict; role erosion and total role stress emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Overall quality of working life (QWL) significantly affected overall psychological well-being (PWB) among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, supervisory roles emerged predictor of overall good mental health among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions; trust; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall poor mental health among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Seven factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself; physical working conditions; organizational climate; supervisory roles; clarity in organization; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall social support among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions; union management relations; clarity in organization and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall social stressor among overall bank managers of scale-2.
• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions and organizational commitment emerged predictors of overall personal support among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Three factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation; trust and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall personal stressor among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Six factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions; organizational climate; clarity in organization; recognition; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall work support among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall work stressor among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Nine factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation; physical working conditions; organizational climate; organizational commitment; supervisory roles; clarity in organization; economic benefits; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Overall role stress (RS) significantly affected overall psychological well-being (PWB) among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role expectation conflict and total role stress emerged predictors of overall good mental health among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of overall poor mental health among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, role inadequacy emerged predictor of overall social support among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, self role distance emerged predictor of overall social stressor among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role erosion and role overload emerged predictors of overall personal support among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, role erosion emerged predictor of overall personal stressor among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, inter role distance emerged predictor of overall work support among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of overall work stressor among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Four factors of role stress, namely, personal inadequacy; role ambiguity; role inadequacy and total role stress emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being among overall bank managers of scale-2.

• Overall quality of working life (QWL) significantly affected overall organizational commitment (OC) among overall bank managers of scale-3.
• Three factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions; intergroup relations and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall affective commitment among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, recognition emerged predictor of overall continuance commitment among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions and self respect emerged predictors of overall normative commitment among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Five factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions; autonomy at work; recognition; employee health and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Overall role stress (RS) significantly affected overall organizational commitment (OC) among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, role inadequacy emerged predictor of overall affective commitment among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of overall continuance commitment among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of overall normative commitment among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Five factors of role stress, namely, inter role distance; role stagnation; role erosion; personal inadequacy and role inadequacy emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Overall quality of working life (QWL) significantly affected overall psychological well-being (PWB) among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, trust emerged predictor of overall good mental health among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions and self respect emerged predictors of overall poor mental health among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Three factors of quality of working life, namely, union management relations; autonomy at work and promotion emerged predictors of overall social support among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, recognition and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall social stressor among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, union management relations and promotion emerged predictors of overall work support among overall bank managers of scale-3.
• Three factors of quality of working life, namely, autonomy at work; recognition and and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall work stressor among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, work itself emerged predictor of overall personal support among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, employee relations and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall personal stressor among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Eight factors quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions; union management relations; employee relations; recognition; economic benefits; employee health; promotion and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Overall role stress (RS) significantly affected overall psychological well-being (PWB) among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of overall good mental health among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of overall poor mental health among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of overall social support among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of overall social stressor among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Three factors of role stress, namely, role erosion; role overload and total role stress emerged predictors of overall work support among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of overall work stressor among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Three factors of role stress, namely, inter role distance; role erosion and role inadequacy emerged predictors of overall personal support among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, inter role distance and role inadequacy emerged predictors of overall personal stressor among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role erosion and total role stress emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being among overall bank managers of scale-3.

• Overall quality of working life (QWL) of MP state scale-1 bank managers significantly affected their overall organizational commitment (OC).

• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, total quality of working life emerged predictor of affective commitment of MP state scale-1 bank managers.
• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, total quality of working life emerged predictor of continuance commitment of MP state scale-1 bank managers.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, organizational commitment and total quality of working life emerged predictors of normative commitment of MP state scale-1 bank managers.

• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation; recognition; promotion and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment of MP state scale-1 bank managers.

• Overall role stress (RS) of MP state scale-1 bank managers significantly affected their overall organizational commitment (OC).

• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of affective commitment of MP state scale-1 bank managers.

• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of continuance commitment of MP state scale-1 bank managers.

• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of normative commitment of MP state scale-1 bank managers.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of overall total organizational commitment of MP state scale-1 bank managers.

• Overall quality of working life (QWL) of MP state scale-1 bank managers significantly affected their overall psychological well-being (PWB).

• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, recognition emerged predictor of good mental health of MP state scale-1 bank managers.

• None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of poor mental health of MP state scale-1 bank managers.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself and recognition emerged predictors of social support of MP state scale-1 bank managers.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, organizational commitment and trust emerged predictors of social stressor of MP state scale-1 bank managers.

• Three factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself; physical working conditions and employee relations emerged predictors of work support of MP state scale-1 bank managers.

• Seven factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself; inter group relations; autonomy at work; trust; economic benefits; promotion and total quality of working life emerged predictors of work stressor of MP state scale-1 bank managers.

• None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of personal support of MP state scale-1 bank managers.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, organizational commitment and trust emerged predictors of personal stressor of MP state scale-1 bank managers.
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- Eight factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation; physical working conditions; inter group relations; supervisory relations; trust; economic benefits; self respect and promotion emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being of MP state scale-1 bank managers.
- Overall role stress (RS) for MP state scale-1 bank managers significantly affected their overall psychological well-being (PWB).
- Two factors of role stress, namely, role erosion and total role stress emerged predictors of good mental health of MP state scale-1 bank managers.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of poor mental health of MP state scale-1 bank managers.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of social support of MP state scale-1 bank managers.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of social stressor of MP state scale-1 bank managers.
- None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of work support of MP state scale-1 bank managers.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of work stressor of MP state scale-1 bank managers.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, role ambiguity emerged predictor of personal support of MP state scale-1 bank managers.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, role stagnation emerged predictor of personal stressor of MP state scale-1 bank managers.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of overall total psychological well-being of MP state scale-1 bank managers
- Overall quality of working life (QWL) of UP state scale-1 bank managers significantly affected their overall organizational commitment (OC).
- None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of affective commitment of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- Four factors of quality of working life, namely, union management relations; inter group relations; recognition and total quality of working life emerged predictors of continuance commitment of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- A single factor of quality of working life, namely, total quality of working life emerged predictor of normative commitment of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- Four factors of quality of working life, namely, inter group relations; organizational commitment; trust and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- Overall role stress (RS) of UP state scale-1 bank managers significantly affected their overall organizational commitment (OC).
- Three factors of role stress, namely, inter role distance; role overload and total role stress emerged predictors of affective commitment of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
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- A single factor of role stress, namely, role overload emerged predictor of continuance commitment of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of normative commitment of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- Three factors of role stress, namely, inter role distance; role overload and total role stress emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- Overall quality of working life (QWL) of UP state scale-1 bank managers significantly affected their overall psychological well-being (PWB).
- A single factor of quality of working life, namely, total quality of working life emerged predictor of good mental health of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- Two factors of quality of working life, namely, clarity in organization and total quality of working life emerged predictors of poor mental health of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- A single factor of quality of working life, namely, organizational climate emerged predictor of social support of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- Five factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself; employee relations; trust; clarity in organization and total quality of working life emerged predictors of social stressor of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- A single factor of quality of working life, namely, recognition emerged predictor of work support of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- A single factor of quality of working life, namely, work itself emerged predictor of work stressor of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- A single factor of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions emerged predictor of personal support of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- Two factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions and employee relations emerged predictors of personal stressor of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of overall total quality of working life of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- Overall role stress (RS) of UP state scale-1 bank managers significantly affected their overall psychological well-being (PWB).
- None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of good mental health of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- Two factors of role stress, namely, personal inadequacy and self role distance emerged predictors of poor mental health of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- Three factors of role stress, namely, role expectation conflict; role inadequacy and total role stress emerged predictors of social support of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of social stressor of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- Two factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation and total role stress emerged predictors of work support of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of work stressor of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of personal support of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, role overload emerged predictor of personal stressor of UP state scale-1 bank managers.
- None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of overall total quality of working life of UP state scale-1 bank managers.

- Overall quality of working life (QWL) of MP state scale-2 bank managers significantly affected their overall organizational commitment (OC).
- None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of affective commitment of MP state scale-2 bank managers.
- None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of continuance commitment of MP state scale-2 bank managers.
- None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of normative commitment of MP state scale-2 bank managers.
- Two factors of quality of working life, namely, recognition and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment of MP state scale-2 bank managers.
- Overall role stress (RS) of MP state scale-2 bank managers significantly affected their overall organizational commitment (OC).
- A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of affective commitment of MP state scale-2 bank managers.
- None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of continuance commitment of MP state scale-2 bank managers.
- Two factors of role stress, namely, role erosion and role overload emerged predictors of normative commitment of MP state scale-2 bank managers.
- A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of overall total organizational commitment of MP state scale-2 bank managers.
- Overall quality of working life (QWL) of MP state scale-2 bank managers significantly affected their overall psychological well-being (PWB).
- A single factor of quality of working life, namely, supervisory roles emerged predictor of good mental health of MP state scale-2 bank managers.
- Two factors of quality of working life, namely, supervisory roles and self respect emerged predictors of poor mental health of MP state scale-2 bank managers.
- Two factors of quality of working life, namely, self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of social support of MP state scale-2 bank managers.
• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, organizational climate and self respect emerged predictors of social stressor of MP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Three factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation; employee relations and supervisory roles emerged predictors of work support of MP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation and organizational commitment emerged predictors of work stressor of MP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, union management relations and organizational climate emerged predictors of personal support of MP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Three factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions; clarity in organization and self respect emerged predictors of personal stressor of MP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions; recognition; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total quality of working life of MP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Overall role stress (RS) of MP state scale-2 bank managers significantly affected their overall psychological well-being (PWB).

• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of good mental health of MP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role expectation conflict and role erosion emerged predictors of poor mental health of MP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Three factors of role stress, namely, role erosion; personal inadequacy and total role stress emerged predictors of social support of MP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role inadequacy and total role stress emerged predictors of social stressor of MP state scale-2 bank managers.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, inter role distance emerged predictor of work support of MP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation and total role stress emerged predictors of work stressor of MP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role ambiguity and total role stress emerged predictors of personal support of MP state scale-2 bank managers.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, inter role distance emerged predictor of personal stressor of MP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role ambiguity and role inadequacy emerged predictors of organizational commitment overall total role stress of MP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Overall quality of working life (QWL) of UP state scale-2 bank managers significantly affected their overall organizational commitment (OC).
• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation; physical working conditions; trust and promotion emerged predictors of affective commitment of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions and organizational commitment emerged predictors of continuance commitment of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of normative commitment of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Overall role stress (RS) of UP state scale-2 bank managers significantly affected their overall organizational commitment (OC).

• A single factor of role stress, namely, self role distance emerged predictor of affective commitment of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, role stagnation emerged predictor of continuance commitment of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, inter role distance emerged predictor of normative commitment of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of overall total organizational commitment of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Overall quality of working life (QWL) of UP state scale-2 bank managers significantly affected their overall psychological well-being (PWB).

• None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of good mental health of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, supervisory roles and self respect emerged predictors of poor mental health of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Seven factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself; physical working conditions; organizational climate; supervisory roles; clarity in organization; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of social support of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Three factors of quality of working life, namely, union management relations; employee relations and economic benefits emerged predictors of social stressor of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself; physical working conditions; employee relations and organizational commitment emerged predictors of work support of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, employee health emerged predictor of work stressor of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, employee participation; trust; clarity in organization and self respect emerged predictors of personal support of UP state scale-2 bank managers.
• Three factors of quality of working life, namely, organizational climate; clarity in organization and self respect emerged predictors of personal stressor of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, inter group relations; supervisory roles; employee health and promotion emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Overall role stress (RS) of UP state scale-2 bank managers significantly affected their overall psychological well-being (PWB).

• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of good mental health of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, role isolation emerged predictor of poor mental health of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, role inadequacy emerged predictor of social support of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, self role distance and role ambiguity emerged predictors of social stressor of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of work support of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Three factors of role stress, namely, role expectation conflict; role overload and role isolation emerged predictors of work stressor of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Two factors of role stress, namely, role isolation and total role stress emerged predictors of personal support of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of personal stressor of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of overall total psychological well-being of UP state scale-2 bank managers.

• Overall quality of working life (QWL) of MP state scale-3 bank managers significantly affected their overall organizational commitment (OC).

• None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of affective commitment of MP state scale-3 bank managers.

• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, union management relations emerged predictor of continuance commitment of MP state scale-3 bank managers.

• None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of normative commitment of MP state scale-3 bank managers.

• Two factors of quality of working life, namely economic benefits and promotion emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment of MP state scale-3 bank managers.

• Overall role stress (RS) of MP state scale-3 bank managers significantly affected their overall organizational commitment (OC).

• A single factor of role stress, namely, role stagnation emerged predictor of affective commitment of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of role stress, namely, personal inadequacy emerged predictor of continuance commitment of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of role stress, namely, inter role distance emerged predictor of normative commitment of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Two factors of role stress, namely, inter role distance and total role stress emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Overall quality of working life (QWL) of MP state scale-3 bank managers significantly affected their overall psychological well-being (PWB).
• None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of good mental health of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions emerged predictor of poor mental health of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself; supervisory roles; self respect and total quality of working life emerged predictors of social support of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions emerged predictor of social stressor of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, organizational climate and employee relations emerged predictors of work support of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, autonomy at work emerged predictor of work stressor of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, work itself and total quality of working life emerged predictors of personal support of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, employee relations emerged predictor of personal stressor of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Five factors of quality of working life, namely, union management relations; organizational climate; clarity in organization; promotion and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Overall role stress (RS) of MP state scale-3 bank managers significantly affected their overall psychological well-being (PWB).
• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of good mental health of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of poor mental health of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Two factors of role stress, namely, self role distance and role inadequacy emerged predictors of social support of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of social stressor of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of role stress, namely, role inadequacy emerged predictor of work support of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of role stress, namely, self role distance emerged predictor of work stressor of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of role stress, namely, inter role distance emerged predictor of personal support of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of role stress, namely, role inadequacy emerged predictor of personal stressor of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Two factors of role stress, namely, role inadequacy and total role stress emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being of MP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Overall quality of working life (QWL) of UP state scale-3 bank managers significantly affected their overall organizational commitment (OC).
• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions and inter group relations emerged predictors of affective commitment of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of continuance commitment of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, inter group relations and self respect emerged predictors of normative commitment of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Four factors of quality of working life, namely, physical working conditions; autonomy at work; recognition and total quality of working life emerged predictors of overall total organizational commitment of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Overall role stress (RS) of UP state scale-3 bank managers’ significantly affected overall organizational commitment (OC).
• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of affective commitment of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role isolation emerged predictor of continuance commitment of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of normative commitment of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Three factors of role stress, namely, role stagnation; personal inadequacy and total role stress emerged predictor of overall total organizational commitment of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Overall quality of working life (QWL) of UP state scale-3 bank managers significantly affected their overall psychological well-being (PWB).
• None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of good mental health of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of poor mental health of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of social support of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, employee relations emerged predictor of social stressor of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of work support of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of quality of working life, namely, economic benefits emerged predictor of work stressor of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• None of the factors of quality of working life emerged predictor of personal support of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, clarity in organization and total quality of working life emerged predictors of personal stressor of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Two factors of quality of working life, namely, clarity in organization and recognition emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Overall role stress (RS) of UP state scale-3 bank managers significantly affected their overall psychological well-being (PWI).
• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of good mental health of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Two factors of role stress, namely, role inadequacy and total role stress emerged predictors of poor mental health of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of social support of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of social stressor of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of work support of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Two factors of role stress, namely, role overload and total role stress emerged predictors of work stressor of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• None of the factors of role stress emerged predictor of personal support of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• A single factor of role stress, namely, total role stress emerged predictor of personal stressor of UP state scale-3 bank managers.
• Three factors of role stress, namely, inter role distance; role overload and total role stress emerged predictors of overall total psychological well-being of UP state scale-3 bank managers.

The results obtained by applying t-test on various comparison groups are concluded as under:
Chapter Five Conclusions and Recommendations

- Mean scores of quality of working life among overall various levels of bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among overall various levels of bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of role stress among overall various levels of bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among overall various levels of bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is significant at .01 level.

- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels of bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels of bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among overall various levels of bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among overall various levels of bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is highly significant.

- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is highly significant.

- Mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.
organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is highly significant.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers. The difference between them is highly significant.

- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers. The difference between them is significant at .01 level.

- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers. The difference between them is significant at .01 level.

- Mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers. The difference between them is highly significant.

- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived...
organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers. The difference between them is significant at .05 level.

- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers. The difference between them is highly significant.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers. The difference between them is highly significant.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers. The difference between them is significant at .05 level.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers. The difference between them is significant at .01 level.

- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is highly significant.

- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is highly significant.

- Mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is highly significant.

- Mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is highly significant.

- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is highly significant.
• Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

• Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is highly significant.

• Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is significant at .02 level.

• Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

• Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is significant at .01 level.

• Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

• Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is significant at .01 level.

• Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is highly significant.

• Mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is highly significant.

• Mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is highly significant.

• Mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is highly significant.

• Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived
organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is highly significant.

- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is highly significant.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is highly significant.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

FURTHER RESEARCH SUGGESTIONS

By keeping in mind the findings of the present study, the following suggestions are enlisted below:

- An otherwise extensive plan of study is required to conduct the underlying study on the samples drawn from various other banking organizations like multi-national banks; cooperative banks; lead banks; regional rural banks (RRBs) and private banks may yield fruitful and varied results.

- Further it is also suggested that this type of research can be replicated on the samples of groups of employees working in some organizations other than banking organizations like railways, educational institutes; medical professionals; government employees of various departments like PHE; PWD; EBS and they may also be considered to be the source of sample.

- It would be suggested to use much larger samples.

- Inversion of the dependent and independent variables may be carried on.

- Inclusion and exclusion of one or more variables for the study may lead to varied and substantial results.
Summary
The present investigation is systematically designed in accordance with the aims and objectives. Generally, it assumes significance as related to quality of working life; stress arising out of the role played by an employee in the organization (bank); perceived commitment to the organization in which the employee works and psychological well-being of the bank managers and such other aspects of organizational behaviour. But, specifically, the study aims at relational comparisons of the scale one; scale two and scale three bank managers of the central Indian state of Madhya Pradesh and the north Indian state of Uttar Pradesh respectively.

Keeping in view the problem of the present investigation, the random sampling technique was applied for data collection. The sample comprised of 300 subjects of bank managers in all. 150 bank managers have been selected from the state of MP and 150 bank managers have been selected from the state of UP. Later on each state's bank managers had been divided into three groups, namely, scale one bank managers; scale two bank managers and scale three bank managers respectively, with 50 bank managers of each scale.

In all eleven comparison groups have been formulated. Likewise the results are divided into twelve different parts. Altogether 160 null hypotheses have been formed, and each of the hypotheses is tested to meet out the objectives of the research.

Various tools which have been used for gathering the information are valid and reliable. Quality of Working Life Scale developed and standardized by Shawkat and Ansari (2000) has been used. It is a five point scale with 48 items divided among 17 dimensions, and its range is from 48 to 240. Role Stress scale developed and standardized by Paieck (1977) has been used. It is a five point scale with 21 items divided among 10 dimensions, and its range is from 21 to 105. Further for measuring the dependent variable Organizational Commitment Scale developed and standardized by Shawkat and Ansari (2000) has been used. It is a seven point scale with 15 items divided among 3 dimensions, and its range is from 15 to 105. The last scale is Psychological Well-Being Scale developed and standardized by Nishizawa (1996) has been used. It is a five point scale with 40 items divided among 8 dimensions, and its range is from 40 to 200. All the scales have been individually administered upon the respondents. Scoring has been done separately as instructed by the authors. Finally, stepwise multiple regression and t-test have been applied to analyze the data.

The major findings of the results show-

- Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP and UP states.
- Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of MP and UP states.
• Role stress influenced psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of MP and UP states.
• Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
• Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
• Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
• Role stress influenced psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of MP state.
• Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
• Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
• Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
• Role stress influenced psychological well-being among overall various levels bank managers of UP state.
• Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale one bank managers of MP and UP states.
• Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale one bank managers of MP and UP states.
• Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale one bank managers of MP and UP states.
• Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale one bank managers of MP and UP states.
• Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale two bank managers of MP and UP states.
• Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale two bank managers of MP and UP states.
• Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale two bank managers of MP and UP states.
• Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale two bank managers of MP and UP states.
• Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale three bank managers of MP and UP states.
• Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale three bank managers of MP and UP states.
• Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale three bank managers of MP and UP states.
• Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale three bank managers of MP and UP states.
• Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale one bank managers of MP state.
• Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale one bank managers of MP state.
• Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale one bank managers of MP state.
• Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale one bank managers of MP state.
• Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale two bank managers of MP state.
• Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale two bank managers of MP state.
• Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale two bank managers of MP state.
• Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale two bank managers of MP state.
• Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale three bank managers of MP state.
• Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale three bank managers of MP state.
• Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale three bank managers of MP state.
• Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale three bank managers of MP state.
• Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale one bank managers of UP state.
• Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale one bank managers of UP state.
• Quality of working life had not influenced psychological well-being among scale one bank managers of UP state.
• Role stress had not influenced psychological well-being among scale one bank managers of UP state.
• Quality of working life had not influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale two bank managers of UP state.
• Role stress had not influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale two bank managers of UP state.
• Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale two bank managers of UP state.
• Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale two bank managers of UP state.
• Quality of working life influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale three bank managers of UP state.
Role stress influenced perceived organizational commitment among scale three bank managers of UP state.

Quality of working life influenced psychological well-being among scale three bank managers of UP state.

Role stress influenced psychological well-being among scale three bank managers of UP state.

Further the results of t-test show-

- Mean scores of quality of working life among overall various levels of bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among overall various levels of bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.
- Mean scores of role stress among overall various levels of bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among overall various levels of bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.
- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels of bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among overall various levels of bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.
- Mean scores of psychological well-being among overall various levels of bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among overall various levels of bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.
- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.
- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.
- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.
- Mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is non-significant.
- Mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.
- Mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is non-significant.
• Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

• Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

• Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

• Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

• Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.

• Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

• Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.

• Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.

• Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.

• Mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers. The difference between them is non-significant.

• Mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.

• Mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers. The difference between them is non-significant.
Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.

Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.

Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.

Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.

Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.

Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers. There is a significant difference between them.

Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.

Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.

Mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.

Mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

Mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.

Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.
Summary

- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of MP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of MP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of quality of working life among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of quality of working life among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of role stress among scale-1 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of role stress among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of role stress among scale-3 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

- Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is non-significant.
• Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

• Mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of perceived organizational commitment among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

• Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-1 bank managers of UP state. There is a significant difference between them.

• Mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-3 bank managers of UP state is higher as compared to the mean scores of psychological well-being among scale-2 bank managers of UP state. The difference between them is non-significant.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is a universally known fact that research in any discipline and especially in social sciences is a never ending effort. Similarly any study cannot be free from criticism from varied sides. Researches in psychology focuses on few problem areas, and during the processing of the investigation the researcher comes to know about the novel areas which were unknown during starting the particular study. Each and every research scholar is enthusiastic and is inclined to pursue research which is comprehensive and enduring. However in due process of completion of research, many hurdles and shortcomings pass by the researcher. In a long time period of completing the thesis and thus achieving the desired goal, the investigator has to keep on working by ignoring some important variables because of paucity of time; financial constraints etc. Sometimes the respondents are not available; the other time they may not have the time to answer the investigator’s questions and so on and so forth. As all these unavoidable hindrances accompany a researcher all through the research, many variables in the psychological researches remains unexplored.

By keeping in mind the limitations of the present study, it is suggested that-

• An otherwise extensive plan of study is required to conduct the underlying study on the samples drawn from various other banking organizations like multi-
national banks; cooperative banks; lead banks; regional rural banks (RRBs) and private banks may yield fruitful and varied results.

- Further it is also suggested that this type of research can be replicated on the samples of groups of employees working in some organizations other than banking organizations like railways, educational institutes; medical professionals; government employees of various departments like PHE; PWD; EBS may also be considered to be the source of sample.

- It would be suggested to use much larger samples.

- On the contrary, inversion of the dependent and independent variables of the study as-well-as inclusion and seclusion of one or more variables for the study may lead to varied and substantial results.

- The study can be transformed into a cross-cultural study.
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Appendices
Dear Respondents,

You are presented with a series of four questionnaires. You are requested to answer each and every statement mentioned in them. The success of my study depends on your honest responses.

You are requested not to reveal your identity. Rest assured, the confidentiality of your responses will be kept truly.

We are confident of your whole hearted cooperation. Once again, kindly help me in achieving my objectives.

Thank You

Shaili Misra
Research Scholar
Department of Psychology
A.M.U., Aligarh
APPENDIX I

QUALITY OF WORK LIFE MEASURE

INSTRUCTIONS

The following statements pertain to your work. Against each statement you have to endorse your response in a manner given below:

- Assign ‘5’ to the statements of “High Agreement”.
- Assign ‘4’ to the statements of “Agreement”.
- Assign ‘3’ to the statements for which you have “Neutral” opinion.
- Assign ‘2’ to the statements of “Disagreement”.
- Assign ‘1’ to the statement of “High Disagreement”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Disagree-Highly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Organization/Company gives us opportunity in decision-making pertaining to company’s policies and functions.

2. Employees in the organization/Company have satisfaction with the company’s leave rules and other policies affecting employees work related behavior.

3. Thinking of going to the job makes me feel sick.

4. Supervisors generally encourage people here to make use of their best efforts for good performance.

5. Good opportunities and freedom are here to use special skills and abilities in my job.

6. People with whom I work are very co-operative.

7. There is a greater clarity in the functioning and activities of the organization.

8. My company takes enough care of employees performance record while awarding promotion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Company provides good working environment for employees to work under stress-free condition.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sense of achievement comes through my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I feel that my quality of life will remain the same even after retirement because company/organization ensures ideal retirement benefits.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My supervisor and the company/organization always have their expectations and policies very clear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Management gives due respect to each and every employee here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Doing my job well, I get a feeling of satisfaction.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Supervisors invite suggestions, opinion and ideas from their employees and consider them for improving organizational/company’s functioning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Management has great appreciation about the importance of my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I have a say in deciding how to schedule my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I feel satisfied with the working of my company’s employees’ union.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>My supervisor maintains good relations with people at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Adequate medical facilities are provided for employees and their family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Employees have a lot of freedom to perform their work activity in their own best way.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>My organization/company always make efforts to improve physical working conditions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Employees willingly get motivated to work as a team member.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Skill, abilities, and performances are highly appreciated by the company.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Promotion in my company/organization is not a constraint for a good worker. 
26. I am satisfied with organization/company's fair policies with respect to company treatment with all employees. 
27. My work is interesting. 
28. Nothing comes in the way in opting the new best method in performing the task. 
29. Management does not allow employees to give their suggestion in any matter of the organization/company. 
30. My relations with co-workers are highly satisfactory here. 
31. Employees are generally satisfied with the perks and benefits being given by the company. 
32. My supervisor has great confidence. 
33. I feel that my work conditions such as plant maintenance related to machine and tools, lighting noise, temperature, etc., are sufficiently in good conditions. 
34. Employees generally here have high and positive opinion about each other. 
35. I have a feeling of being a part of the company. 
36. I have good family relations. 
37. Organization/company here has a clear-cut and reasonable goals and objectives. 
38. My job makes me feel to have enough prestige within the company/organization. 
39. Management practically recognize employees union and pay much attention to our union's actions. 
40. Employees generally have satisfaction with the pay/salary they are receiving.
41. Managers and supervisors here provide greater opportunity to set target for production through mutual understanding.

42. The real pleasure comes to me through working with this organization/company.

43. Employees generally are highly satisfied with the "saving plan" and retrieval facilities.

44. I and my family members feel satisfied with respect to our quality of life.

45. Management and the employees of this company/organization always help employees when they are in need to overcome their stress.

46. I get due recognition for the good work I perform here.

47. I and my organization/company are made for each other.

48. My organization/company provides me all opportunity to feel part of the management.

Please, do not leave any question/statement unanswered
APPENDIX II

ROLE - STRESS SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS

Some job related aspects have been given below and you are requested to indicate your reactions that to what extent you are making efforts to bring about changes and the response to each aspects of work be given in the following manner:

- Assign ‘5’ when ‘Very High’ efforts are being made
- Assign ‘4’ when ‘High’ efforts are being made
- Assign ‘3’ when ‘Moderate’ efforts are being made
- Assign ‘2’ when ‘Low’ efforts are being made
- Assign ‘1’ when ‘Very Low’ efforts are being made

1. Changing behavior from more auto-bureaucratic to more liberal-democratic behavior to control employee’s work behavior
2. Decentralization of work responsibility
3. Openness in the company/organization
4. Opting most efficient methods/machine and tools for enhancing productive efficiency
5. Changing mode/of payments to workers, i.e., from piece wage to salary system
6. Developing concept of permanency for employees
7. Changing the design of the product as per consumer need and market demand
8. Changing organization/company into well planned structure
9. Developing healthy relations with employees
10. Changing quality product to give better service to customers
11. Controlling production rate
12. Changing work duration from 9 hrs or more a day to maximum 8 hours a day or so
13. Changing old system of one top man (owner/manager) show to new system of participative management
14. Replacing old machine by installing new sophisticated machines ( ) for improving quality production
15. Changing work style by encouraging workers to give suggestions to ( ) improve organizational efficiency
16. Improving skills of employees' through some kind of training ( )
17. Developing positive attitude of employees' towards their work ( )
18. Developing concept of loyalty among employees' towards ( ) organization
19. Developing increased team spirit among employees' ( )
20. Designing jobs in such a way through which work may become ( ) comfortable and easy
21. Changes in the company are happily accepted by the employees ( ) because they benefit them
### APPENDIX III

### ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT SCALE

**INSTRUCTIONS**

Listed below are a series of statements that represent possible feelings that individuals might have about the company/organization for which they work. Please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement. Responses to each item are to be measured on a 7-point scale with scale point labeled as:

- Assign ‘1’ when you “Strongly Disagree”
- Assign ‘2’ when you “Moderately Disagree”
- Assign ‘3’ when you “Slightly Disagree”
- Assign ‘4’ when you “Neither Agree Nor Disagree”
- Assign ‘5’ when you “Slightly Agree”
- Assign ‘6’ when you “Moderately Agree”
- Assign ‘7’ when you “Strongly Agree”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel proud of being attached to my organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel that I would be at loss when I would be leaving this organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel a firm conviction of not leaving my job in this organization/company because this organization/company has helped me to stand on my feet.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do not leave the office/work-place unless I complete my task/work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I can never think of leaving this organization/company even if my promotion is delayed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My organization/company has provided me opportunity to live with dignity on this earth, So I can never think to switch over to other organization/company.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I believe should not overstay in the organization/company at the cost of family affairs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My organization/company is sufficiently fulfilling my needs which other organization/company cannot do.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. I feel sorry and dissatisfied when I fail to utilize my utmost efforts for meeting the goals of the organization/company.

10. Personal benefits are more important than to help promote organizational development.

11. I love to work for my organization/company.

12. What status I am enjoying here, I could not have found it in any other organization/company.

13. I live, eat, and breathe my job in this organization/company.

14. I do not delay my work because I cannot take any risk of being kicked out from this organization/company.

15. Real pleasure comes to me only when I accomplish the task.
### APPENDIX IV

**PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING SCALE**

**INSTRUCTIONS**

The following 40 statements are concerned with psychic well-being. Please circle the number which best indicates how well each statement applies to you, taking into account your usual feelings of well-being. There are no right or wrong responses. Please be honest. Total confidentiality is guaranteed. DON’T SIGN YOUR NAME. Remember, you are the only one who will know how this form has been filled out. Please feel free to make comments anywhere in the margins, when you want to.

- Don’t apply at all: 1
- Applies very slightly: 2
- Applies moderately: 3
- Applies quite well: 4
- Applies very well: 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I am full of energy enthusiasm about life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I find it easy to relax, play or have fun.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I often investigate or try new things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I am generally satisfied with life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I have dreams or aspirations for a better life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I don’t care what happens and feel life given up and running away.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I am moody, sad and depressed or cry easily.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I keep to myself and avoid others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I tire easily, am listless or restless, or have difficulty sleeping.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I often have headaches, back/neck pains, or feel faint or dizzy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I get well with my family and neighbours.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I enjoy being with my friends and doing things with them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I am currently in love.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I have someone to help me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I have number of good, loyal friends or companions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>There is no one I really care about or who cares about me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>People are always bothering me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>People often insult or make fun of me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Circumstances make it necessary for me to be separated from my family to those I love.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>People discharge with me or are against what I want to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>At work, I feel I am helping to make the world better.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>My work makes me feel important and powerful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>The people I work with, like me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Where I work, I have chance to earn and improve myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>The work I do gives me personal satisfaction, dignity and pride.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>At work, I have to fight to get ahead.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>My work is too simple, repetitions routine, and boring.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>People take me for granted and never appreciate what I do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>There is no chance to rest when I am tired.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I have to do too much work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I tend to look on the good side of life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I am happy about myself, I like who I am.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I can take the presence when I have to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I recall quickly from stressful events.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>The hardship I have serves a worthwhile purpose.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Let things bother me for a long time, even though it does no good.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. I have difficulty in getting started one what I have to do.

38. No matter what I do, it will not be right.

39. I am impatient with myself, and with other people.

40. I need a lot of support and encouragement.
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION BLANK

*Kindly furnish the following information:*

- Name of the organization
- Section Designation
- Work experience (in years)
- Number of promotion earned
- Special Training, if any
- Age Marital Status
- Educational Level
- Total salary (per month) Rupees
- Place of Work

*(Please use the space if you want to mention any other aspect not covered)*