Organizational Role Stress in Telecom Organization

Mr.N.Raja Rajeshwaran, Dr. U. Syed Aktharsha,
(Jamal Institute of Management, Jamal Mohamed College, Tiruchirapalli –20)
(Jamal Institute of Management, Jamal Mohamed College, Tiruchirappalli –20)

Abstract: *Modern life is full of stress. Stress is an inevitable consequence of socio-economic complexity, and to some extent, its stimulant as well. The term stress will be used here to refer to such terms and concepts as strain, pressure, etc. Even as stress is inevitable in today's complex life, so it is necessary for human progress. The purpose of this paper is to examine the relationship between the variables causing stress. For this study, a sample of 155 executives was drawn from the population of 425 executives working in telecom sector using a structured questionnaire.*

The results of correlation analysis have shown that there exist a positive and highest correlation between Inter role distance and role overload, role stagnation and self role distance, role expectation and inter role distance, role erosion and resource inadequacy, role isolation and inter role distance, personal inadequacy and role overload, self role distance and role expectation conflict, role ambiguity and resource inadequacy, resource inadequacy and inter role distance.

Key Words: *Role Stress, Role Overload, Role Isolation, Role Erosion, Role Ambiguity .*

I.   Introduction

Modern life is full of stress. As organizations become more complex the potential for, and the amount of stress increases. Urbanization, industrialization and the increase in scale of operations in the society are some of the reasons for rising stress. Stress is an inevitable consequence of socio-economic complexity, and to some extent, its stimulant as well. People experience stress as they can no longer have complete control over what happens in their lives. There being no escape from stress in modern life, we need to find ways of using stress productively, and reducing dysfunctional stress. The term stress will be used here to refer to such terms and concepts as strain, pressure, etc. Even as stress is inevitable in today's complex life, so it is necessary for human progress. A distinction has been made between productive or functional stress (stress for creative work, entrepreneurial activities, Olympic competitions, etc.) and dysfunctional stress (stress of boredom, unmanageable conflicts, overwork, etc.) The former has been called 'eustress' and the latter 'distresses.

Stress is an inevitable part of our life. Academicians, practitioners, administrators and researchers have always been interested in studying this problem as it directly affects the efficiency of the employee. An optimum amount of stress is required for an optimum performance. The present study was undertaken in Telecom sector, Tiruchirapalli .

Conceptual Framework of Role

Role is the position one occupies in the system, and is defined by the functions one performs in response to the expectations of the significant members of a social system, and one's own expectations from that position or office. A role is not defined without the expectations of the role senders, including the role occupant. The position of a Human Resource Manager may be created in an organization, but his role will be defined by the expectations (stated or unstated) that different persons have from the Human resource manager, and the expectations that he, in turn, has from the role. In this sense, the role gets defined in each system by the role senders, including the role occupant.

Role Space Conflicts

Role space is the dynamic relationship between the various roles and individual occupies and his self. It has three main variables; self, the role under question and the other roles he occupies. Any conflict among these is referred to as role space conflict or stress. These conflicts may take several forms.

Self Role distance: This stress arises out of the conflict between the self concept and the expectations from the role, as perceived by the role occupant. If a person occupies a role that he may subsequently find to be conflicting with the self concept, he feels stressed.

Role Stagnation: As an individual grows older, he also grows in the role that he occupies in an organization. With the individual's advancement, the role changes; and with his change in role, the need for taking on a new role becomes crucial. This problem of role growth becomes acute especially when an individual who has occupied a role for a long time enters another role in which he feel less secure. The new role demands

that an individual outgrows the previous one and takes charge of new the role effectively. This is bound to produce some stress.

Inter-role distance: When an individual occupies more than one role there are bound to be conflicts between them. For example, a lady executive often faces a conflict between her organizational role as an executive and her familial role as a wife and mother. The demands on her time by husband and children may be incompatible with organizational demands. Such inter-role conflicts are quite frequent in a modern society, where an individual is increasingly occupying multiple roles in various organizations and groups.

Role Set Conflicts

The role set consists of important persons who have varying expectations from the role that an individual occupies. The conflicts which arise as a result of incompatibility among these expectations by the significant others (and by the individual himself) are referred to as role sets.

Role Ambiguity: When an individual is not clear about the various expectations that people have from his role he faces role ambiguity. Role ambiguity may be due to lack of information available to a role occupant, or his lack of understanding of the cues available to him. Role ambiguity may be in relation to activities, responsibilities, priorities, norms or general expectations. Generally, role ambiguity is experienced by persons occupying roles that are newly created in organizations, roles that are undergoing change, or process roles (with less clear and less concrete activities).

Role expectation Conflict: When there are conflicting expectations or demands by different roles senders (persons having expectations from the role), the role occupant experiences this type of stress. The conflicting expectations may be from the boss, subordinates, peers or clients.

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

Role Erosion: A role occupant may feel that the functions he would like to perform are being done by some other role. Role erosion is the individual's subjective feeling that some important expectations that he has from a role are shared by other roles within the role set. Role erosion is likely to be experienced in an organization that is redefining its role and creating new roles. Studies indicate that in several such organizations the stress of role erosion was inevitably felt. In one organization, a particular role was abolished and in its place two were created to cater to executive and planning needs. This led to great erosion, and a feeling that the new roles were less important than the previous role.

Resource Inadequacy: Resource inadequacy stress is experienced when the resources required by a role occupant for performing his role is effectively are not available. Resources may include information, people, material, finance or facilities.

Personal Inadequacy: When a role occupant feels that he does not have enough knowledge, skills or training to undertake a role effectively, or that he has not had time to prepare for the assigned role he may experience stress. Persons who are assigned new roles without adequate preparation or orientation are likely to experience feelings of personal inadequacy.

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

Need of the Study

Jothi Sharma and Arti Devi (2011) undertook a study titled "Role Stress among Executives : An Empirical study of Commercial Banks". In this study, the authors identified that the critical importance of a stress-free work-life for an organization for creating and sustaining competitive advantage cannot be underestimated and it comes with the realization that Executives are susceptible to high levels of stress. Aizzat Mohd Nasurdin , T.Ramayah and S.Kumaresan undertook a study titled "Organizational Stressors and Job stress among Managers: The moderating Role of Neuroticism ". In this study, Neuroticism was found to moderate the effects of the three organizational stressors (alienation, work overload, and unfavorable work environment) on job stress. Modekurti and Chattopadhyay(2008) under took a study titled "A study on service-oriented jobs, which involve a direct interaction with customers, are prone to create relatively greater stress levels for Executives in service sectors". In his study, the authors found that the balance between their personal and professional lives.

From the literature review, it is observed that the concept of 'Organizational role stress' has been less explored in the field of Telecom sector. So, the study has been undertaken to understand the variables causing stress to executives working in Telecom sector.

Research Objectives
➢ To study the Demographic profile of Executives in Grade level A and B of select Telecom organization.
➢ To examine the relationship between the variables causing stress among the executives of Telecom organization.

II.   Review Of Literature

Modekurti and Chattopadhyay(2008) highlighted that the stress levels was more overwhelming in the case of women Executives due to the greater need among them to strike a balance between their personal and   professional lives. Recent years have seen that in addition to the traditional family and societal expectations, women are also required to meet their more demanding professional tasks. Hence, caught in the midst of such an array of expectations, they experience severe stress, which takes a toll on their life styles.

Rutledge, John Edvord (2000) found that there is a difference between the agencies new questions wise from the study as to the nature and cause of the organizational stress differences that warrant further research.

Jothi Sharma and Arti Devi (2011) have demonstrated that the direct and indirect costs of stress. Due to its cost, the critical importance of a stress-free work-life for an organization for creating and sustaining competitive advantage cannot be underestimated and it comes with the realization that Executives are susceptible to high levels of stress. A survey in 2007 by Associated Chamber of Commerce and Industry of India also reported that work related stress and mental fatigue is affecting the Indian Executives (www.assocham.org). In such an environment, it becomes the responsibility of the employing organizations and the individual to identify the causes of stress at the workplace and make efforts to reduce them for the effectiveness and efficiency of the individual and the organization itself.

Anita DeLongis and Susan Holtzman (2005) suggested that Personality and social relationships play an important role in almost every aspect of stress and coping. Daily process methods are particularly useful in elucidating how these factors might influence both responses to and outcomes of stress. Our work has linked both dimensions of personality, particularly the Big Five, and aspects of social relationships, particularly social support, to the likelihood of engaging in certain coping strategies and the effectiveness or outcomes of these coping strategies. In addition, we have found the effect of personality on coping and stress outcomes to vary by the situational context in which stress occurs. We review findings from our recent daily process studies of stress, coping, and social support. Further, we discuss the costs and benefits of the daily process methodology for addressing these questions, highlighting the clinical utility of findings gleaned with the use of this approach. Finally, we discuss future directions and applications of daily process methods to the study of stress and coping. As defined by Ritu Lehal (2007) highlighted that two important variables related to behavioral science viz. Organizational role stress and Job satisfaction. The study reveals that in case of ORS and JS both, the results of public sector are better than private sector. Further in public sector, female executives are more stressful than males. But in case of JS, in the same sector, female executives are more satisfied with their jobs. The correlation analysis brings to light that there is a strong but negative relationship between two variables. The Hest also confirms the significance of studying the two variables together.

S. Karve, S. K. Nair (2010) suggested that an effort to extend theory & research on the effect of role stress on individuals and their coping ability, the relationship between Role Stress and Coping with Role Stress among women executives was examined. In today's world more women are taking up managerial responsibilities which require them to balance multiple roles both at work and at home. This automatically gives rise to some amount of stress. The research examines the different role stressors encountered by women executives and the coping style used by them, to deal with these stressors. Results showed that executives tend to use more of proactive style of Approach Mode of Coping with Role Stress wherein they deal with Role Stress through own efforts, seeking help from significant others and using organizational resources to reduce role stress.

Aizzat Mohd Nasurdin , T.Ramayah and S.Kumaresan have determine that influence of organizational variables (conflict, blocked career, alienation, work overload, and unfavorable work environment) on job stress among managers and, second, to examine whether this relationship varies according to the individual's level of neuroticism. Analyses of 285 responses using hierarchical regression revealed that three of the five organizational variables (conflict, blocked career, and alienation) had significant positive effects on job stress. Neuroticism was found to moderate the effects of the three organizational stressors (alienation, work overload, and unfavorable work environment) on job stress. Implications for managerial practice and future research are discussed.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This basically is an empirical study and as the name suggests it relies on experience or observation alone, and it can even be without due regard for system and theory (Kothari, 2004). This is basically a data-based research, which can give conclusions based on observation.

Respondents

The respondents are employees who are Grade A and Grade B Executives of Telecom organization in Tiruchirapalli District. The sample size of the study is 155 Executives. Simple random sampling was adopted. Finally, the metric in the form of a self-administered questionnaire with 5-point Likert scale was used to collect data from 155 executives.

Procedure

With the support of HR Manager, the respondents were contacted during their free timings and the objective as well as the importance of the research was explained, and also, it was ensured that there would be no bias in their response.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire consists of two parts namely Part I and Part II**.** The part I contained 7 questions on Demographic factors of users such as Age, Gender, Marital Status, educational qualification, designation, Year of experience and Year of experience in this Cadre. Part- II consists of the conceptual factors such as Self Role distance with 5 questions, Role Stagnation with 5 questions, Inter-role distance with 5 questions, Role Ambiguity with 5 questions, Role expectation Conflict with 5 questions, Role Overload with 5 questions, Role Erosion with 5 questions, Resource Inadequacy with 5 questions, Personal Inadequacy with 5 questions, and Role Isolation with 5 questions. The scaling values are 1- Rarely; 2- occasionally; 3- sometimes; 4- frequently; 5- always.

IV. Data Analysis

Demographic profile of the respondents

Out of 155 respondents, 3.6 percent of the executives were between the age group of 31-35 years, 7.3 percent of the executives were between the age group of 36-40 years, 9.1 percent of the executives were between the age group of 41-45 years, 18.2 percent of the executives were between the age group of 46-50 years and 61.8 percent of the executives were between the age group of 51 & above. 60 percent of the executives are Male and 40 percent of the executives are Female.1.8 percent of the executives were single and 98.2 percent of the executives were married. 61.8 percent of the executives were UG holders, 25.5 percent of the executives were PG holders and 12.7 percent of the executives were Professional holders. About 7.3 percent of the executives were in cadre of D.E, 5.5 percent of the executives were in cadre of A.G.M, 7.3 percent of the executives were in cadre of C.A.O, 47.3 percent of the executives were in cadre of S.D.E, 12.7 percent of the executives were in cadre of J.T.O, 7.3 percent of the executives were in cadre of J.A.O, 12.7 percent of the executives were in cadre of A.O. 1.8 percent of the executives were in experience of 6-10 years, 10.9 percent of the executives were in experience of 11-15 years, 1.8 percent of the executives were in experience of 16-20 years and 85.5 percent of the executives were in experience of 20 & above years. 27.3 percent of the executives were experience in present cadre of 0-5 years, 14.5 percent of the executives were experience in present cadre of 6-10 years, 40 percent of the executives were experience in present cadre of 11-15 years, 1.8 percent of the executives were experience in present cadre of 16-20 years and 16.4 percent of the executives were experience in present cadre of 20 & above years.

Table 1. Multiple Correlations

The Table 1. shows the Correlations between the Dimension Inter- Role Distance , Role Stagnation , Role Expectation Conflict , Role Erosion , Role Overload , Role Isolation , Personal Inadequacy , Self – Role Distance , Role Ambiguity , Resource Inadequacy of Organizational Role Stress.

		Ird	Rs	Rec	Re	Ro	ri	pin	srd	ra	Rin
Ird	Pearson Correlation	1.000	.547	.747	.499	.770	.756	.553	.697	.660	.766
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	155.000	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155
Rs	Pearson Correlation	.547	1.000	.555	.386	.575	.587	.526	.596	.583	.497
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.004	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	155	155.000	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155

Rec	Pearson Correlation	.747	.555	1.000	.477	.570	.690	.483	.740	.655	.696
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	155	155	155.000	155	155	155	155	155	155	155
Re	Pearson Correlation	.499	.386	.477	1.000	.308	.563	.390	.493	.444	.593
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.004	.000		.022	.000	.003	.000	.001	.000
	N	155	155	155	155.000	155	155	155	155	155	155
Ro	Pearson Correlation	.770	.575	.570	.308	1.000	.672	.766	.667	.590	.671
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.022		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	155	155	155	155	155.000	155	155	155	155	155
Ri	Pearson Correlation	.756	.587	.690	.563	.672	1.000	.479	.561	.637	.709
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	155	155	155	155	155	155.000	155	155	155	155
Pin	Pearson Correlation	.553	.526	.483	.390	.766	.479	1.000	.670	.517	.587
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.003	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	155	155	155	155	155	155	155.000	155	155	155
Srd	Pearson Correlation	.697	.596	.740	.493	.667	.561	.670	1.000	.653	.683
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155.000	155	155
Ra	Pearson Correlation	.660	.583	.655	.444	.590	.637	.517	.653	1.000	.721
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155.000	155
Rin	Pearson Correlation	.766	.497	.696	.593	.671	.709	.587	.683	.721	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155	155.000

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The dimension Inter- Role Distance (Ird) is moderately correlated with the other dimensions Role Stagnation (.547) , Role Erosion (.499) , Personal Inadequacy (.553) and highly correlated with Role Expectation Conflict (.747) , Role Overload (.770) , Role Isolation (.756) , Self – Role Distance (.697) , Role Ambiguity (.660) , Resource Inadequacy (.766) and it is significant at (.000) with all dimensions.

Role Stagnation (Rs) is moderately correlated with the dimensions Inter- Role Distance (.547), Role Expectation Conflict (.555) , Role Overload (.575) , Role Isolation (.587) , Personal Inadequacy (.526) , Self – Role Distance (.596), Role Ambiguity (.583), Resource Inadequacy (.497) and it is significant at (.000). There is mildly correlation between Role Erosion (.386) and it is moderately significant at (.004).

Role Expectation Conflict (Rec) is moderately correlated with the dimensions Role Erosion (.477), Personal Inadequacy (.483) and it is significant at (.000). the Role Expectation Conflict is highly correlated with Inter- Role Distance (.747), Role Stagnation (.555), Role Overload (.570), Role Isolation (.690), Self – Role Distance (.740), Role Ambiguity (.655), Resource Inadequacy (.695) and significant at (.000)

Role Erosion (Re) is moderately correlated with the dimensions Inter- Role Distance (.499), Role Expectation Conflict (.477), Role Isolation (.563), Self – Role Distance (.493), and Resource Inadequacy (.593), and it is significant at (.000). Role Erosion is mildly correlated with Role Stagnation (.385), Role Overload (.308), Personal Inadequacy (.390), and Role Ambiguity (.444) and moderately significant at RS (.004), Role Overload (.022), Personal Inadequacy (.003), Role Ambiguity (.001).

Role Overload (Ro) is moderately correlated with Role Stagnation (.575), Role Expectation Conflict (.570), Role Ambiguity (.590), is highly correlated with Inter- Role Distance (.770), Role Isolation (.672), Personal Inadequacy (.766), Self – Role Distance (.667), Resource Inadequacy (.671) and it is significant at (.000).

Role Isolation (Ri) moderately correlated with Role Stagnation (.587), Role Erosion (.563), Personal Inadequacy (.479), Self – Role Distance (.561) and it is highly correlated with Inter- Role Distance (.756), Role Expectation Conflict (.690), Role Overload (.672), Role Stagnation (.637) and Resource Inadequacy (.709) and it is significant at (.000).

Personal Inadequacy (Pin) it is moderately correlated with Inter- Role Distance (.553), Role Stagnation (.526), Role Expectation Conflict (.483), Role Isolation (.479), Role Ambiguity (.517), Resource Inadequacy (.587) and it is highly correlated with Role Overload (.766), Self – Role Distance (.670) and it is significant at (.000)

Self – Role Distance (Srd) is moderately correlated with Role Erosion (.493), and it is highly correlated with Inter- Role Distance (.697), Role Stagnation (.596), Role Expectation Conflict (.740), Role Overload (.667), Role Isolation (.561), Personal Inadequacy (.670), Role Ambiguity (.653), Resource Inadequacy (.683) and it is significant at (.000).

Role Ambiguity (Ra) is highly correlated with Inter- Role Distance (.660), Role Stagnation (.583), Role Expectation Conflict (.655), Role Overload (.690), Role Isolation (.637), Personal Inadequacy (517), Self – Role Distance (.653), Resource Inadequacy (.721) and it is significant at (.000)

Resource Inadequacy (Rin) is moderately correlated with Role Stagnation (.497) and highly correlated with Inter- Role Distance (.766), Role Expectation Conflict (.696), Role Erosion (.593), Role Overload (.671), Role Isolation (.709), Personal Inadequacy (.587), Self – Role Distance (.683) and Role Ambiguity (.721) and it is significant at (.000)

V.   Discussion

Inter- Role Distance

The study indicates that the Executives occasionally feel their role interfere to their Family life. Similarly they have said that they do not get time to participate in social, religious activities and also with their family. The friends are also occasionally complained that Organizational responsibility is rarely interfering with extra organizational role.

Role Stagnation

The study indicates that the executives occasionally feel that they are not learning enough in their present role for handling the higher responsibilities. They also rarely preoccupied with their present roles and responsibilities to be able to prepare for higher responsibilities. They rarely felt that they have little scope for their personal growth and feel stagnant in their role.

Role Expectation Conflict

The study indicates that the executives are rarely feel that, they are able to meet the conflicting demands of various people, similarly feel that they are able to satisfy the expectations of various peer level people and juniors and meet the satisfaction of clients and others through these are conflicting with one another. They rarely bothered about contradictory expectations of different people.

Role Erosion

The study indicates that the executives rarely feel that their role is reduced in importance recently and their roles are assigned to others. Then they occasionally feel that they have more responsibilities and do much more work than what they are assigned. They sometimes feel that they could have been given more challenging tasks.

Role Overload

The study indicates that the executives occasionally feel their work load is heavy. They rarely feel that the amount of work they have to do interfere with the quality, similarly they have too much of responsibility and some parts of their work are to be reduced. The executives are over burdened in their role.

Role Isolation

The study indicates that the executives are occasionally feel that other roles occupants do not give attention and time to their role , similarly there was more consultation with their role and other roles , similarly no involvement of their role in joint problem solving or collaboration in planning action. And there is not much initiative for discussions or help.

Personal Inadequacy

The study indicates that the executives are rarely feel that they do not have adequate knowledge to handle the role and they similarly feel that they did not have pertinent training to relate to their role. They occasionally feel that they could have more skills to handle the responsibilities of their role and they need

training and preparation in their role to work effective. The executives sometimes feel that they are not prepared well for their role.

Self – Role Distance

The study indicates that the executives are rarely feel that the things they do in their role that they are against the better judgment. Similarly they feel that they are not able to use their training and expertise in their role. They rarely feel that their experience conflict in their values and what they have to do in their roles. The executives occasionally feel that they would do different what they are doing now if they had full freedom to define their role.

Role Ambiguity

The study indicates that the executives are rarely feel that their roles are not defined clearly and they are not clear about the priority of their work. Similarly they are rarely feel that they do not know the expectation of other peoples with whom their roles are vague and unclear and they are not clear about their scope and responsibilities of the role assign to them.

Resource Inadequacy

The study indicates that the executives are occasionally feel that they are not getting information needed to carry out the responsibilities assign to them. Similarly they are not getting enough people to work them and they occasionally feel that they are lack in the necessary facilities needed in their role. The executives rarely feel that they are not getting enough resources to be effective in their role. Similarly they feel that they had more financial resources for the work which is assigned to them.

Recommendations

Training can be given at suitable intervals on Planning, Time Management etc to overcome Stress. Yoga, Laughing therapy, meditation etc to help them to come out of Stress if any. Executives have to be trained to take up higher responsibilities. Executives have to be assigned responsibilities taking in to account of a Potential and Aptitude.

VI.   Conclusion

The study has been undertaken to understand the level of stress and also to investigate the relationship among the various variables causing stress to the executives of Grade A and Grade B of particular Telecom organization. Through analysis it is found that the factors such as role stagnation, role expectation, role erosion, role isolation and role ambiguity are found to be significant predictors of stress. So it is concluded that the administrators of the organization may device some techniques of managing stress about which an orientation program may be organized for the benefit of executives. If the executives are in a position to manage their stress, undoubtedly it will have potential positive impact on their productivity.

References

[1].   Jothi Sharma and Arti Devi (2011). Role Stress among Executives : An Empirical study of Commercial Banks.
[2].   Aizzat Mohd Nasurdin , T.Ramayah and S.Kumaresan. Organizational Stressors and Job stress among Managers: The moderating Role of Neuroticism.
[3].   Modekurti and Chattopadhyay(2008). A study on service-oriented jobs, which involve a direct interaction with customers, are prone to create relatively greater stress levels for Executives in service sectors.
[4].   Rutledge, John Edvord (2000). A study on organizational role stress in two small low enforcement agencies.
[5].   Anita DeLongis and Susan Holtzman (2005). The Role of Stress, Social Support, and Personality in Coping.
[6].   Ritu Lehal (2007). A Study of Organizational Role Stress and Job Satisfaction among Executives in Punjab.
[7].   S. Karve, S. K. Nair (2010). A study on Role Stress and Coping with Role Stress among Indian Women Executives.