



## Effect of Demographic Variable on Organizational Role Stress and Job Satisfaction Relationship: A Study on Private Sector Managers

Shalini Srivastava<sup>1</sup>  
Nidhi Srivastava<sup>2</sup>

---

### **Abstract**

*Stress has become an inevitable part of human life in recent times. It makes life more challenging and charming, however within a limit. In the past two decades, empirical researches on the theme of stress have increased manifold. The study of job satisfaction is important because it can be viewed as an end in itself, since happiness and general well-being are considered the goal of life.*

*The present study was planned to investigate the effect of Age on Organizational stress and job satisfaction among managers of different levels. A sample of 300 managers working in different organizations was selected randomly for the present study. The Organizational Role stress Scale (ORS) developed by Udai Pareek (1993) and Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) by Spector (1985) were used to assess the level of Organisational stress and job satisfaction of the sample. The findings of the study reveals higher levels of Organizational stress and less job satisfaction among junior managers of 20-35 years age than their counterparts in the middle level (36-45 years) and the senior level(46-55years).*

**Key words:** Organisational Role Stress, Job Satisfaction, Reliability, Correlation Coefficient

---

### **Introduction**

As we turn the first page of the new millennium, we witness a plethora of changes occurring in the world. Name anything, world politics,

---

<sup>1</sup> Associate Professor (OB &HR), IILM-College of Management Studies, Greater Noida

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor, IILM-College of Management Studies, Greater Noida

social values, business, technology; in every arena people are facing the heat of tough competition. Everything is getting affected by change, and in turn, also affecting this 'cycle of change.' It is time to step back from the mundane and reflect on the path through which the management discipline has guided the business world so far.

Since the dawn of Human consciousness humankind has been engaged in the pursuit of happiness, peace and stress-free life. In the process, human beings are caught in a dynamic technological whirlpool which has 'spawned mega-bureaucracies, micro-task specialization and greater urbanization. Phenomena like these are closely linked with work settings, which have numerous systems such as production, marketing, finance, administration as well as macro-organizational sub systems like internal-organizational systems and organizational level, goals, strategies, climates, cultures, structures, management styles and performance. These are accountable for the growth of the organization and its role incumbents on the one hand, and society at large on the other.

Stress in the work place is increasingly a critical problem for employees, employers and the society. Researchers who study stress have demonstrated the direct and indirect costs of stress. (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987). There are many variables which have been related to organizational stress. Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) proposed a model of organizational stress research that outlined the major antecedents of work stress. They noted the importance of individual differences as moderators of stress and detailed possible outcomes of stress at work.

Stress is associated with impaired individual functioning in the workplace. A number of aspects of working life have been linked to stress. Aspects of work itself can be stressful, namely work overload (Defrank & Ivancevich, 1998; Sparks & Cooper, 1999) and role-based factors such as lack of power, role ambiguity, and role conflict (Burke, 1988; Nelson and Burke, 2000). In the past three decades, empirical researches on the theme of stress have increased many folds. Researchers have focused their attention on causal factors of stress, stress manifestations, moderators of stress-strain relationship, and types of stresses experienced by diverse work populations, and various

coping strategies adopted by organizational entities to cope with stress (Pestonjee, 1992).

The large organizations, like other settings, exert its own set of unique forces on the individual. Through the application of these forces, the organization is able to channel the individual's behavior towards certain goals and to direct his/her interactions towards certain people and away from others.

#### *Relationship between Organizational Stress and Job Satisfaction*

Most of the research on organizational stress has focused on its relationship with job satisfaction. Much of this research has been correlational studies that have used role ambiguity and role conflict to operationalize stress. These studies generally indicate that job stress and satisfaction are inversely related (e.g., Hollon Chesser, 1976; Miles, 1976; Miles & Petty, 1975). Because the relationships between role conflict and ambiguity, and organizational outcomes have been meta-analyzed (Fisher & Gitelson, 1983; Jackson & Schuler, 1985) reviewed (Van Sell, Brief, & Schuler, 1981), and critiqued (King & King, 1990) elsewhere, our analysis does not include these previously examined areas. Instead we focus on newer methods of data analysis and other operationalizations of job stress and research completed since these meta-analyses.

In addition to these correlational studies, more sophisticated techniques, such as Lisrel and path analysis, have been used to examine the stress-satisfaction relationship. For instance, Kemery, Mossholder, and Bedeian (1987) employed Lisrel to test three models, (e.g., Beehr & Newman, 1978; Locke, 1976; Schuler, 1982) that postulate causal relationships among role ambiguity, role conflict, and organizationally valued outcomes such as job satisfaction, physical symptoms, and turnover intentions. Using 370 employees, (e.g., faculty, administrators, staff), from a large southeastern university, Kemery and associates found that role conflict and ambiguity exert a direct influence on job satisfaction and physical symptoms, which in turn influence turnover intentions.

Similar findings of the indirect effect of stress on turnover intentions through job satisfaction have been reported by Hendtix, Ovalle, and Troxier (1985) and Kemery, Bedian, Mossholder, and Touliatos

(1985). Hendrix and associates used a stress assessment package developed by them to measure organizational stress, job satisfaction and turnover intentions of employees working for the Department of Defense (n=341) and a civilian hospital (n=29). They did not find a direct, significant relationship between organizational stress and turnover intentions. However, results of a path analysis indicated that job satisfaction was affected by factors such as involvement in decision making, skill variety, and whether work was subject to the whims of supervisors. In turn, job satisfaction was strongly linked to the intention to quit. Kemery and associate (1985) used three samples of accountants, (public n=275, government n=254, industrial n=459), and a sample of hospital employees (n=66) derived from Jackson's 1983 study, to replicate the Bedeian and Armenakis (1981) model of the relationship between role ambiguity and conflict, as well as job tension, satisfaction, and intention to leave. Using Lisrel, they found that data from these three samples of accountants supported the Bedeian and Armenakis model(1). Stress exerted an indirect influence on turnover intentions through job satisfaction. However, unlike the results of Kemery et al. (1985) and Hendrix et al. (1985), stress also exerted a direct influence not only on job-related tension and job satisfaction, but on the propensity to leave the organization. The diversity of job types, (e.g., university, defense department, hospital employees), as well as the differences in experienced stress levels and in the measures employed could explain these conflicting findings.

Relative effects of different sources of stress on job satisfaction have also been analyzed. Drory and Shamir (1981) examined the effects of intraorganizational factors, (e.g., role conflict, role ambiguity, management support), extraorganizational factors, (e.g., community support, family-role conflict), and task characteristics on the job satisfaction and burnout of 266 Israeli prison guards. They found that extraorganizational factors, especially community support, made the greatest contribution to explained variance (12%) in job satisfaction. Task characteristics accounted for 4.35% and organizational variables accounted for 3.4% of the explained variance. These results suggest that extraorganizational types of stresses are as important as intraorganizational sources in determining an individual's levels of job

satisfaction in Israel. These results also emphasize the impact of the non-work factors on work outcomes in the Israeli context. However, in explaining job burnout, intraorganizational factors accounted for 9% and extraorganizational factors accounted for 5% of the variance. Task characteristics did not add significantly to the net explained variance in job burnout. Although both intra- and extraorganizational factors made unique contributions to the explained variance in burnout, internal factors accounted for a greater proportion. These results seem to suggest that though management support may be an important factor in preventing burnout, it is probably of lesser importance in preventing job dissatisfaction.

Low job satisfaction can be an important indicator of the counterproductive employee behavior and can result in behavior such as absenteeism (Spector,1985; Martin & Miller,1986) and turnover intentions (Spector,1985;Dupre & Day,2007).Perceived satisfaction on the job is reflected by the needs of fulfillment and expectation for the job to be interesting, challenging and personally satisfying(Smith,1994).Job satisfaction is also an achievement indicator in career development tasks(Sidek,2002) and is associated with the psychological (Limbirt,2004) and individual well-being (Nassab,2008).

#### *Relation between Age and Job Satisfaction*

Mixed evidence exists in the literature concerning the relationship between the age and job satisfaction. Herzberg et al., (1957), after an extensive review of job satisfaction literature, concluded that the association is best described as a U-shaped function. Initially satisfaction is high, then decreases, and eventually, after hitting a low point, increase again with age. Hulin & Smith (1965) indicated that job satisfaction increases in a positive linear fashion with respect to age. As workers grow older, they tend to be more satisfied with their jobs. Older workers have lower expectations than younger workers,and they tend to be better adjusted to the work situation Quinn, Staines, and McCullough(1974) claimed that older workers are more satisfied with their work because they move into better work or more desirable positions across their careers.

The role of age in job satisfaction has been explained in several ways. Four alternative models are the career stage model (Hall & Mansfield, 1975), Rhodes' taxonomy (1983), Zeitz's situational model (1990), and the job change hypothesis suggested by White and Spector (1987).

Hall and Mansfield (1975) use the career stage model to account for age differences in job satisfaction. In their research, they suggested three career stages. In the early stage (age 20 to 34), the individual is in a trial phase and the highest needs are for self fulfillment. Individuals in the second or middle stage (ages 35 to 50) are in a "stabilization substage" (p. 208), in which the need for self fulfillment is strong and in which the individual is looking for professional achievement. During the third and final stage (age 50 ), the individual is in a "maintenance" (p. 208) stage. The individuals in this stage are most strongly motivated by the need for security, yet they also show a higher level of intrinsic motivation (as defined by Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson & Capwell, 1957).

In the taxonomy proposed by Rhodes (1983), age effects on work attitudes and behaviors are divided into four categories: Chronological Age(the effects of both psychosocial aging and biological aging.), Cohort Effects(generational effects), Period Effects (the effects arising from the passage of time), and Sources of Systematic Error(the effects of selective sampling, selective survival, selective dropout, and testing effects.).

The situational model proposed by Zeitz (1990) suggests that job satisfaction varies by situation and that age may contribute to or detract from individuals' job satisfaction, depending on other personal, organizational, and occupational influences.

White and Spector (1987) propose a model in which employee age is, itself, not a factor in job satisfaction, but is rather an indirect measure of such variables as tenure, salary, and job congruence, or the match between employee expectations and what the job actually provides. In support of this hypothesis are the results of a longitudinal study of job satisfaction (Hoppock, 1960), where several individuals reported greater job satisfaction when in jobs that matched their expectations and needs.

Age may affect job satisfaction and work attitudes in several different ways.

Most studies have found a positive relationship between age and job satisfaction (Glenn, 1977; Sharma and Sharma, 1978; Hashim, 1985; Liou, et al., 1990). However, some recent evidence suggests that the heretofore assumed direct relationship between age and job satisfaction may not be true. Towards the end of an employee's career, there may be downturn in satisfaction, suggesting a curvilinear relationship between age and job satisfaction (Luthans and Thomas, 1989; Zeitz, 1990). Yet there

is some other evidence to suggest that job satisfaction may be independent of age (Wright, 1987) or may be inversely related to age (Ghazali, 1979).

## **Methodology**

**Design:** The study employed descriptive survey research design using the ex-post facto type. In this kind of study, no manipulation is involved. It is an after fact study.

**Participants:** The sample for this study consisted of 300 managers, randomly drawn from fifteen Private Sector Organizations comprising of BPO, Banks and IT Sectors. The organizations within the private sector were located in Delhi and NCR. All the subjects were educationally well qualified. The employees were males 20-65 years of age group, with a mean of 42.5 years and standard deviation of 4.6 years. Of 300 Managers, 100 were Junior level Managers (20-35 years, Mean age 27.5 years), 100 were Middle level managers (36-50 years, Mean age 43 years), and 100 as Senior level managers (51-65 years, Mean Age 58 years). They had spent at least two years in the same organization. All the subjects completed Organizational role Stress Scale (Udai Pareek, 1981) and Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) Spector, 1983). The data was collected by administering questionnaires mainly during office hours, with the consent of relevant representatives of the employer as well as the respondents. The participants were chosen randomly from each organization and belonged to different

departments of the organization. Most of the participants showed their willingness to participate in the study after a short meeting.

### *Instrumentation*

Two instruments were used in the study to assess the impact of Age: Organizational role stress, and Job satisfaction. Self-report measures were used to obtain the data. The measures used in this study were borrowed from their original source and adapted from Indian work setting.

**Organisational Role Stress (ORS):** This scale was developed by Uday Pareek (1983). The ORS scale is used to measure 10 role stresses. It is a 5-point scale (0 to 4), containing five items for each role stress and a total of 50 statements. The scale is reported to have satisfactory reliability as well as validity Uday Pareek (1983). The ten role stressors are as follows:

1. Inter-role distance(IRD)
2. Role Stagnation(RS)
3. Role expectation conflict(REC)
4. Role erosion(RE)
5. Role overload(RO)
6. Role isolation(RI)
7. Personal Inadequacy(PI)
8. Self-role distance(SRD)
9. Role ambiguity(RA)
10. Resource Inadequacy(RIn)

*Self-role distance (SRD):* It arises out of the conflict between the self-concept and the expectations from the role, as perceived by the role occupant.

*Inter-role distance (IRD):* The conflict arises when an individual occupies more than one role .

*Role Erosion (RE):* It 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 overload (RO):* An individual's feeling that there are too many expectations from the significant others in his role set.

*Role Stagnation (RS)*; Feeling of being stagnated in the same role.

*Role Expectation Conflict (REC)*: It arises due to conflicting expectations or demands by different roles senders.

*Role ambiguity (RA)*: Unclear about the various expectations that a person has from his role.

*Resource Inadequacy (RIn)*; It arises when the resources required by the role occupant for performing his role effectively are unavailable.

*Role isolation (RI)* ; When there is incompatibility of one's role with other roles in the organization.

*Personal Inadequacy (PIN)*: A feeling of insufficient knowledge, skills or training to undertake a role effectively.

**Job Satisfaction survey (JSS)**: The Scale was developed by Paul E. Spector (1985). It is a 36 item, nine facet scale to assess employee attitudes about the job and aspects of the job. Each facet is assessed with four items, and a total score is computed from all items. A summated rating scale format is used, with six choices per item ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". The nine facets are as follows:

1. Pay
2. Promotion
3. Supervision
4. Fringe benefits
5. Contingent Rewards
6. Operation Procedures
7. Coworkers
8. Nature of work
9. Communication

**Procedure**: The research Instruments were administered on 330 employees using the drop-off and pick-up method whereas the respondents were given a week to respond to the questionnaires. Out of 330 distributed, 300 were returned and considered useful for the study. This number represents a response rate of 90.9%.

## **Analysis and Results**

**Table 1: Reliability Coefficients of the Instruments**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Factors</b>	<b>No. of items</b>	<b>Cronbach's <math>\alpha</math></b>
<b>Organisational Role stress</b>			
	Self-role distance	5	.84
	Resource Inadequacy	5	.71
	Role ambiguity	5	.94
	Role expectation conflict	5	.89
	Role erosion	5	.94
	Personal Inadequacy	5	.76
	Inter-role Distance	5	.82
	Role Stagnation	5	.76
	Role Overload	5	.88
	Role Isolation	5	.79
<b>Job Satisfaction</b>			
	Pay	4	.75
	Promotion	4	.73
	Supervision	4	.82
	Fringe Benefits	4	.73
	Contingent Rewards	4	.76
	Nature of work	4	.78
	Communication	4	.71
	Operation Procedures	4	.62
Co-workers	4	.60	

As seen from Table 1, the instruments used in this study were reliable, with coefficients ranging from 0.60 to 0.94.

**Table 2: Coefficient Of Correlation among the Variables Used in the Study**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>
Self-role distance(1)	1								
Resource Inadequacy(2)	.36* *	1							
Role ambiguity(3)	.44* *	.52* *	1						
Role expectation conflict(4)	.36* *	.62* *	.43* *	1					
Role erosion(5)	.61* *	.28* *	.54* *	.80* *	1				
Personal Inadequacy(6)	.46* *	.56* *	.42* *	.32* *	.46**	1			
Inter-role Distance(7)	.42* *	.52* *	.38* *	.44* *	.64* *	.39* *	1		
Role Stagnation(8)	.48* *	.36* *	.42* *	.58* *	.40**	.46* *	.53* *	1	
Role Overload(9)	.34* *	.56* *	.44* *	.54* *	.42**	.30* *	.46* *	.32* *	1
Role Isolation(10)	.42* *	.36* *	.42* *	.36* *	.42**	.44* *	.37* *	.48* *	.61* *
Pay(11)	- .40* *	- .51* *	- .52* *	- .31* *	- .42**	- .46* *	- .41* *	- .32* *	- .44* *
Promotion(12)	- .48* *	- .36* *	- .46* *	- .52* *	- .32**	- .44* *	- .38* *	- .50* *	- .31* *
Supervision(13)	- .30* *	- .54* *	- .48* *	- .36* *	- .34**	- .42* *	- .46* *	- .38* *	- .40* *
Fringe Benefits(14)	- .46**	- .36* *	- .46* *	- .34* *	- .24**	- .34* *	- .54* *	- .42* *	- .36* *
Contingent Rewards(15)	- .32* *	- .46* *	- .36* *	- .36* *	- .32**	- .48* *	- .40* *	- .48* *	- .36* *
Nature of work(16)	- .46* *	- .36* *	- .36* *	- .46* *	- .44**	- .34**	- .52* *	- .38* *	- .46* *
Communication(17)	- .32* *	- .43* *	- .24* *	- .36* *	- .43**	- .28* *	- .51* *	- .26* *	- .42* *
Operation Procedures(18)	- .36* *	- .34**	- .31* *	- .42* *	- .46**	- .41* *	- .31* *	- .42* *	- .44* *

	*		*	*		*	*	*	*
Co-workers(19)	-.36*	-.34*	-.42*	-.46*	-.38**	-.40*	-.32*	-.40*	-0.51

Variables	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Pay(11)	-.36**	1								
Promotion(12)	-.42**	.36**	1							
Supervision(13)	-.32**	.36**	.46**	1						
Fringe Benefits(14)	-.32**	.32**	.42**	.52**	1					
Contingent Rewards(15)	-.26**	.43**	.32**	.48**	.44**	1				
Nature of work(16)	-.24**	.32**	.46**	.21**	.42**	.51**	1			
Communication(17)	-.34**	.43**	.41**	.32**	.28**	.37**	.45**	1		
Operation Procedures(18)	-.38**	.36**	.42**	.58**	.40**	.46**	.53**	.42**	1	
Co-workers(19)	-.52**	.31**	.40**	.44**	.54**	.42**	.30**	.46**	.32**	1

Note: \*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.0

1-10-Dimensions of Organisational Role stress

11-19-Dimensions of Job satisfaction

The above table shows that Organizational role stress and Job satisfaction are negatively correlated to each other.

**Table 3: Mean, sds and ‘T’ Values for Organizational Role Stress Scores**

Age group	Mean	SD	‘t’ Values
X 20-35yrs (n=100)	132.48	11.26	XY 5.24**
Y 36-50yrs (n=100)	124.26	10.42	XZ 8.32**
Z 51-65yrs (n=100)	114.32	10.12	YX 6.98**
X-Junior level manager=Middle level manager=Senior level manager			

Note: \*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05

The results obtained above show significant decreases in the mean stress score of Junior level managers to Senior level managers. The ‘t’ values obtained in the table 2 show significant difference between Junior level(20-35 yrs.) and those in Middle level (36-45 yrs.) and Senior level managers (46-60 yrs.). Junior levels were found to be experiencing less stress than Middle level and Senior level managers. Middle level managers were found to be most affected by the stress prevailing in the organization.

**Table 4: Mean, SDs and ‘t’ values for various dimensions of organizational role stress**

Dimensions	X 20-35yrs (n=100)		Y 36-50yrs (n=100)		Z 51-65yrs (n=100)		‘t’ Values		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	XY	XZ	YZ
Self-role distance	15.26	4.32	14.32	3.26	11.42	3	14.68**	13.77**	4.02**
Resource Inadequacy	14.24	4.12	12.24	2.96	10.26	1.9	5.84**	4.60**	4.03**
Role ambiguity	14.42	3.54	11.26	2.16	9.24	2	5.45**	2.95**	.75@
Role expectation conflict	10.54	2.51	10.29	2.06	9.54	1.9	3.17**	.36@	3.07**
Role erosion	9.72	3.14	11.24	3.42	9.12	2.6	2.95**	2.42*	2.78**
Personal Inadequacy	14.32	3.24	12.34	2.84	8.12	2.2	4.94**	6.46**	5.24**
Inter-role Distance	13.26	2.48	11.45	2.63	10.22	2.5	5.62**	8.36**	3.44**
Role Stagnation	10.24	2.23	13.27	3.34	12.62	3.1	4.43**	4.56**	3.13**

Role Overload	11.23	2.62	13.26	3.14	12.22	2.4	3.62**	4.24**	2.42**
Role Isolation	12.26	2.82	10.24	2.14	10.12	2	3.22**	4.26**	2.12**

Note: \*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05;@ Not significant

It is being observed from Table 3 that Junior level managers and Middle level managers were experiencing more stress self-role distance, Resource inadequacy, Inter-role distance, role expectation conflict, role isolation and personal Inadequacy as compared to Senior level managers. Junior level managers perceived more stress in the above mentioned dimensions as compared to middle level managers. In case of role erosion, it is observed that middle level managers are experiencing more stress in comparison to junior level and Senior level Managers. With respect to personal Inadequacy dimension of Organisational role stress, Junior level bear the maximum amount of stress than Middle level managers. Senior level managers are least affected comparatively on this dimension. In case of role overload, the result shows that Middle level managers are the most affected one and the junior level as the least affected.

**Table 5: Mean, SDs and ‘t’ values for Job Satisfaction scores**

Age group	Mean	SD	‘t’ Values
X 20-35yrs (n=100)	132.24	12.34	XY 4.21**
Y 36-50yrs (n=100)	166.46	9.48	XZ 5.14**
Z 51-65yrs (n=100)	184.58	9.26	YX 5.62**
X-Junior level manager=Middle level manager=Senior level manager Note: ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05			

The ‘t’ values obtained in table 4 show that the Senior level managers reported significantly found to have more job satisfaction than the middle level and junior level managers. The ‘t’ values obtained in the table show significant difference between Junior level(20-35 yrs.) and those in Middle level (36-45 yrs.) and Senior level managers (46-60

yrs.). Junior levels were found to be experiencing less job satisfaction than Middle level and Senior level managers.

**Table 6: Mean, SDs and ‘t’ values for various facets of Job Satisfaction**

Facets	X 20-35yrs (n=100)		Y 36-50yrs (n=100)		Z 51-65yrs (n=100)		‘t’ Values		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	XY	XZ	YZ
Pay	17.26	4.14	16.24	5.24	20.12	6.3	2.12**	3.73**	2.04**
Promotion	14.96	3.16	18.24	2.98	19.96	5.9	1.98*	2.43**	2.16**
Supervision	13.21	4.04	18.26	4.74	16.36	6.3	2.36**	3.59**	3.73**
Fringe Benefits	14.22	3.92	20.12	5.12	17.34	7.3	1.99**	2.14**	2.02**
Contingent Rewards	14.96	3.84	19.94	5.11	16.45	5.5	2.08**	2.34**	2.52**
Nature of work	15.24	4.18	18.92	4.34	17.42	7	2.16**	2.22**	2.43**
Communication	14.26	3.76	20.26	5.04	18.28	6.1	2.11**	2.36**	2.42**
Operation Procedures	12.24	2.24	16.26	3.98	14.32	4.2	2.42**	3.26**	2.02**
Co-workers	18.27	4.23	19.24	4.22	17.12	4.1	2.64**	3.25**	1.98*

X-Junior level manager=Middle level manager=Senior level manager

Note: \*\* p < 0.01; \* p < 0.05

If the above result is to be analyzed, it can be deduced that the Middle and Senior level managers were satisfied with their jobs for most of the facets as the obtained mean is more than the scale mean (Scale mean=16 for every facet).But comparatively, Middle level managers are more satisfied with all the facets of job satisfaction in comparison

to the Senior and Junior level managers. But in respect to the promotion facet, it is being observed that the Junior level managers are less satisfied in comparison to Senior level and Middle level managers. Senior level managers were the most satisfied one with respect to the Co-workers facet.

## **Discussion**

As observed from the study, it can be concluded that Junior level managers are the least satisfied groups in respect to their jobs in their organizations. It may be due to the reason that they may be getting adjusted to their jobs as well as to the demands and adjustments of young married life. Perhaps the reduced job satisfaction in Junior level managers might have resulted from their occupying lower status positions in organizations a result of which they have minimal organizational power and little control over work demands. Under such circumstances it may be expected that, compared to the middle level who are more or less settled in their personal as well as work life's, young adults found their jobs much more stressful. Subjects' age, as a main variable, was for lower occupational level employees the effects of role conflict are more important than role ambiguity which might have resulted in their high score on intrinsic impoverishment, powerlessness and low status.

From the results it may be said that Junior manager's experience of high stress might have resulted in their significantly low job satisfaction of similarly low Organisational stress experienced by Senior level might be related to their relatively higher job satisfaction scores than the younger group.

Further analysis of scores obtained on each factor found by the three levels using 't' test reveals (table 4), that the Middle level managers were more satisfied with their work and co-workers compared to the other two levels.. The Middle level and the Senior level were appeared to be more satisfied on supervision than Junior levels but on the pay facet the middle level managers were less satisfied than the other two age groups.

As far as co-workers are concerned the Middle level managers are more satisfied than Junior level managers. Perhaps, in their long job

tenure, they learned how to master the intricacies of work and thereby feel work as relatively less strenuous than younger managers. Findings of the study are in line with those of many others. Lawler (1971), Khan (1972), Paul (1978) and Rio (1980) all reported that as individuals get older, there would-be changes in the values and needs at the mid life point. Findings of Wernimount (1966) also support dependence of job satisfaction on need satisfaction. Perhaps, by the time people are in later middle age most of their intrinsic needs might have been met or they altered their needs to expect less hence, the resulting low occupational stress and high job satisfaction in the late middle age group, compared with younger men.

The Senior level managers seem to be more satisfied with promotions also, when compared to the other groups. The results further shows that senior level managers were less satisfied with their jobs in comparison with Middle level managers. The findings are supported indirectly with the previous studies done in the past. Early research in this area found a U shaped relationship between age and job satisfaction. Herzberg, et al. (1957) found that individuals' level of job satisfaction declined through their career, then rose later in the individual's life. Saleh and Otis (1964) also found a curvilinear relationship, with individuals' level of satisfaction increasing until the pre retirement years, then decreasing. Other researchers have concluded that there is a positive, linear relationship between employee age and expressed job satisfaction (Gibson & Klein, 1970; Hulin & Smith, 1964). This interpretation is now generally agreed to be the most appropriate way to explain the observed relationship between employee age and job satisfaction (Rhodes, 1983).

## **Conclusion**

It is but natural that Individuals who perceive stress are bound to be less satisfied with their jobs. With support from previous studies (Hollingsworth et. al. 1988; Keller, 1975), the findings of the present study reveal the same. Managers with lower job satisfaction were found to experience more stress in the form of overload, role ambiguity, personal Inadequacy, Resource Inadequacy , role conflict,

compared to those with higher job satisfaction. Age, was found to be of great significance in these study findings. Significantly decreasing stress and increasing job satisfaction with increasing age was found among the managers and these confirm the importance of the developmental process.

### **Limitations & Scope for Future Research**

The results of the present study indicate that there are so many related areas, open to further research. The sample size of the present study targeted only the participants of Delhi & NCR region. The extensive research can be done by taking a large sample and comparing the relationship amongst male and female managers belonging to different age groups. The overall stress level in almost all the organisations has increased so much that separate studies should be conducted on organisational role stress. Even the organisations, at their own levels should also conduct minor research studies on the behaviour of its employees/executives.

### **Limitations & Scope for Future Research**

The results of the present study indicate that there are so many related areas, open to further research. The sample size of the present study targeted only the participants of Delhi & NCR region. The extensive research can be done by taking a large sample and comparing the relationship amongst male and female managers belonging to different age groups. The overall stress level in almost all the organisations has increased so much that separate studies should be conducted on organisational role stress. Even the organisations, at their own levels should also conduct minor research studies on the behaviour of its employees/executives.

### **References**

Beehr, T.A. & Newman, J.E. (1978). Job stress, employee health, and organizational effectiveness: A facet analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 31: 665-700.

Burke, R.J., (1988). "Sources of managerial and professional stress in large organization." In Cooper C.L., Payne, R. (Eds) *causes, coping and*

consequences of stress at work, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, pp77-112.

De Frank, R.S., and J.M. Ivancevich (1998). "Stress on the job: An Executive update" *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 20, pp.285-308

Drory, A., & Shamir, B. (1981). Occupational tedium: Relationship to stress, task characteristics, support, and satisfaction. Paper presented at the 89th convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, California

Fisher, C., & Gitelson, R. (1983). A meta-analysis of the correlates of role conflict and ambiguity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68: 320-333.

Ghazali bin Othman (1979). "An Investigation of the Sources of Job Satisfaction of Malaysian School Teachers". Ph D Thesis: University of California, Los Angeles.

Hall, D.T. and R. Mansfield (1975). Relationships of age and seniority with career variables of engineers and scientists. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60 201-210

Hashim Abu Bakar (1985). "An Analysis of Job Satisfaction Among Academic Staff of Universities in Malaysia". Ph D Thesis: Ohio University.

Hendrix, W., Ovalle, N.K., & Troxler, R.G. (1985). Behavioral and physiological consequences of stress and its antecedent factors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70: 188-201

Hollon, C. J., & Chesser, R. J. (1976). The relationship of personal influence dissonance to job tension, satisfaction, and involvement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 19: 308-314.

Hulin, C.L. & P.C., A Linear model of Job satisfaction, *Journal Of applied Psychology*, 49(3)(1965) 209-216

Ivancevich, J. & Matteson, M., (1980), *Stress at Work*, Scott, Foresnian, Glenview, Illinois.

Ivancevich, J.M. and Matteson, M.T.: *Stress at Work: A Managerial Perspective*. Scott, Foreman and Co., Glenview, II. 1980.

Jackson, S., & Schuler, R. (1985). A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict in work settings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 36: 16-78.

Kemery, E.R., Mossholder, K.W., & Bedeian, A. (1985). Role stress, physical symptomatology, and turnover intentions: A causal analysis of three alternative specifications. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 8: 11-23.

Kemery, E.R., Mossholder, K.W., & Bedeian, A. (1985). Role stress, physical symptomatology, and turnover intentions: A causal analysis of three alternative specifications. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 8: 11-23.

King, L., & King, D. (1990). Role conflict and role ambiguity: A critical assessment of construct validity. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107: 48-64.

Liou, K T, Syla, R D and Brunk, G (1990). "Non work factors and job satisfaction revisited". *Human Relations*, 43, 77-86.

Locke, E.E. (1976). The nature and consequences of job satisfaction. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*: 1297-1350. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Luthans, F (1992). *Organizational Behaviour*. New York: McGraw Hill. Luthans, F and Thomas L T (1989). "The relationship between age and job satisfaction". *Personnel Review*. 18(1), 23-26.

Miles, R. H. (1976). A comparison of the relative impacts of role perceptions of ambiguity and conflict by role. *Academy of Management Journal*, 19: 25-35.

Miles, R. H., & Petty, M. M. (1975). Relationship between role clarity, need for clarity, and job tension and satisfaction for supervisory and non-supervisory roles. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18: 877-883.

Nelson, D.L., and Burke, R.J., (2000). "Women Executives: Health, Stress and Success. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14, pp 107-21

Pestonjee, D.M. (1992). *Stress and Coping. The India experience*. New Delhi: Sage Publication.

Quinn, Robert, G. Staines, and B.C. McCullough (1974) *Jobs: Is There a Trend ?* Washington D.C.: U.S. Govt. Printing Office

Rhodes, S.R. (1983). Age related differences in work attitudes and behaviour: A review of conceptual analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 93, 328-367

Schuler, R.S. (1982). An integrative transactional model of stress in organizations. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 3: 5-19.

Sharma, S and Sharma, R K (1978). "A study of job involvement in relation to certain demographic variables among engineers". *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 14, 141-148.

Sparks, K., and Cooper, C.L., (1999), "Occupational differences in work in the workstrain relationship: Towards the use of situation-specific mode," *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 72, pp 219-229.

Spector, P. E. (1982), Behaviour in Organisations As a Function of Employees' Locus of Control," *Psychological Bulletin*, 91, pp.482 - 497.

Van Sell, M., Brief, A., & Schuler, R. (1981). Role conflict and ambiguity: Integration of the literature and directions for future research. *Human Relations*, 34: 43-71.

White.A.T. & P.E.spector (1987).an investigation of age related factors in the age- job satisfaction relationship. *Psychology and aging*.2(3),261-265

Wright, Jr. R, King, S W, Berg, W E and Greecy, R F (1987). "Job satisfaction among black female managers: A causal approach". *Human Relations*, 40, 489-506.

Zeitz, G (1990). "Age and work satisfaction in government agency: A situational perspective". *Human Relations*, 43, 419-438.

---