

# Role Efficacy and Role Stress in Managers from Professional and Voluntary Organisations

**Dr. Amruta Shantanu Bhuskute**

(M. A., M. Phil., Ph. D.)

Assistant Professor,

Department of Psychology,

Smt. Binzani Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Nagpur, Maharashtra, India-440022

**Abstract:** Any organization consists of assorted vision, mission, resources, procedures and outcomes. With altogether different set-up and strategy, Managerial Staff working in Professional or Voluntary Organisations follow different set of objectives, strategies, people, resources, challenges, too. It is very much evident to study how efficient are Managers in performing their 'Roles' and how much Stress their Role is put down. Hence, total 130 Manager from Professional and Voluntary Organisations were administered Role Efficacy Scale and Organizational Role Stress. This study indicates that Professional Organisations Managers posses higher Role Efficacy and lower Role Stress. Negative Correlation is observed between variables.

**Keywords:** Role Efficacy, Role Stress, Managerial Role, Professional & Voluntary Organisations.

## I. INTRODUCTION:

An organization is nothing without human resources. It is the people who make an organization a success. Those Organisations that are able to acquire, develop, stimulate and have outstanding workers will be both effective (able to achieve their goals) and efficient (expending the least amount of resources necessary). Therefore Human Resource Management concerns with the "people" dimension in Management (David & Stephen, 2001). At the same time, while acquiring peoples' services, developing their skills, motivating them to high levels of performance, and ensuring that they continue to maintain their commitment with organization, developing their capabilities and resources they have can not be ignored. Thus, Human Resource Development is the function more concerned with training and development, planning, performance and potential appraisal, counseling and succession planning (Aswathapa, 2002). The performance of a person working in an organization depends on his potential effectiveness, technical competence, managerial experience, etc. as well as on the design of the role he performs in an organization.

Role is the position one occupies in a social 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 (Pareek, 1997). The concept of role is vital for the integration of the individual with an organization. The organization has its own structure and goals. Similarly, the individual has his personality and motives. All these aspects interact with each other and to some extent get integrated into a role. Therefore, role is one of the central concepts to be studied while considering employee performance.

### **Role Efficacy:**

Integration of the person and the role always insures person's effectiveness. Unless the person has the requisite knowledge, technical competence and skills required for the role, he can not be effective. Equally important how is role, which he occupies in the organization, is designed (Pareek, 1997). Thus, effectiveness of a person's role in an organization will depend upon his own potential effectiveness, the potential effectiveness of the role, and the organization climate. This potential effectiveness can be termed 'Efficacy'. Efficacy has two types. 1. Personal efficacy is the potential effectiveness of a person in personal and interpersonal situations. 2. Role efficacy is the potential effectiveness of an individual occupying a particular role in the organization.

Research shows that persons with high role efficacy seem to experience less role stress, anxiety and work related tensions as it increases Managerial Effectiveness (Bamel, Budhwar, Stokes, & Paul, 2017). Role efficacy is found to be related to Employee Engagement, Motivation and attrition (Sinha, Abraham, Bhaskarna, & Xavier, 2014). Role efficacy has also been reported as a strong moderator or mediating variable, having a dramatic influence of in predicting or enhancing organizational climate (Pareek, 1997).

### **Role Stress:**

The concept of stress is first introduced in the life sciences by Hans Seley in 1936. During eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, stress was equated with 'force', 'pressure or stress exerted upon material object or person which resists these forces (Pestonjee, 1992). In psychological context, Stress is an affective reaction on the part experience of incongruence whereas coping is any behavior that deals with the emotional component in the experience of incongruence. Modern life is full of stress. As organization become more complex, the potential for stress increases. Urbanization, industrialization and increase in the scale of operations are some of the reasons for rising stress. Stress is an inevitable consequence of social economic complexity (Pareek, 1997)<sup>2</sup>. Role of the person that he performs in the organization also contribute to the stress the person experiences. Role stressors are Inter-role Distance, Role Stagnation, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Erosion, Role Overload, Role Isolation, Personal Inadequacy, Self-role Distance, Role Ambiguity , Resource Inadequacy (Pestonjee,1992)<sup>2</sup>. Organizational Role Stress is found to be one of the

important factors that affect productivity, quality of work-life, organizational commitment as well as job satisfaction (Patwardhan, Mayya, & Joshi, 2014, Bano & Jha, 2012, Qazi & Nazneen, 2016).

## **II. Scope of the Study:**

Any organization has defined role for each employee to play. It assures the smooth operations and hassle-free job performance. Highest productivity can be gained only if the said employee is efficient to perform his or her given role. If not, it leads to various non-productive effects including Role Stress. This research study will prove insightful to the executives of professional, as well as voluntary Organisations to gaze a compact picture of various dimension of Role Efficacy and Role Stress. It will direct them to understand the training needs and future scope. In general, it will help to see the under play of 'Role' in Organisations at a large.

## **III. Method:**

This research study has been undertaken with an objective to compare Managers from Professional Organisations and Voluntary Organisations on Role Efficacy and Role Stress.

### **Hypotheses:**

1. Managers of Professional Organisations will score significantly high on various dimensions of Role Efficacy than Managers of Voluntary Organisations.
2. Managers of Professional Organisations will score significantly high on various dimensions of Role Stress than Managers of Voluntary Organisations.
3. Role Efficacy and Role Stress will found negatively correlated.

**Sample:** For this research study, total 130 Managers (65 from Professional and Voluntary Organisations each) were randomly selected from Nagpur City (Mean Age = 46 yrs).

### **Tools and Materials:**

**1. Role Efficacy Scale:** The role efficacy scale is a standard instrument by Udai Pareek, (1997) consisting of twenty triads of statements. A respondent marks one statement in each triad that describes the role most accurately. This is a standardized, valid, reliable instrument. It measures the role efficacy level through 10 dimensions of Role Efficacy : 1. Centrality, 2. Integration, 3. Pro-activity, 4. Creativity, 5 Inter-role linkage, 6. Helping Relationship, 7. Super Ordination, 8. Influence, 9. Growth and 10. Confrontation.

**2. Role Stress scale:** Organizational Role Stress Scale (ORS) is a standardized instrument by Udai Pareek (1997) and is used to measure ten role stressors, i.e. Inter-Role Distance, Role Stagnation, Role Isolation, Role Ambiguity, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Overload, Role Erosion, Self-role Distance, Resource Inadequacy and Personal inadequacy. ORS is a 5-point scale (0 to 4), containing five items for each Role Stressor and a total of 50 statements.

### **STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:** To test the hypotheses:

- a. t test is performed to compare significant difference between two means.
- b. Correlation Coefficient is calculated through Rank-Difference Correlation Method.

## **IV. RESULT & DISCUSSION:**

Table No. 01 exhibits the figures of *t* test employed for various factors to analyze significant difference between Means:

**Table No.01  
Mean scores and z scores for all sub-factors of Role Efficacy and Role Stress**

Sr. No.		M <sup>1</sup> (M-PO)	SD <sup>1</sup>	M <sup>2</sup> (M-VO)	SD <sup>2</sup>	MS	df	t
<b>Role Efficacy (N = 130)</b>								
1.	Centrality	3	0.23	2.01	0.3	0.33	128	2.91**
2.	Integration	4.46	1.5	4.1	1.08	10.31		0.034
3.	Pro-activity	3	1.38	2.53	1.72	6.88		0.06
4.	Creativity	3.26	0.94	3.2	1.37	3.46		0.01
5.	Inter-role linkage	2.8	0.12	2.66	0.23	0.06		2.32*
6.	Helping Relationship	3.2	1.22	1.86	1.34	5.72		0.23
7.	Super Ordination	3.06	1.06	2	1.79	5.04		0.21
8.	Influence	3.06	0.09	1.4	1.02	0.76		2.16*
9.	Growth	3.88	1.42	2.8	1.51	8.63		0.12
10.	Confrontation	3.4	1.73	2.8	1.42	10.89		0.05
<b>Role Stress (N = 130)</b>								
1.	Inter-Role Distance	2.4	1.18	2.8	1.56	10.15	128	0.03
2.	Role Stagnation	2.2	0.29	5	0.41	1.02		2.73*
3.	Role Ambiguity	2.7	0.31	4.46	0.33	0.74		2.36*
4.	Role Isolation	2.7	1.1	2.8	1.61	10.52		0.01
5.	Role Expectation Conflict	2.6	0.2	4.2	0.34	0.58		2.71**
6.	Role Overload	1.86	0.79	5.4	0.12	1.23		2.85**
7.	Role Erosion	2.4	0.61	4.6	0.12	0.95		2.29*
8.	Self Role Distance	2.8	0.47	4.8	0.23	0.87		2.29*
9.	Resource Inadequacy	2.8	0.56	4.9	1.18	1.03		0.27
10.	Personal Inadequacy	4.1	1.6	5.97	2.11	37.07		0.05

\*\*p < .01, \* p < .05

**Hypotheses no. 01: Managers from Professional Organisations have significantly higher level of Role Efficacy and its dimensions than Managers from Voluntary Organisations.**

This hypothesis is partially proved as Managers from Professional Organisations significantly differ on *Centrality, Inter-role linkage and Influence*. Managers of Professional Organisations are significantly high on **Centrality** ( $M_1=3$ ,  $M_2=2.01$ )  $t = 2.91$ ,  $p < .01$ ) which means they perceive themselves very much crucial to the organization i.e. they have very important role to play in the organizational development. If this idea is extended to the managers of Voluntary Organisations, they do feel as a part of the organization but less crucial compared to Managers from Professional Organisations. They are either defused regarding their role or they found every member of Voluntary Organisations contributing equally for the development.

Managers from Professional Organisations are found significantly high on **Inter-role Linkage** ( $M_1 = 2.8$ ,  $M_2 = 2.66$ )  $t = 2.32$ ,  $p < .05$  which means that they work in close collaboration with other colleagues. They always maintained their importance in the organization and other perceives their role very much significant to the work. Managers of Professional Organisations also have significantly high score on **Influence** ( $M_1 = 3.06$ ,  $M_2 = 1.4$ )  $t = 2.16$   $p < .05$ ) which indicate that they have a strong feeling of influence in their given role compared to Managers from Voluntary Organisations. This influence may be in terms of decision-making, implementation, advice or problem solving.

**Hypotheses no. 02: Managers from Professional Organisations have significantly higher level of Role Stress and its dimensions than Managers from Voluntary Organisations.**

This hypothesis is rejected as Managers of Voluntary Organisations have shown significantly higher level on few dimensions of Role Stress than Managers from Professional Organisations. Though these findings are not in line with what is hypothesized at the beginning of the study, it is very much worth studying further what Manager of Voluntary Organisations goes through.

They have scored significantly higher on **Role Stagnation** ( $M_1= 2.2$ ,  $M_2 = 5$ ,  $t= 2.73$ ,  $p <.05$ ) which implies that they lack requisite amount of time or opportunity in their present role to get prepared for future challenges. It leads them to have very little scope for personal growth and thus feel stagnant in the role. Managers of Voluntary Organisations are significantly high on **Role Ambiguity** ( $M_1= 2.7$ ,  $M_2= 4.46$ ,  $t = 2.36$ ,  $p < .05$ ) which shows that they clarity about their role, may be due to lack of information, understanding and orientation. They are also high on **Role Expectation Conflict** ( $M_1 = 2.6$ ,  $M_2 = 4.2$ ),  $t = 2.71$   $p < .05$ ) which indicates that they are overloaded with too many expectations from the significant others in his role set. The reason may be lack of power, larger variations in the expected outcome, etc. Managers of Voluntary Organisations have scored high on **Role Erosion** ( $M_1= 2.4$ ,  $M_2 = 4.6$ ),  $t = 2.29$   $p < .05$ ) which suggest that they lack in resources, adequate preparation or orientation needed for their role the most. Significantly high score by Managers from Voluntary Organisations on **Self – Role Distance** ( $M_1 = 2.8$ ,  $M_2 = 4.8$ ),  $t = 2.29$   $p < .05$ ) indicates that they may have conflict between their self concept and the kind of role they play. They also score high on **Role Overload** ( $M_1= 1.86$ ,  $M_2 = 5.4$ ),  $t = 2.85$   $p < .05$ ) which shows that they mostly do things with inadequate training, aptitude and temperament.

**Hypothesis No. 03: Role Efficacy and Role Stress will found negatively correlated.**

This last and third hypothesis is accepted as Correlation Coefficient calculated by Rank-Difference Correlation Method is -0.69. It shows Moderate Negative Correlation amongst Role Efficacy and Role Stress. These findings validate that higher amount of Role Efficiency a Manager in any kind of Organisations has, he or she experiences lower amount of Role Stress. It is well supported by the above-mentioned findings which indicate that Managers of Voluntary Organisations possessing lower Role Efficacy experience higher Role Stress than Managers of Professional Organisations. It also directs high level management and administrative Personnel to identify the training needs of Managers to train them further for being more efficient in carrying their role more successfully and without being stressed about the same.

**V. CONCLUSION:** According to the results of the research study, it is found that:

- 1) Managers of Professional Organisations possess significantly higher Role Efficacy on dimensions such as Centrality, Inert-Role Linkage and Influence than Managers of Voluntary Organisations.
- 2) Managers of Voluntary Organisations exhibit significantly higher Role Stress on the dimensions such as Role Stagnation, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Overload, Self – Role Erosion, Self- Role Distance and Role Ambiguity than Managers of Professional Organisations.
- 3) Role Efficacy is negatively correlated with Role Stress.

**VI. LIMITATIONS:**

1. The sample size is very small.
2. Gender and Personality factors are not taken into consideration.
3. The study is restricted to Managers of Professional & Voluntary Organisations only.
4. This study is restricted to Nagpur City only.

**REFERENCES:**

- Aswathapa, K. (2002). *Human Resource and Personal Management*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company.  
 Bamel, U., Budhwar, P., Stokes, P., & Paul, H. (2017). Dimensions of role efficacy and managerial effectiveness: evidence from India. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance* , 4 (3), 218-237.  
 Bano, B., & Jha, R. K. (2012). Organizational Role Stress among Public and Private Sector Employees: A Comparative Case Study. *The Labore Journal of Business* , 1 (1), 23-36.  
 Pareek, U. (1997). *Training Instruments for Human Resource Development*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw – Hill Publishing Company.

- Patwardhan, V., Mayya, S., & Joshi, H. G. (2014). Organizational Role Stress among Managers in the Indian Hospitality Industry. *International Journal for Business and Management Invention*, 3 (9), 13-19.
- Pestonjee, D. (1992). *Stress and Coping*. New Delhi: Sage Publishing Ltd.
- Qazi, S., & Nazneen, A. (2016). A Comparative Study of Organizational Role Stress and Organizational Commitment Among The University Faculty Members of India and Saudi Arabia. *European Scientific Journal*, 12 (31), 108.
- Sinha, V., Abraham, A., Bhaskarna, B., Xavier, K., & Karian, K. (2014). Role Efficacy: Studying the Impact on Employee Engagement, Employee Motivation, Attrition. *International Journal of Human Capital and Information Technology Professionals*, 5 (4), 20.

