CHAPTER - IV

DISCUSION AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULT

4.1. INTRODUCTION

4.2. VARIATIONS IN ROLE STRESS FACTORS, JOB-SATISFACTION & DIMENSION OF OC FOR EACH OF THE FOUR ORGANIZATIONS

4.3. DIFFERENTIAL HYPOTHESES

4.4. CORRELATIONAL HYPOTHESES

4.5. MODERATOR HYPOTHESES

CHAPTER - IV

DISCUSION AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

4.1. INTRODUCTION

In the present chapter, an effort is made to summarise the statistical analysis of data (obtained from four job categories from each of the four organizations) to test the differential, correlational and moderator hypotheses.

First variations in role stress factors in all four organizations will be described in terms of means and standard deviations. This will be followed by similar description for job satisfaction and OC dimensions across all the four organizations.

The differential hypothesis deals with the differences within an organization due to cadre of personnel and the nature of job (technical - non-technical) in respect of role stress factors. This analysis will be presented in a 2x2 factorial design, including cadres and nature of job effects will be discussed for each of the ten factors separately for each of the four organizations.

The correlational hypothesis postulates the possible interrelationships of role stress factors, climate dimensions and job satisfaction. In this case the

various correlations of role stress factors with job satisfaction, OC dimension (motivational) and job satisfaction will be interpreted for highlighting the relationships.

In case of moderator hypothesis it is assumed that the relationships of organizational role stress with job satisfaction will be moderated by the climate dimensions, in other words it was hypothesized that the predicted relations between role stress factors and satisfaction will vary according to variation in the particular climate dimension For testing the moderating effect the high climate group and the low climate group will be formed on the basis of total climate score on a particular dimension with cut off point at mean. The correlation of role stress factors with job satisfaction will then be examined in these two groups for their possible variations.

4.2. VARIATIONS IN ROLE STRESS FACTORS, JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DIMENSIONS (MOTIVATIONAL)

Tables 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3 and 4.2.4. present the means and standard deviations of role stress factors, job satisfaction variables and dimensions of organizational climates for all the four organizations and for all the four job categories.

4.2.1. VARIATIONS IN ROLE STRESS, JOB SATISFACTION AND DIMENSION OF OC IN G.S.F.C FOR ALL THE FOUR JOB CATEGORIES, ARE PRESENTED IN TABLE 4.2.1.

It should be recalled that each of the ten role stress factors was represented in terms of five items each to be rated on a five point scale (from 1 lowest to 5 highest). This resulted in a range of scores from five to twenty five with a mid point at 15 score points. In case of role stress factors higher score (above 15) indicated presence of a conflict at a higher level. Similarly a score less than 15 will indicate that the conflict is relatively at lower level. Considering the various mean scores of managerial and supervisory cadres personnel in GSFC, it is seen that they are all below 15 score points indicating that the role stress conflicts are relatively at a lower level among managers and supervisors.

All the mean scores vary in a very small range which does not exceed the score point of 15 within this range, Managers-technical have a relatively higher level of role stress conflicts in general than managers non-technical. At the supervisory level both technical and non-technical do not differ much in a consistent manner for all types of role conflicts. So far as job satisfaction is concerned the scores of managers as well as supervisors are sufficiently high indicating that the

TABLE - 4.2.1. VARIATIONS IN ROLE STRESS, JOB SATISFACTION AND DIMENTIONS OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE IN G.S.F.C. FOR ALL THE FOUR JOB CATEGORIES

CATE-GORY	ROLE STRESS FACTORS																				JOB-SATIS-FAC-TION		DIMENSIONS OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE											
	I Inter Role Distance ↘		II Role Stag-nation ↘		III Role Ex-pectation Conflict ↘		IV Role Erosion ↖		V Role Overload ↖		VI Role Isolation ↖		VII Personal Inade-quacy ↖		VIII Self Role Distance ↖		IX Role Am-biguity ↖		X Resource Inade-quacy ↖				I Achieve-ment Climate		II Expert In-fluence Climate		III Exten-sion Climate		IV Control Climate		V Affilia-tion Climate		VI Depend-ency Climate	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Manager Tech	8 9	3 6	10.6	4 8	10 9	4 0	11.8	4 1	10 0	4 6	11 3	3 4	9 0	3 5	11 9	5.3	10 8	5 0	11 8	5.2	67.7	7 1	49 3	9.1	50.0	8 2	48 7	8 0	45 1	10.5	51.1	8 9	51 7	8 3
Manager Non-Tech	7 3	3 6	8 0	5.6	7 9	2 9	8.3	3 4	7 2	2 6	9 3	3 8	6 1	1 6	7 4	3 2	6.9	2 9	8 9	4 2	71 5	6 4	57 3	17.8	51 1	9.7	52 7	14.4	43.1	9.4	52 8	11 2	56 1	6 9
Supervisor Tech	8 2	2.9	5.9	3.1	10 2	4 7	10 4	3 0	7 8	3 0	10 0	3 1	8.7	3 6	9 3	3.8	8.0	3.3	9.4	3.2	69.3	7 4	51 3	13.5	47.4	9.6	48 2	11 5	49.3	11.6	51.4	8.6	51 7	8 9
Supervisor Non-Tech	9 0	2 8	8.6	3.0	10 6	3.0	8.5	2 3	8 5	3 0	10.8	3 2	8.3	2.3	8 5	3 1	7 0	2 3	8 9	2.7	70 4	5 7	54.1	15 9	49 2	10 0	52.4	11.8	48 4	8.0	54 0	10 3	54.0	11 9

level of overall job satisfaction is considerably high. Considering the mean scores on climate dimension, it is observed that almost all the mean scores, representing different climate as perceived by managers and supervisors are quite close to the mid point of the climate score range from 12 to 84. It is also observed that all the four mean scores in case of control climate for the four categories of personnel are slightly on the lower side and all the four mean scores of dependency and affiliation climate are slightly on the higher side.

4.2.2. VARIATIONS IN ROLE STRESS, JOB SATISFACTION AND DIMENSION OF OC IN G.A.C.L. FOR ALL THE FOUR JOB CATEGORIES, ARE PRESENTED IN TABLE 4.2.2.

Considering the mean scores for role conflict measures in table 4.2.2, it is observed that as in case of GSFC, GACL personnel have relatively lower mean scores indicating relatively low level of role conflicts.

Although all the mean scores are on lower side technical and non-technical groups at the managerial cadre and at the supervisory cadre show some variations in regard to certain role stress conflict measures.

Managers non-technical, for example have relatively higher mean score in case of role expectation conflict, role overload, role isolation and resource inadequacy in

TABLE - 4.2.2. VARIATIONS IN ROLE STRESS, JOB SATISFACTION AND DIMENTIONS OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE IN G.A.C.L. FOR ALL THE FOUR JOB CATEGORIES

CATE-GORY	ROLE STRESS FACTORS																				JOB-SATIS-FAC-TION		DIMENSIONS OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE											
	I Inter Role Distance		II Role Stag-nation		III Role Ex-pecta-tion Conflict		IV Role Erosion		V Role Overload		VI Role Isolation		VII Personal Inade-quacy		VIII Self Role Distance		IX Role Am-bigurty		X Resource Inade-quacy				I Achieve-ment Climate		II Expert In-fluence Climate		III Exten-sion Climate		IV Control Climate		V Affilia-tion Climate		VI Depend-ency Climate	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Manager Tech	9 1	4 5	9 2	3 6	10 0	3.0	8.7	1 9	8 7	5 0	10.1	3 0	6 9	1.9	8 3	3.2	8 3	3.7	11 3	4.2	69 1	9.5	48 7	14 2	46 3	11 9	46.8	10 3	46.1	12 3	47 5	6 8	50.8	8 3
Manager Non-Tech.	9 9	3.6	7 7	2 0	11.5	3.4	6 9	1 5	11 5	4 9	10.7	2 9	8 8	2.8	8 8	3.7	7 9	2.4	10.7	2 7	69.9	4 7	52 6	8 9	53.3	9 3	46 7	11 1	51.7	9 1	50 8	9 7	51.9	6 2
Supervisor Tech	7 7	2 6	11 1	4 2	9.5	3 7	10 7	4 4	7 8	2 4	10 9	3 9	9.1	3.0	11 0	3 0	8.7	3 5	11 2	4 4	65 4	5.9	44 2	12 2	43 6	11 9	44 0	12.3	50 0	13 9	46.3	10 1	52 2	9 8
Supervisor Non-Tech.	9 6	3 2	10.6	3 3	9.4	3.9	9.6	3.2	9 2	4 6	10 0	3 4	10 1	3.7	9 7	3 5	8.7	3 0	11 3	4.7	70 8	8.2	52 3	10 3	49.4	7 4	51.4	10 0	43.7	7 9	52.2	10 8	51.0	8 5

comparison to managers-technical.

So far as supervisors-technical are concerned the role stagnation, role erosion and role isolation, self role distance and resource inadequacy conflicts are relatively at a higher level within this group. In case of supervisory non-technical personnel role stagnation, role isolation personnel inadequacy and resource inadequacy conflicts are observed to be at relatively higher level within this group.

Curiously it is observed that resource inadequacy , and role isolation type of conflicts are observed at relatively higher level in all the four job categories.

On the whole it could be said that with some stray differences the level of conflicts is relatively quite low in all the four job categories.

So far as job satisfaction is concerned all the four groups seem to be more highly satisfied with scores ranging from 65.4 to 70.8.

In case of climate dimensions on the whole the various mean scores are more or less closer to the mid point of the score range of 12 to 84. Relatively achievement climate seems to be more dominant in case of manager non-technical and supervisors non-technical. The same

trend is observed in the case of expert influence climate. The extension climate is observed to be slightly more dominant among supervisory non-technical personnel. The control climate seems to be little more dominant in case of manager non-technical and supervisors technical.

The Affiliation climate is perceived to be more dominant among technical groups than among non-technical groups.

Surprisingly the dependency climate is found to be more dominant among all the four groups.

4.2.3. VARIATIONS IN ROLE STRESS, JOB SATISFACTION AND DIMENSION OF OC IN G.C.E.L. FOR ALL THE FOUR JOB CATEGORIES, ARE PRESENTED IN TABLE 4.2.3.

As can be seen from the table 4.2.3. the role stagnation conflict seems to be more prominent among managers (non-technical) and supervisors both technical and non-technical. Similarly the role expectation conflict is found to be more prominent relatively among manager technical and supervisors both technical and non technical. Role erosion type of conflict is felt and experienced more by supervisory personnel both technical and non-technical then managerial personnel.

It is also observed from the table that the non

TABLE - 4.2.3. VARIATIONS IN ROLE STRESS, JOB SATISFACTION AND DIMENTIONS OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE IN G.C.E.L. FOR ALL THE FOUR JOB GATEGORIES

CATE-GORY	ROLE STRESS FACTORS																				JOB-SATIS-FAC-TION		DIMENSIONS OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE											
	I Inter Role Distance		II Role Stag-nation		III Role Ex-pecta-tion Conflict		IV Role Erosion		V Role Overload		VI Role Isolation		VII Personal Inade-quacy		VIII Self Role Distance		IX Role Am-biguity		X Resource Inade-quacy				I Achieve-ment Climate		II Expert In-fluence Climate		III Exten-sion Climate.		IV Control Climate		V Affilia-tion Climate		VI Depend-ency Climate	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Manager Tech	10.5	3 8	9 5	3 4	11.9	3 9	10 2	3 9	9 7	4.3	10.3	3 4	9 5	3 4	9 8	3 9	9.6	4 6	12.6	4.3	73 1	5.7	48 7	11 3	46.7	10.5	48.5	8.8	44.5	7.2	49.1	9.7	48.2	6.5
Manager Non-Tech	9.3	3 4	11 0	3 8	9 9	2 4	9 7	3 4	7 6	2.3	10.5	2 5	8.2	2 3	9.3	2.5	8.7	2 3	9 5	2.7	69 0	6 2	49.3	10 1	46 1	7.8	48.9	8.0	45.0	5.3	47.1	6 1	50.9	5.7
Suprvisor Tech.	9 0	3 4	12 5	3 5	12 2	4 6	11 4	3.8	9 7	4.0	10 6	3.1	9 5	4 0	10 7	2 3	10 7	4.3	13.5	4.8	65.4	8.4	41.6	7 0	38.8	7.6	39.8	6 1	45.9	9 5	47.3	8.9	45.8	7.1
Supervisor Non-Tech.	9.1	3.8	12.0	5 2	12.1	4 2	11 0	4.3	12 4	9.2	11 5	4.0	9.1	3 7	11.5	5.2	8 9	3 2	12.7	4.2	66 4	9.9	46 4	12.5	43 0	11.9	44.7	8 0	46 7	7.6	49.4	8 1	49 8	6 6

technical personnel experience role isolation and self role distance to a greater extent in comparison to technical supervisory personnel and managerial personnel. Finally resource inadequacy type of conflict is more prominent among managers technical and among supervisors both technical and non-technical.

In general although all the mean scores are on the lower side, certain types of conflicts are felt and experienced relatively more by the personnel of some job categories than others. For example, inter-role distance, role expectation conflict and response inadequacy are more prominent among manager technical whereas role stagnation, role isolation seem to be relatively more prominent among manager non-technical.

In case of supervisory personnel role stagnation, role expectation conflict, role erosion, role isolation, self role distance and resource inadequacy are felt and experienced by both technical and non-technical personnel. In other words more role stress conflicts are experienced by supervisory personnel than managerial personnel.

From the table 4.2.3. it is observed that the job satisfaction level is sufficiently high among all the managers and supervisors, the satisfaction level among managers being slightly higher than that in case of

supervisors.

The mid-point of 48.0 of the climate scores ranging from 12 to 84 may be considered a cut-off point for identifying high and low climate. Accordingly achievement climate and extension climate are more dominant in managerial cadre.

Affiliation and dependency climate seem to be more dominant in the eyes of both managers and supervisors. Thus the only relatively more dominant climate dimensions are affiliation and dependency among supervisory personnel.

4.2.4. VARIATIONS IN ROLE STRESS, JOB SATISFACTION AND DIMENSION OF OC IN G.T.C.L. FOR ALL THE FOUR JOB CATEGORIES, ARE PRESENTED IN TABLE 4.2.4.

From table 4.2.4. it is observed that the managers non-technical group is relatively higher in perceiving nine out of ten role stress conflicts than the group of managers-technical.

In the supervisory cadre non-technical supervisors experience more role stress conflicts than supervisors technical.

Among the conflicts experienced more by the non-technical managers in comparison to technical managers

TABLE - 4.2.4. VARIATIONS IN ROLE STRESS, JOB SATISFACTION AND DIMENTIONS OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE IN G.T.C.L. FOR ALL THE FOUR JOB CATEGORIES

CATE-GORY	ROLE STRESS FACTORS																				JOB-SATIS-FAC-TION		DIMENSIONS OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE											
	I Inter Role Distance		II Role Stag-nation		III Role Ex-pecta-tion Conflict		IV Role Erosion		V Role Overload		VI Role Isolation		VII Personal Inade-quacy		VIII Self Role Distance		IX Role Am-biguity		X Resource Inade-quacy				I Achieve-ment Climate		II Expert In-fluence Climate		III Exten-sion Climate		IV Control Climate		V Affilia-tion Climate		VI Depend-ency Climate	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Manager Tech	7 3	2 5	10 0	4 3	7 1	2 0	8 8	3 7	6.1	1.6	7.6	3 2	8.1	2.5	7.4	2.5	5 6	9	8 6	3 7	65.1	9 2	45 9	9 1	41 5	11.6	42.5	9 5	37.0	7 1	42 0	8 9	44 6	6.5
Manager Non-Tech	9 3	3 5	11 6	5 4	9.9	2 9	10 6	3 1	8.4	3.5	10 5	3.8	7.4	2 6	10.8	4 9	8 1	4.5	11 3	5 2	66 0	11 9	48 0	10 2	48 3	4 5	47 0	6 5	49.9	8 5	47.6	6 7	49 0	5.5
Supervisor Tech.	9 2	3 6	10 5	3 3	8 5	3 9	9.0	4 2	8 7	2 8	10 0	4 4	10 9	2 9	8 7	4.0	7 1	2 7	11 3	2.6	66.1	10 1	44 7	11 2	42 3	9 4	41.9	6 7	43 6	10.7	41 7	8 1	46 5	10 3
Supervisor Non-Tech.	9.4	4 1	9 7	3 3	11.1	3 0	10.3	2.6	12 2	3 6	9 9	3.3	9 9	4.0	9.3	1.8	8 0	2 7	11.3	3 4	64 1	14 4	48 5	12 2	43 7	80.3	44.5	11 0	42.1	10 7	44 8	9 5	49 3	11 9

are included such conflicts as role stagnation, role erosion, role isolation, self role distance and resource inadequacy. Similarly the higher level conflicts experienced by non-technical supervisors in comparison to technical supervisors are role expectation, role erosion, role overload and resource inadequacy conflicts.

From table 4.2.4 it can also be seen that the job satisfaction level is considerably higher among both supervisors and managers.

Considering climate scores it is observed that all the six types of climate are experienced comparatively at a higher level in the non technical managers' group.

In case of supervisors, the achievement climate and dependency climate seem to be relatively at a higher level in the non-technical than the technical.

4.3 DIFFERENTIAL HYPOTHESES

- ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA CONCERNING ORGANISATIONAL ROLE STRESS MEASURES. (2 WAY ANOVA FOR EACH ORGANISATIONAL ROLE STRESS SCALE FOR EACH OF THE FOUR ORGANISATIONS).

These hypotheses require the test of differences in mean scores pertaining to Organisational Role Stress factors.

TABLE 4.3.1. SHOWING ANOVA TABLE IN RESPECT OF INTER ROLE DISTANCE

SOURCE	ORGANISATION			
	GSFC	GACL	GCEL	GTCL
CADRE (Manager and Supervisor)	.570	1.052	1.023	.890
NATURE (Technical and Non-tech.)	.046	3.195	.280	.607
CADRE x NATURE	2.808	.400	.554	.654

* P < .05 ** P < .01

The inter-role distance type of role stress is related to role compatibility. If conflicting demands are placed upon the employee, they would experience considerable amount of stress. Cadre wise and nature-of job-categorywise differences in IRD were tested for each of the four organizations using analysis of variance. It has been found as noted in table no 4.3.1 that not a single F-ratio is significant. This indicates neither the main effect nor interaction effect, is significant for any of the four organizations. It should be recalled here that all the mean scores are on the lower side.

TABLE 4.3.2. SHOWING ANOVA TABLE IN RESPECT OF ROLE STAGNATION

SOURCE	ORGANISATION			
	GSFC	GACL	GCEL	GTCL
CADRE (Manager and Supervisor)	.004	8.749 **	3.784	.318
NATURE (Technical and Non-tech.)	3.938	1.327	.121	.001
CADRE x NATURE	.510	.394	.979	1.012

* P < .05 ** P < .01

Many a times an employee feels stagnated because there is no provision in the organization for promotional prospects. The person may experience the dead end of his career even though he has many more years to go.

The F-ratio of 8.749 in case of cadre in GACL is significant at .01 level. The managers and supervisors differ significantly from each other in their experience of role stagnation. In terms of mean score for role stagnation it is observed that the supervisors have a relatively higher level of role stagnation conflict than do managers.

All the other F ratios are not significant. Thus, in general, except in case of cadre in GACL in all other organizations no significant differences have been obtained due to cadre or nature of employment category.

TABLE 4.3.3. SHOWING ANOVA TABLE IN RESPECT OF ROLE EXPECTATION CONFLICT

SOURCE	ORGANISATION			
	GSFC	GACL	GCEL	GTCL
CADRE (Manager and Supervisor)	1.374	2.377	1.822	1.665
NATURE (Technical and Non-tech.)	1.078	.431	.944	8.043*
CADRE x NATURE	3.580	.832	.999	.006

P < .05 ** P < .01

The f ratio of 8.043 in case of nature of job category in GTCL is significant at .05 level. This shows that technical personnel differ significantly form non-technical personnel in respect of role expectation conflict. This type of conflict is experienced more by non-technical personnel (M = 10.65) than by technical personnel (M = 8.00). It should be mentioned here that it is the conflicting expectations of others made upon the role incumbent that this type of conflict arises.

All the other F-ratios in other organisations are not significant indicating that there is no differential impact of role expectation conflict on groups based on cadre and nature of job categories.

TABLE 4.3.4 SHOWING ANOVA TABLE IN RESPECT OF ROLE EROSION

SOURCE	ORGANISATION			
	GSFC	GACL	GCEL	GTCL
CADRE (Manager and Supervisor)	.680	10.052 **	1.640	.003
NATURE (Technical and Non-tech.)	13.139 **	3.549	240	2.068
CADRE x NATURE	1.257	.237	.000	.079

* P < .05 ** P < .01

Role erosion type of conflict is marked when the work is not properly distributed. A role incumbent feels that his role is being interfered by other roles expressed in the form of expectation of others. The F ratio of 10.052 in case of cadre in GACL and of 13.139 in case of nature of job category in GSFC are significant at .01 level. The two groups based on cadre namely managers and supervisors in GACL have their mean scores as 7.83 and 10.18 respectively. The supervisors seem to have a higher level of role erosion type of conflict in comparison to one experienced by managers. The two mean scores of technical and non-technical personnel in GSFC are 10.93 and 8.40 respectively. The technical personnel therefore experience the role erosion type of conflict significantly to a greater extent.

All the other F ratios fail to meet the minimum

requirements for judging them as significant.

TABLE 4.3.5. SHOWING ANOVA TABLE IN RESPECT OF ROLE OVERLOAD

SOURCE	ORGANISATION			
	GSFC	GACL	GCEL	GTCL
CADRE (Manager and Supervisor)	.329	2.884	2.961	11.685 **
NATURE (Technical and Non-tech.)	.652	4.349 *	.223	11.528 **
CADRE x NATURE	5.263 *	.577	2.879	.418

* P < .05 ** P < .01

The role overload type of conflict is experienced by a person when he feels overloaded with his work. He is expected to carry out many more roles beyond his capacity. This type of conflict is experienced by both technical and non-technical personnel in GACL with non-technical personnel experiencing it to a significantly greater extent (M = 10.05) in comparison to technical personnel (M = 8.10). In GTCL ,both manager and supervisors differ significantly in respect of role overload conflict. The supervisors have a higher mean score (M = 10.47) than managers (M = 7.25). Thus supervisors have a higher level of conflict of role overload than managers. The F ratio of 11.528 in case of nature of job categories in GTCL is also significant at .01 level indicating that technical personnel differ significantly from non technical personnel. The mean

scores for the technical and non-technical personnel are 7.83 and 10.87 respectively. Here also the non-technical personnel have a higher level of conflict of role overload type.

The interaction effect of cadre X nature of job categories is significant in case of GSFC. The mean scores for the two levels of cadre and two levels of nature of job category are shown below.

TABLE 4.3.b.1. THE MEAN SCORES BASED ON SUB-GROUPS

CATEGORY	MANAGERS	SUPERVISORS
TECH.	10.00	7.80
NON-TECH.	7.20	8.52

The technical and non-technical personnel at the managerial level appeared to differ considerably from one another whereas there is hardly any difference between the two groups at the supervisory level. This is the meaning of significant interaction.

The degree of conflict due to role overload depends upon the combination of cadre and nature of job category.

On the whole role overload type of conflict has a differential impact in GSFC, GACL and GTCL.

TABLE 4.3.6. SHOWING ANOVA TABLE IN RESPECT OF ROLE ISOLATION

SOURCE	ORGANISATION			
	GSFC	GACL	GCEL	GTCL
CADRE (Manager and Supervisor)	.017	.010	.600	.554
NATURE (Technical and Non-tech.)	.092	.154	.462	.672
CADRE x NATURE	3.198	.961	.197	1.654

* P < .05 ** P < .01

Role isolation type of conflict arises when a person experiences that his role is of no significance. He feels isolated from the rest of organization. This happens when the role becomes obsolete.

Looking to the results reported in table no. 4.3.6. it is seen that not a single F ratio is significant. This shows that there is no differential impact of this type of conflict on groups based on cadre and nature of job categories. It should be recalled here that all the mean scores for all the groups and sub-groups are considerably low.

TABLE 4.3.7 SHOWING ANOVA TABLE IN RESPECT OF PERSONAL INADEQUACY

SOURCE	ORGANISATION			
	GSFC	GACL	GCEL	GTCL
CADRE (Manager and Supervisor)	1.940	6.066 *	.277	7.227 **
NATURE (Technical and Non-tech.)	4.330 *	3.639	.929	.922
CADRE x NATURE	3.279	415	.237	.016

* P < .05 ** P < .01

Personal inadequacy type of conflict relates to the feeling of incompetence or inability to accomplish the assigned task. This happens when the organization fails to train its personnel from time to time so as to update their skills and competence.

Considering the results reported in table 4.3.7 it is observed that the F-ratio of 4.330 in case of nature of job categories in GSFC, of 6.066 in case of cadre in GACL and 7.227 in case of cadre in GTCL are significant. In case of GSFC the technical and non-technical personnel have the mean scores of 8.82 and 7.48 respectively. The technical group has slightly higher mean score than the non-technical group, both the mean scores being on the lower side. In case of GACL the two mean scores of managers and supervisors are 7.87 and 9.60 respectively, the supervisors having slightly higher score so far as GTCL is concerned the managers

and supervisors have their mean scores of 7.75 and 10.43 respectively. The supervisors have a higher level of conflict of personal inadequacy than managers, all other F-ratios are not significant.

TABLE 4.3.8. SHOWING ANOVA TABLE IN RESPECT OF SELF ROLE DISTANCE

SOURCE	ORGANISATION			
	GSFC	GACL	GCEL	GTCL
CADRE (Manager and Supervisor)	0.763	5.552 *	2.708	.004
NATURE (Technical and Non-tech.)	6.550 *	.639	.083	2.324
CADRE x NATURE	4.620 *	1.368	.494	1.838

* P < .05 ** P < .01

Self-role distance type of conflict arises out of discrepancy between self expectation and expectation of others. This type of conflict takes place when a person fails to assess the employment situation more realistically. It may also be that there is no way for the person to get first hand information about the job he is seeking. In GSFC as can be seen from the result of table 4.3.8. both the main effect of nature of job category and interaction effect of nature of job category and cadre are significant. It can be seen that though the effect of nature of job category is significnat, its effect is not independent of cadre since combination of both results in significant

interaction. The mean scores based on sub-groups are shown below.

TABLE 4.3.8.1. THE MEAN SCORES BASED ON SUB-GROUPS.

CATEGORY	MANAGERS	SUPERVISORS
TECH.	11.93	9.28
NON-TECH.	7.40	8.52

As can be seen from table above the technical managers differ significantly from technical supervisors but the managers non-technical do not differ significantly from supervisor non-technical. Thus the conflict due to self-role distance depends upon the joint effect of cadre and the nature of job category.

The F-ratio of 5.552 in case of cadre in GACL is significant at .05 level. The managers thus differ significantly from supervisors in respect of self-role distance type of conflict. The supervisors have a higher mean score (M = 10.36) than the managers (M = 8.53). All other F-ratios are not significant.

TABLE 4.3.9. SHOWING ANOVA TABLE IN RESPECT OF ROLE AMBIGUITY

SOURCE	ORGANISATION			
	GSFC	GACL	GCEL	GTCL
CADRE (Manager and Supervisor)	3.141	.648	.454	.534
NATURE (Technical and Non-tech.)	8.101 **	.077	2.354	2.967
CADRE x NATURE	3.265	.082	.239	.756

* P < .05 ** P < .01

Role ambiguity conflict arises when the roles are not properly defined and allocated to role incumbents. In case of GSFC the technical personnel differ significantly from non-technical personnel in respect of role ambiguity. The mean score of technical personnel is 9.07 and that of non-technical personnel is 6.95. The technical group has a higher level of conflict than non-technical personnel.

All other F-ratios are not significant indicating that there is no differential impact of role ambiguity in these other groups.

TABLE 4.3.10. SHOWING ANOVA TABLE IN RESPECT OF RESOURCE INADEQUACY

SOURCE	ORGANISATION			
	GSFC	GACL	GCEL	GTCL
CADRE (Manager and Supervisor)	2.054	.036	4.138 *	1.508
NATURE (Technical and Non-tech.)	2.854	.025	3.206	.819
CADRE x NATURE	1.879	.136	1.285	1.329

* P < .05 ** P < .01

The F-ratio of 4.138 in case of cadre in GCEL is significant at .05 level. All other F ratios are not significant. The mean score for resource inadequacy of managers of GCEL is 11.07 and that of supervisors is 13.10. This shows that the supervisors experience more resource inadequacy type of stress than managers.

OVERALL VIEW :-

On the whole it appears that conflict like role stagnation, role expectation, role overload, self role distance and resource inadequacy are experienced mostly by managers-technical in all the four organizations. Managers non-technical and supervisors both technical and non-technical do not seem to be bothered much by the role stress conflicts.

Of the four organizations most of the personnel of

managerial-technical cadre and supervisors-technical and non-technical cadres of GECL felt and experienced role stagnation, role expectation, role erosion and role inadequacy types of conflict. Resource inadequacy type of conflict appears to be present in all the four organizations.

4.4. CORRELATIONAL HYPOTHESIS

4.4.1. This hypothesis is in regard to intercorrelations between factors of role-stress and job satisfaction. Tables 4.4.1.1 to 4.4.1.4 presents the coefficients of correlation.

TABLE 4.4.1.1. INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN FACTORS OF ROLE STRESS WITH JOB SATISFACTION FOR ALL JOB CATEGORIES OF GSFC.

CATEGORY	VARIABLES and FACTORS									
	JS & IRD	JS & RS	JS & REC	JS & RE	JS & RO	JS & RI	JS & PI	JS & SRD	JS & RA	JS & RIN
Manager -tech.	-.16	.04	-.17	-.16	.37	-.08	.15	.15	-.001	-.20
Manager-non-tech.	-.40	-.72 **	-.63 *	-.51 *	-.24	-.46	-.67 **	-.67 **	-.66 **	-.21
Supervisor--tech.	.16	.18	.27	-.20	.26	-.007	-.39 *	- 57 **	-.12	.05
Supervisor-non-tech.	.18	-.18	.01	-.30	.03	-.20	-.003	-.14	-.008	-.28

* P < .05 ** P < .01

As can be seen from table 4.4.1.1. none of the correlations of role stress factors with job satisfaction is significant. They are both positive and negative but of low value, in case of managers technical in GSFC.

The correlations of role stagnation role expectation conflict, role erosion, personal inadequacy, self role distance and role ambiguity with job satisfaction in case of manager non-technical are quite high and significant beyond 0.01 level of signiticance except one correlation between role erosion and job satisfaction.

In case of supervisor technical job satisfaction is significantly correlated with personal inadequacy as well as self role distance. None of the correlations in case of supervisor non-technical is significant.

All the significant correlations are in the expected direction. Accordingly a positive correlation would mean a correlation of high role stress accompanied by low job satisfaction. Thus the negative sign of correlation would indicate positive relationship. Higher score in case of role stress indicates higher value of the underlying stress factor. Similarly higher score of job satisfaction measure would indicate higher value of job satisfaction. Under the

circumstances the negative value of the correlations between role stress factors and job satisfaction would indicate positive correlation in the expected direction.

TABLE 4.4.1.2 INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN FACTORS OF ROLE STRESS AND JOB SATISFACTION FOR ALL JOB CATEGORIES OF GACL.

CATEGORY	VARIABLES & FACTORS									
	JS & IRD	JS & RS	JS & REC	JS & RE	JS & RO	JS & RI	JS & PI	JS & SRD	JS & RA	JS & RIN
Manager -tech.	-.20	-.49	.09	-.55 *	.13	.12	-.21	-.84 **	-.35	.14
Manager-non-tech.	-.05	-.66 **	-.38	-.05	-.08	-.19	-.47	-.26	-.52 *	-.29
Supervisor--tech.	-.39 *	-.64 **	-.23	-.58 **	.16	-.56 **	-.0008	-.72 **	-.45 *	-.55
Supervisor-non-tech.	.03	-.59 **	-.33	-.08	.17	.07	-.27	-.42 *	-.27	-.007

* P < .05 ** P < .01

As can be seen from table 4.4.1.2 in GACL for the manager-technical category the correlations of -.55 between job satisfaction and role erosion and the correlation of -.84 between job satisfaction and self role distance are quite high and significant, indicating that higher level of stress is accompanied by low job satisfaction to a significant extent. Two

other correlations - one of job satisfaction and role stagnation relationship and another of job satisfaction and role ambiguity relationship - are also sufficiently high but they are not significant. One correlation of -.21 between job satisfaction and personal inadequacy also indicates a positive trend in general level of manager technical. Job satisfaction relates in the expected direction with role stagnation personal inadequacy, role ambiguity, self role distance and role erosion.

In case of manager non-technical category only the correlations of -.66 between job satisfaction and role stagnation and -.52 between job satisfaction and role ambiguity are significant indicating high role stress being associated with low job satisfaction. Other correlations in the same job category also show a positive trend. The correlations of -.38 between job satisfaction and role expectation conflict.

- .19 between job satisfaction and RI

- .47 between job satisfaction and PI

- .26 between job satisfaction and SRD

and - .29 between job satisfaction and RIN

are all in the expected direction. In general though the number of significant correlations in the managerial category (both technical and non-technical) is quite small most of the correlations of role stress factors with job satisfaction though not significant

are sufficiently high to indicate a positive trend. Thus the nature of relationship between role stress factor and job satisfaction follows a similar trend in both categories at the managerial level. In the case of supervisor-technical categories the significant correlations and the correlations in the expected directions are between job satisfaction and inter-role distance, JS & RE, JS & RI & JS & SRD, JS & RA & JS & RIN.

Besides these significant correlations one more correlation of -.23 in case of JS and REC also indicates a positive trend. In case of supervisor non technical job satisfaction and RS and between JS and SRD these two correlations indicate positive relationships. Other correlations of the value -.33 between JS & REC, JS & RO, JS & PI and JS & RA though not significant also show that relatively high role stress is accompanied by low job satisfaction. In general it seems that job satisfaction correlates negatively but in the expected direction with most of the role stress factors, in all the four job categories.

The noteworthy feature is that most of these correlations are significant in the supervisor-technical cadre.

TABLE 4.4.1.3. INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN FACTORS OF ROLE STRESS AND JOB SATISFACTION FOR ALL JOB CATEGORIES OF GCEL

CATEGORY	VARIABLES & FACTORS									
	JS & IRD	JS & RS	JS & REC	JS & RE	JS & RO	JS & RI	JS & PI	JS & SRD	JS & RA	JS & RIN
Manager -tech.	-.42	-.53 *	.41	-.42	.21	.45	-.44	-.57 *	-.34	.54 *
Manager-non-tech.	-.52 *	-.51 *	-.38	-.35	-.03	-.55 *	-.30	-.27	-.64 **	-.24
Supervisor--tech.	-.05	-.41	-.42	-.47 *	.03	-.13	-.21	-.42	-.06	-.11
Supervisor-non-tech.	.22	-.67 **	-.06	-.81 **	.15	.35	-.32	-.56 **	-.28	-.31

* P < .05 ** P < .01

Table 4.4.1.3. shows correlations between role stress factors and job satisfaction for various job categories in GCEL. In case of manager technical the significant correlations are between JS and role stagnation, between JS and SRD and JS and RIN. All other correlations, though not significant are negative in directions and are of sufficient value to indicate a general positive trend between stress factors and job satisfaction relationships. In case of manager non technical job satisfaction correlates significantly with IRD, RS, RI and RA. The correlations are indicating positive relationship between role stress factors and job satisfaction. All

other correlations except one of -.03 between JS and RO are sufficiently high to show a positive trend. Thus in both categories of managerial cadre most of the role stress factors have their relationship with job satisfaction in the expected directions.

So far as supervisory technical cadre is concerned only one correlation for the value -.47 is significant. Also the correlation of job satisfaction with RS, REC, PI and SRD though not significant indicate a trend towards positive association between role stress factors and job satisfaction. In supervisory non technical category job satisfaction is significantly correlated with RS, RE and SRD. Also job satisfaction has negative correlations but in the expected directions with RI, PI, RA and RIN. Here in this category also it is observed that the role stress factors in general correlate with job satisfaction in the expected directions.

TABLE 4.4.1.4. INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN FACTORS OF ROLE STRESS AND JOB SATISFACTION FOR ALL JOB CATEGORIES OF GTCL

CATEGORY	VARIABLES & FACTORS									
	JS & IRD	JS & RS	JS & REC	JS & RE	JS & RO	JS & RI	JS & PI	JS & SRD	JS & RA	JS & RIN
Manager -tech.	-.43	-.40	-.17	-.53	.16	-.50	.72 *	-.24	.09	-.16
Manager-non-tech.	-.67	-.78 *	-.72 *	-.81 *	-.32	-.37	.08	-.93 **	-.92 **	-.64
Supervisor--tech.	.007	-.52 *	-.03	-.30	.35	-.20	.26	-.59 *	- 32	.21
Supervisor-non-tech.	.0007	.29	-.008	.32	.12	-.17	-.15	-.27	-.51 *	-.11

* P < .05 ** P < .01

As can be seen from table 4.4.1.4 in GTCL only one correlation of -.72 in case of JS & PI is significant. Most other correlations between JS and role stress factors are sufficiently high to indicate positive trend. Surprisingly five of the ten role stress with job satisfaction in the expected directions. Four other negative correlations are of the values -.67, -.32, -.37 and -.64. All these correlations though not significant are quite high to indicate a positive trend in the relationship of role stress factors with job satisfaction. In case of supervisory cadre only one correlation of -.51 between JS and RA in the non technical group is significant. Most of the other correlations are in the negative direction showing a

positive trend in the relationship of role stress factors with job satisfaction. In general it appears that in GTCL the correlations of role stress factors with job satisfaction are relatively stronger in the managerial category than in the supervisory category.

4.4.2. This hypothesis is with regard to job satisfaction and dimension of OC (motivational) table 4.4.2.1 to 4.4.2.4 present the coefficient of correlation between these.

TABLE 4.4.2.1 - CORRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE JOB SATISFACTION AND DIMENSION OF OC (MOTIVATIONAL) FOR EACH JOB CATEGORY OF GSFC.

CATEGORY	VARIABLES & FACTORS					
	JS & Achievement climate	JS & Expert inflence climate	JS & Extension climate	JS & Control climate	JS & Affiliation climate	JS & Dependency climate
Manager -tech.	-.01	.01	.16	-.17	-.14	-.009
Manager-non-tech.	.46	.34	.46	-.48	.31	-.03
Supervisor--tech.	.30	.05	.33	.49*	.23	.36
Supervisor-non-tech.	.48*	.26	.55	.14	.40*	.50*

* P < .05 ** P < .01

Achievement climate is characterized by striving for

excellence through healthy competition, availability of needed information, & reward being contingent upon the outcome.

The job satisfaction measure reflects the overall feeling associated with job performance. The high positive correlation between achievement orientation and satisfaction indicates that the job provides necessary opportunities so that job satisfaction is promoted.

In view of this postulated relationship it could be said that the relationship between climate and job satisfaction may vary according to situation. Considering the various correlations of achievement climate with job satisfaction among managerial and supervisory cadre personnel both technical and non technical personnel being included, it is seen in table 4.4.2.1 that correlation is close to zero in case of manager-technical. It varies between .30 and .48 in case of other personnel. It is also seen that the higher positive correlations of .46 and .48 are observed in the non-technical groups. It is only in the case of technical personnel in the supervisory cadre that the correlation is .30 which though positive is quite low.

Expert influenced climate is characterized by people

with skills and expertise are encouraged, and are influential in decision making.

In view of the above, it is seen that correlation is very low and insignificant in case of manager-technical and supervisor technical but it varies from .26 to .34 for non technical supervisors and managers. It is observed that job satisfaction measure correlates positively in case of non technical personnel but it fails to correlate significantly with expert climate in case of technical personnel.

In case of technical personnel job satisfaction seems to be independent of expert climate.

So far as correlations of job satisfaction with extension climate are concerned all the four correlations are positive varying from .16 to .5. Except the correlations of .16 in case of manager technical the other three correlations are positive and sufficiently high.

Extension climate is characterized by a concern to develop people or groups of people. In such a climate of helping relationships job satisfaction is expected to be high. This type of expected relationship is obtained in all the four job categories but the correlation in case of manager technical is quite low.

Control climate indicates that the superiors would like to control the subordinates. Communication and other transactions with people are restricted in order to exercise a high control over the subordinates. This type of climate is expected to be non-conducive in promoting job satisfaction.

The first two correlations in table 4.4.2.1 of -.17 and -.48 are in the expected direction, indicating that higher degree of control is accompanied by low satisfaction. This is true of manager techhical and manager non-technical categories. In the supervisory cadre the correlations are positive indicating that job satisfaction correlates positively with control influence. In other words the more highly controlled personnel have higher job satisfaction. This finding appears to be strange but in a sense this is true in the technical category of supervisors. In case of non technical supervisors the correlations though positive are quite low.

In general, control climate leads to lower satisfaction in case of manager non-technical but it leads to higher satisfaction in case of supervisor technical.

Job satisfaction seems to be positively correlated with affiliation climate. In case of manager non-

technical and supervisors of both technical and non-technical categories. Only the correlations of .40 in case of non-technical supervisors is significant, indicating that concern for high social relationships is strongly associated with job satisfaction. The correlation of -.14 in case of technical managers is quite low and insignificant. Except this category in other categories job satisfaction correlates positively with concern for friendly and social relations.

Dependency climate fails to correlate significantly with job satisfaction in case of both technical and non-technical managerial personnel whereas it correlates positively with job satisfaction in case of both technical and non-technical supervisors.

The correlation of .05 in case of non-technical supervisors is positive and significant indicating that high dependency is associated with high job satisfaction. The first two correlations in case of managerial personnel are expected in view of the fact that no manager can feel satisfied by rating subordinates dependent on superiors.

The positive correlations in case of supervisory cadre personnel indicate that it is by being strict about enforcing rules and regulations and by making

subordinates strictly observe the rules and regulations that they can derive satisfaction in the job.

Considering the correlations of job satisfaction with all the six climates in case of technical managers it appears that all the six correlations are either low positive or negative and insignificant. Whereas in case of non-technical managers except the correlation of -.30 in case of denpendency climate all other correlations indicate positive relationships of job satisfaction with climate measures.

In case of supervisors both technical and non technical except some stray correlation most of the correlations are positive and sufficiently high indicating that job satisfaction varies as a function of climate.

TABLE 4.4.2.2 - INTERCORRELATION BETWEEN THE JOB SATISFACTION AND DIMENSIONS OF OC (MOTIVATIONAL) FOR EACH JOB CATEGORY OF GACL.

CATEGORY	VARIABLES & FACTORS					
	JS & Achievement climate	JS & Expert influence climate	JS & Extension climate	JS & Control climate	JS & Affiliation climate	JS & Dependency climate
Manager -tech.	.38	.56 *	.26	-.15	.49	.46
Manager-non-tech.	-.05	-.26	-.05	-.24	.12	.13
Supervisor--tech.	.37	.27	.19	-.46 *	.17	-.15
Supervisor-non-tech.	.27	.04	.25	.11	.37	.40 *

* P < .05 ** P < .01

As can be seen from the table 4.4.2.2. the correlation of job satisfaction with achievement climate are positive and sufficiently high, in all except one job category namely manager non technical. In case of manager technical and supervisers both technical and non-technical the positive correlations indicate that relatively higher job satisfaction is obtained in an organization which promotes achievement striving.

The expert climate correlates positively and significantly with job satisfaction in case of manager technical job category. Its correlations with job

satisfaction in the non-technical manager category is -.26 and .27 in case of supervisor technical category. The correlation of .04 in case of non-technical supervisors is very low and insignificant. In general job satisfaction among technical personnel is supported by an organization in which people are allowed to participate in decision making and where worth is recognised. Job satisfaction among non-technical personnel is not positively influenced in such a climate. i.e. expert influence climate.

The job satisfaction correlates positively with an extension climate to the extent of .26 in case of technical managers, .19 in case of technical supervisors and .25 in case of non-technical supervisors. Job satisfaction fails to correlate with extension climate in case of managers non technical. Although the positive correlations reported above are not significant but they indicate that the job satisfaction is supported in a climate in which enough attention is paid to promote growth and development of employees.

The only significant correlation between control climate and job satisfaction is in case of technical supervisors' category. Among managers both technical and non-technical the correlations are fairly low but they do indicate that relatively job satisfaction is

higher in a climate where subordinates are controlled by various mechanisms.

Affiliation climate correlates positively but not significantly with job satisfaction in all the four job categories. The highest correlations, of .49 and .37 are in case of technical managers and non-technical supervisors. The other two correlations are of fairly low magnitude.

Dependency climate correlates positively and sufficiently highly with job satisfaction in case of technical managers and non-technical supervisors the correlations of .13 and -.15 in case of non-technical managers and technical supervisors respectively are fairly low.

In general in case of technical managers job satisfaction seems to be positively associated with achievement climate, expert climate, affiliation climate and dependency climate. Surprisingly the correlations of job satisfaction with six climate measures among non-technical managers are either low positive or negative. Among technical supervisors the control climate and achievement climate correlate positively and highly with job satisfaction whereas in case of non-technical supervisors the affiliation and dependency climate have their positive and high

correlations with job satisfaction.

TABLE 4.4.2.3 - INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND DIMENSIONS OF OC (MOTIVATIONAL) FOR EACH JOB CATEGORY OF GCEL.

CATEGORY	VARIABLES and FACTORS					
	JS & Achievement climate	JS & Expert inflence climate	JS & Extension climate	JS & Control climate	JS & Affiliation climate	JS & Dependency climate
Manager -tech.	.34	.31	.28	.59 *	.32	-.03
Manager-non-tech.	-.10	.08	.03	-.24	.31	.04
Supervisor--tech.	-.05	-.01	.07	-.40	.13	.27
Supervisor-non-tech.	.38	.50 *	.50 *	-.23	-.04	.31

* P < .05 ** P < .01

Referring to table 4.4.2.3. it can be seen that job satisfaction correlates positively and sufficiently highly with achievement climate, expert climate and extension climate among technical managers and non-technical supervisors. In case of supervisors both technical and non-technical the correlations of job satisfaction with achievement climate, expert climate, extension climate and control climate are fairly low. Surprisingly there is a very high positive correlation between job satisfaction and control climate in the technical managers' group. This shows that a high

degree of control appears to be associated with high job satisfaction. Affiliation climate also correlates with job satisfaction positively. Job satisfaction seems to be positively correlated with dependency climate among supervisors both technical and non-technical.

In general in the technical managers' group in comparision to non-technical managers' group job satisfaction correlates positively with the four climate measures except dependency climate. Similarly except affiliation climate all other climate measures are positively correlated with job satisfaction in the non-technical supervisors' group. In the technical supervisors' group most of these correlations are fairly low except one of .27 between dependency climate and job satisfaction.

TABLE 4.4.2.4 - INTER-CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE JOB SATISFACTION AND DIMENSIONS OF OC (MOTIVATIONAL) FOR EACH JOB CATEGORY OF GTCL.

CATEGORY	VARIABLES & FACTORS					
	JS & Achievement climate	JS & Expert inflence climate	JS & Extension climate	JS & Control climate	JS & Affiliation climate	JS & Dependency climate
Manager -tech.	.63	.74 *	.56	.59	.24	.41
Manager-non-tech.	.41	.32	.74 *	.77 *	.58	.66
Supervisor--tech.	.60 **	.55 *	.71 **	.20	.67**	.55 *
Supervisor-non-tech.	.09	.02	.21	.30	-.07	.47

* P < .05 ** P < .01

As can be seen from table 4.4.2.4. achievement climate and expert climate seem to be higher and positively correlated with job satisfaction among technical managers and technical supervisors. These two climate measures are also correlated positively with job satisfaction among the non-technical group of managers. The corresponding correlations in case of non-technical supervisors are vary low and insignificant. Extension climate is positively and highly correlated with job satisfaction among managers both technical as well as non-technical and among technical supervisors. Control climate correlates

positively with job satisfaction among technical managers but it correlates negatively and significantly among non-technical managers. It should be mentioned here that a negative correlation in case of control climate indicates positive relationship. Accordingly more restrictive climate seems to be associated with higher job satisfaction among technical managers but the same type of climate reduces job satisfaction considerably among non-technical managers. The correlations of control climate with job satisfaction among the supervisory group are positive but are of low magnitude.

Affiliation climate has its positive correlation with job satisfaction among technical as well as non-technical managers and also among technical supervisors. Its correlations in case of non-technical supervisors is negative and very low.

Dependency climate correlates positively and highly with job satisfaction in all the four job categories. This finding is surprising in view of the fact that more highly satisfied people show a good deal of dependency.

In GTCL people of all cadres look for direction, help and suggestion which if available produce a sense of satisfaction among them.

4.5. MODERATOR HYPOTHESIS

Moderating effect of each climate.

Hypothesis calls upon subgrouping analysis to test the moderating effect of six dimensions of OC (each hypothesis for each dimension of OC) on the degree of relationships between ORS factors and job satisfaction variables in four organizations.

4.5.1. Test of moderating effect of each climate (Achievement climate, Expert influence climate, Extension climate, Control climate, Affiliation climate and Dependency climate) on the degree of relationship between ORS factors and Job satisfaction in case of Gujarat State Fertilizers Company Limited, (GSFC), is presented in Table 4.5.1.

This hypothesis proposes to test the moderating effect of achievement climate, expert influence climate, Extension, Control, Affiliation and Dependency climates.

On the degree of relationship between stress and satisfaction Table 4.5.1. summarises the coefficients of correlation for both Low scoring group and High scoring group on each climate of G.S.F.C. For the purpose of assessing the impact of variation in

TABLE - 4.5.1. TEST OF MODERATING EFFECT OF EACH CLIMATE ON THE DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORS FACTORS AND JOB SATISFACTION IN CASE OF G.S.F.C

DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE		ROLE STRESS FACTORS									
		I Inter Role Distance	II Role Stagnation	III Role Expecta-tion Conflict	IV Role Erosion	V Role Overload	VI Role Isolation	VII Personal Inadequacy	VIII Self Role Distance	IX Role Ambiguity	X Resource Inadequacy
Achievement Climate	Low	.05	-.36*	-.05	-.25	.24	-.05	-.27	-.29	-.22	-.02
	High	-.20	-.08	-.05	-.33*	-.01	-.29	-.20	-.30	-.06	-.05
Expert influence Climate	Low	.16	-.39**	-.03	-.35*	.24	-.14	-.31*	-.46**	-.25	-.05
	High	-.22	-.19	-.04	-.29	-.01	-.22	-.17	-.25	-.15	-.14
Extension Climate	Low	.02	-.42**	-.11	-.29	.14	-.08	-.25	-.45**	-.33*	-.02
	High	-.14	-.05	-.01	-.30	.05	-.18	-.20	-.19	-.03	-.04
Control Climate	Low	-.36	-.45**	-.47**	-.46**	-.19	-.29	-.47**	-.55**	.43**	-.12
	High	.20	-.24	.34*	-.20	.36*	-.10	.01	-.17	-.03	-.13
Affiliation Climate	Low	-.03	-.37**	-.15	-.33*	.06	-.09	-.22	-.39**	-.32**	-.04
	High	-.09	-.21	-.04	-.31*	.16	-.22	-.25	-.31*	-.10	-.12
Dependency Climate	Low	.28	-.26	.00	-.25	.28	.00	-.21	-.23	-.17	.11
	High	-33*	-.31*	-.07	-.38*	-.04	-.34*	-.25	-.44**	-.22	-.30

* P < .05 ** P < 0.01

climate on job satisfaction ORS relationship, all the six climates have been divided into two groups as positive and negative climates. The three climates namely achivement orientation, expert influence and extension climates are considered to be positive climates, whereas control, affiliation and dependency are considered to be negative climates.

Considering the correlations between job satisfaction and inter role distance for the high and low climate groups for the positive climates, it is observed that the correlations indicate strong positive relationship in the high climate group and low positive climate group and low positive or insignificant correlations in the low climate groups.

In case of negative climate groups the relationship is not consistent in the control climate. The relationship between inter-role distance and job satisfaction is highly positive ($r = -.36$) when the climate is perceived as low. In the high control climate the positive correlation of .20 indicates that high inter role distance scorer tends to be more dissatisfied.

In case of affiliation climate both the high and low climate groups have low negative but insignificant correlations between inter-role distance and job

satisfaction.

In case of dependency climate the correlation of -.32 between inter-role distance and job satisfaction is in the expected direction that is high inter-role distance scorers tend to have low satisfaction.

On the whole there is a differential impact of high and low climate *groups* on the relationship between inter-role distance and job satisfaction.

Considering now the correlations of other ORS factors and job satisfaction in the low and high achivement climate groups it can be seen that the low climate group has a significant positive relationship between role stagnation and job satisfaction. A correlation of -.35 in this case indicates that a high role stagnation conflict is accompanied by low job satisfaction or vice versa. All the other correlations in the low group are not significant. In the high group only one correlation of -.33 (role erosion and job satisfaction) is significant indicating that high erosion is accompanied by low satisfaction. All other correlations are not significant.

In case of low expert climate group the correlations of -.39 between role stagnation and job satisfaction, -.35 between role erosion and job satisfaction, -.31

between personal inadequacy and job satisfaction and -.45 between self-role distance and job satisfaction are all significant. The negative signs of these correlations indicate that high job satisfaction is accompanied by low role stress conflicts. In the high climate group none of the correlations is significant.

In the low extension climate group the significant correlations are between role stagnation and job satisfaction, self role distance and job satisfaction and role ambiguity and job satisfaction. All these significant correlations indicate that high job satisfaction is accompnied by low role stress conflict. In the high extension group none of the correlations is significant.

So far as the control climate is concerned job satisfaction has significant correlations with role stagnation, role expected conflict, role erosion, personal inadequacy, self-role distance and role ambiguity, in the low group. All these correlations have a negative sign which indicates that the correlations are in the expected direction. In the high control group the role expectation conflict and role overload have significant correlations with job satisfaction with positive sign which indicates that high role stress conflict is accompnied by high job satisfaction. Thus in the low control group most of

the correlations of role stress factors and job satisfaction are in the expected direction but the two significant correlations in the high control group are obviously not in the expected direction.

Affiliation climate is characterised by good social relations. All types of work to be done is based on warm and friendly relations. Too much of affiliation is not desirable in view of the fact that it may lead to dependency. Considering the correlations in high and low affiliation groups, job satisfaction has significant correlations in the expected direction with role stagnation, role erosion, self-role distance and role ambiguity in the low group. In the high group job satisfaction correlates significantly with role erosion and self role distance. On the whole atleast in terms of the correlations of job satisfaction with role erosion and self role distance in both low and high groups, it can be said that the correlations fail to vary according to variation in affiliation climate.

Considering the correlations of ORS factors and job satisfaction in the low and high dependency groups it is observed that none of the correlations in the low group is significant, whereas atleast five correlations of ORS factors with job satisfaction are significant in the high group.

In general it could be said that there are some inconsistencies in the relationship of ORS factors with job satisfaction in the high and low climate groups based on six climates. It is also observed that in some cases the correlations do vary as a function of variations in the climate. In GSFC the hypothesis on the moderation effect of climate on the relationship between ORS factors and job satisfaction is partly supported.

4.5.2. Test of moderating effect of each climate (achievement, expert influence, extension, control, affiliation and dependency) on the degree of relationship between ORS factors and job satisfaction in case of Gujarat Alkalies and Chemicals Limited. (GACL), is presented in table 4.5.2.

The hypothesis that correlations of job satisfaction ORS factors will vary as a function of variation in climate dimensions is not supported wholly in GACL. As can be seen from table 4.5.2 job satisfaction correlates significantly with role stagnation and self- role distance in all the six climate groups. Job satisfaction also correlates significantly with role erosion and role ambiguity in most of the sub-groups based on climate dimensions. Besides there are some stray correlations which are also significant. The correlation of .32 between inter-role distance and

TABLE - 4.5.2. TEST OF MODERATING EFFECT OF EACH CLIMATE ON THE DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORS FACTORS AND JOB SATISFACTION IN CASE OF G.A.C.L

DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE		ROLE STRESS FACTORS									
		I Inter.Role Distance	II Role Stagnation	III Role Expecta-tion Conflict	IV Role Erosion	V Role Overload	VI Role Isolation	VII Personal Inadequacy	VIII Self Role Distance	IX Role Ambiguity	X Resource Inadequacy
Achievement Climate	Low	-.06	-.61**	-14	-.48*	.02	-.27	-.14	-.56**	-.45**	-.39**
	High	.12	-.39*	-.24	-.10	.00	.01	-.10	-.51**	-21	.03
Expert influence Climate	Low	.01	-.57**	-.17	-.51**	.14	-.29	-.05	-.62**	-.45**	-.29
	High	.06	-.41*	-.25	.04	-.14	.05	-.21	-.45*	-.19	-.02
Extension Climate	Low	.07	-.57**	-.02	-.49**	.07	-.20	-.10	-.56**	-.36**	-.29
	High	.09	-.49**	-.27	-.15	.06	-.02	-.23	-.59**	-.32*	.04
Control Climate	Low	-.25	-.62**	-.39**	-.22	-.35*	-.11	-.40**	-.63**	-.40**	-.15
	High	.32*	-.47**	.10	-.43**	.40*	-.09	.03	-.47*	-.24	-.02
Affiliation Climate	Low	.11	-.51**	-.14	-.41**	.21	-.14	-.02	-.58**	-.31*	-.25
	High	-.04	-.51*	-.31	-.18	-.21	-.20	-.16	-.50*	-.38*	-.05
Dependency Climate	Low	-.10	-.61**	-.23	-.33*	.06	-.11	-.08	-.76**	-.30*	-.23
	High	.30	-.50**	-.31*	-.47*	.04	-.35*	-.03	-.50**	-.47*	-.36*

* P < .05 ** P < 0.01

job satisfaction in the high control group is positive and significant. Similarly the correlation of -.38 between role expectation and job satisfaction in the low control climate and that between role expectation and job satisfaction in the high dependency climate are also significant. Role overload has significant correlation with job satisfaction in the low and high groups based on control climate. Personal inadequacy has its significant correlation with job satisfaction in the low control group and resource inadequacy has its significant correlation with job satisfaction in the low achievement orientation climate group and high dependency climate group.

On the overall basis these results do not show any significant trend in the expected direction. The role stress factors correlate with job satisfaction in a manner which does not indicate any consistent pattern according to variation in the climate.

4.5.3. Test of moderating effect of each climates (achievement, expert influence, extension, control, affiliation and dependency) on the degree of relationship between ORS factors and job satisfaction in case of Gujarat Communication and Electronics Limited. (GCEL), is presented in table 4.5.3.

TABLE - 4.5.3. TEST OF MODERATING EFFECT OF EACH CLIMATE ON THE DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORS FACTORS AND JOB SATISFACTION IN CASE OF G.C.E.L

DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE		ROLE STRESS FACTORS									
		I Inter Role Distance	II Role Stagnation	III Role Expecta-tion Conflict	IV Role Erosion	V Role Overload	VI Role Isolation	VII Personal Inadequacy	VIII Self Role Distance	IX Role Ambiguity	X Resource Inadequacy
Achievement Climate	Low	.09	-.54	-.07	-.51**	.07	-.13	.17	-.53**	-.06	-.30
	High	-.24	-.73**	-.49**	-.73**	-.15	-.50**	-.07	-.42**	-.46**	-.20
Expert influence Climate	Low	.18	-.62**	-.21	-.57**	.08	-.19	.24	-.49**	-.05	-.19
	High	-.56**	-.52*	-.18	-.54*	-.12	-.38*	-.28	-.43**	-.42**	-.30
Extension Climate	Low	.12	-67**	-.18	-.56**	.08	-.19	.19	-.50**	-.09	-.28
	High	-.36*	-.46*	-.23	-.53**	-.21	-.36*	-.12	-.36*	-.29	-.14
Control Climate	Low	-.14	-.50**	-.22	-.26	-.16	-.28	-.00	-.22	-.16	-.20
	High	.05	-.57**	-.14	-.69**	.13	-.10	.31	-.55**	-.07	-.19
Affiliation Climate	Low	.23	-.58**	-.16	-.40*	.19	.02	.09	-.35*	-.00	-.19
	High	-.20	-.60**	-.29	-.75**	-.12	-.48*	.05	-.60**	-.35*	-.33*
Dependency Climate	Low	.05	-.66**	-.31	-.49**	.04	-.35**	.01	-.46**	-.23	-.38**
	High	-.12	-.55**	-.11	-.68**	-.03	-.15	.23	-.54**	-.16	-.10

* P < .05 ** P < 0.01

The moderating effect of climate dimension on the relationship of organizational role stress factors and job satisfaction was also studied in GECL which as described earlier in chapter I is one of the largest public sector organizations in electronics industry.

As can be seen from the table 4.5.3 job satisfaction correlates significantly with role stagnation in all the subgroups based on climate dimensions. Job satisfaction also correlates significantly with role erosion and self-role distance in all the subgroups except one based on low control climate dimension. Role isolation has its significant correlation with job satisfaction in the high expert climate group, high extension climate group, high affiliation climate group and low dependency climate group. There are some stray correlations which can also be noted. The correlation of -.56 between inter-role distance and job satisfaction in the high expert climate and that between inter-role distance and job satisfaction in the high extension climate are also significant. Role expectation conflict has its signiticant correlation with job satisfaction in the high achievement climate group. Similarly role ambiguity correlates significantly with job satisfaction in the high achievement climate group, high expert climate group and high affiliation climate group. Resource inadequacy and job satisfaction are highly correlated

in case of high affiliation and low dependency groups. Role overload fails to correlate with job satisfaction in any of the six climate groups. Similarly personal inadequacy also fails to show any significant correlation.

On the whole it can be said that there is no differential impact of climate variation on the relationship between organizational role stress factors and job satisfaction. All significant correlations do not show any consistent trend.

4.5.4 Test of moderating effect of each climates (achivement, expert influence, extension, control, affiliation and dependency) on the degree of relationship between ORS factors and job satisfaction in case of Gujarat Tractor Corporation Limited. (GTCL), is presented in table 4.5.4.

The various correlations of job satisfaction and ORS factors shown in table 4.5.4 do not reveal any consistent trend towards moderating effect of climate on the relationship of ORS factors with job satisfaction.

As can be seen from table 4.5.4 none of the correlations of inter-role distance, role expectation, role overload and resource inadequacy with job

TABLE - 4.5.4. TEST OF MODERATING EFFECT OF EACH CLIMATE ON THE DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORS FACTORS AND JOB SATISFACTION IN CASE OF G.T.C.L

DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE		ROLE STRESS FACTORS									
		I Inter Role Distance	II Role Stagnation	III Role Expecta-tion Conflict	IV Role Erosion	V Role Overload	VI Role Isolation	VII Personal Inadequacy	VIII Self Role Distance	IX Role Ambiguity	X Resource Inadequacy
Achievement Climate	Low	.08	-.17	-.03	-.28	.22	-.25	.54*	-.44*	-.38	-.16
	High	-.07	-.02	-.23	-.03	-.08	-.20	-.17	-.38	-.62*	-.17
Expert influence Climate	Low	.16	-.12	.11	-.06	.32	-.09	.57*	-.32	-.27	-.13
	High	-.25	-.23	-.32	-.23	-.10	-.33	-.32	-.54**	-.88**	-.19
Extension Climate	Low	-.12	-.39	-.21	-.28	.07	-.47*	.38	-.60**	-.51**	-.32
	High	-.02	-.02	-.18	-.07	.02	-.10	-.20	-.33	-.50**	-.07
Control Climate	Low	-.11	-.03	-.27	-.13	-.10	-.36	-.20	-.50**	-.60**	-09
	High	-.11	-.50**	-.04	-.37	.21	-.15	.32	-.59*	-.47**	-.31
Affiliation Climate	Low	-.21	-.38	-.36	-.42**	.00	-.64**	.36	-.66**	-.65**	-.28
	High	-.03	-.02	-.17	-.05	-.02	-.18	-.17	-.32	-.47	-.15
Dependency Climate	Low	.03	-.02	-.23	-.19	-.06	-.37	-.02	-.31	-.40*	-.15
	High	-.31	- 65**	-.23	-.22	.02	.02	.20	-.71**	-.69**	-.35

* P < .05 ** P < .01

satisfaction is significant. There is only one correlation of -.42 between role erosion and job satisfaction which is significant in case of low affiliation climate group. Role stagnation is significantly correlated with job satisfaction in high control climate group and low affiliation climate group. Role stagnation has its significant correlations with job satisfaction in the high control group and high dependency group. So far as the correlation of self-role distance with job satisfaction are concerned seven of the twelve correlations are significant, whereas nine of twelve correlations between role ambiguity and job satisfaction are significant in different sub-groups based on climate dimensions.

In general it appears that there is no consistent variation of the correlation between ORS factors and job satisfaction in accordance with variation in climate dimensions. Climate thus fails to serve as a moderator variable in this case too.