

Copying Strategies and Organizational Support as predictors of organizational role stress and Job satisfaction among Principals of Government Senior Secondary Schools in Himachal Pradesh

Prakash Sankhyan*

Abstract

This research was conducted on 250 Principals to examine the predicting effect of coping strategies and organizational support on organizational role stress and job satisfaction. Findings revealed that Principals using approach as dominant mode of coping style differed significantly from their counterparts using avoidance coping in role stagnation, resource inadequacy, personal inadequacy, self role distance and role ambiguity dimensions of ORS. Similarly Principals using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping significantly differed from their counterparts using approach coping in role erosion and role isolation dimensions of ORS. Principals having high organizational support differed significantly from their counterparts having low organizational support in Role stagnation, role expectation conflict, role erosion, role overload dimensions of ORS and in overall role stress. There is negative and significant correlation between approach coping and organizational role stress and its majority of component & similarly there is a negative and significant correlation between organizational support and organizational role stress and its components in majority. Regression analyses, findings revealed that approach mode of coping and organizational support explaining 31.9% variation in IRD, 26.3% variation in RS, 30.9% variation in REC, 29.7% variation in RE, 15.9% percent variation in RO, 35.6% variation in PI, 37.4% in Role ambiguity dimensions of ORS and 27.6% variation in total ORS. Avoidance coping explaining 3.6% variation in self role distance and 8.2% in Role Inadequacy. Approach coping, avoidance coping and well as organizational support explaining 11.8% variation in on-the –job satisfaction & 13.6% variation in off-the –job satisfaction.

Keywords: Organizational Role Stress (ORS), Organizational Social Support, Job Satisfaction, on-the job satisfaction, Off-the Job satisfaction, Coping Strategy, Approach Coping and Avoidance coping

Stress has become an inevitable part of the people's life in the modern world. Stresses related to job are pervading feature of modern organization extending significant impairing effects on employee's physical as well as psychological well-being. Nature of relationship with the boss, colleagues and subordinates are other sources of stress (Marshall and Cooper, 1979; Schuler, 1982).

Occupational Stress and Coping

The relationship of individual differences in coping to physical and emotional well-being has received prominent attention in stress, adaptation and health literature (Lazarus, 1993). The coping process is a central aspect of contemporary theories of stress, coping being viewed as a stabilizing factor that may help individuals during stressful periods (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984; Moos and Billings, 1982). Support for conceptualizing approach and avoidance coping as two higher-order dimensions of coping derives from both theoretical and empirical literature (Koeske, Kirk, & Koeske, 1993; Tobin, Holroyd, Reynolds, & Wigal, 1989).

Coping strategies are among other possible variables affecting psychological well-being. To cope means to make cognitive or behavioral efforts to manage individually stressful situations. In studying general coping processes, individuals differentiated regarding three coping styles: task-oriented coping style, emotion-

oriented coping style, and avoidance-oriented coping style (Moos & Holahan, 2003).

Stress Coping and Job Satisfaction: Khanna (2010) describes job satisfaction as a positive attitude by an employee towards his job as well as his personal life. This definition demonstrates that job satisfaction involves activities within and outside workplace. Hulin and Judge (2003) noted that job satisfaction includes multidimensional psychological response to one's job, and that such responses have cognitive (evaluative), affective (or emotional) and behavioural components. Researches prove that satisfied employees are known to show higher level of work performances in organizations. Thus, understanding job satisfaction of employees is an important organizational goal (Aronson, Laurenceau, Sieveking, & Bellet, 2005).

Working conditions such as salary would have their primary impact on job satisfaction (Rice et al., 1985). Occupational pressure might have adverse effects upon a worker's attitude and well being (Furnham and Schaffer, 1984) and this may lead to poor job satisfaction. It is well known that psychological reactions to the environmental conditions manifest themselves both in physiological and psychological form and their combination affect the worker (McCormick and Illgan, 1985). Factors such as age and tenure of job have also been found to be related job satisfaction (Bedeian et al., 1992).

*Lecturer(Psychology), DIET Bilaspur, Himachal Pradesh, Pin code:174033, Email id :prakash.sankhyan@gmail.com

Organizational Social Support: Social support is negatively related to mental problems (Brown et al., 1987). According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), a mismatch between appraisal of available social support and perceived stress can result in negative outcomes, whereas the appraisal of adequate social support can serve as a buffer against perceived stress on well-being. In the occupational stress literature, the main sources of social support are most often divided into supervisors, co-workers and people from outside of the employing organization (Beehr, King and King, 1990; Ganster, Fusilier and Mayes, 1986).

Stephen and long (2000) studied the specific types of social support to buffer the psychological and physical health effects of trauma among 527 police officers. They reported that personal communication buffered stresses at moderate levels. Beehr, Jex, Stary and Murray (2000) examined job stressors and workers social support in relation to both psychological strain and performance among 198 door-to-door booksellers employed on seasonal basis. They reported that social support predicted psychological strain, although it was only weakly related to performance.

Vashishtha and Mishra (2004) studied the relative input of social support and work stress to organizational commitment of supervisors (n=200) the study revealed that the social support and occupational stress notably predict the degree of organizational commitment of supervisors. Jayshree Nayak(2008)studied Factors influencing stress and coping strategies among the degree college teachers of Dharwad city, Karnatka. She found that respondent experience stress frequently because of the multifaceted nature of the work, work family life conflict, due to their ignorance sometimes, Lack of friendly behavior from their colleagues, lack of their contribution in decision making in their organization. Age, total service, monthly income were negatively and significantly correlated with different component of employment organization sources of stressors viz. work, role, personal development, interpersonal relation, organizational climate and total stressors.

Shrestha and Mishra(2012) Conducted a study on Relationship of Job Stress, Locus of Control, Organizational Support and Social Support to Psychological Strain, Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions: A Study in Nepali Commercial Banks. The sample included 153 employees working in nine different Nepali commercial banks. The findings can have significant practical implications for improving organizational performance by providing appropriate stress management interventions to reduce employees' job stress and psychological strain, and enhance their job satisfaction and reduce the intent to turnover. Besides practical implications, numbers of research implications are also highlighted.

Ismail et.al (2013) conducted a study on Job stress with supervisor's social support as a determinant of work intrusion on family conflict. A survey method was employed to gather survey questionnaires from academic staff in a Malaysian government university in Borneo. Findings: The outcomes of Smart PLS path model showed three major findings: first, supervisor's social support does act as an important moderating variable in the relationship between role ambiguity and work intrusion on family conflict. Second, supervisor's social support does not act as an important moderating variable in the relationship between role conflict and work intrusion on family conflict. Third, supervisor's social support does not act as an important moderating variable in the relationship between role overload and work intrusion on family conflict. In sum, supervisor's social support does act as a partial moderating variable in the hypothesized model.

Nagra and Kaur(2014) conducted a study on Occupational Stress and Coping Strategies Among Secondary School Teachers. Occupational Stress Index and self constructed Coping Strategies Scale were used to collect data from a random sample of 200 secondary school teachers. Statistical techniques such as mean, standard deviation, t test and linear regression were employed for the analysis of data. The results revealed that secondary school teachers experienced moderate level of occupational stress and moderately used coping strategies.

Significant differences were indicated regarding occupational stress among secondary school teachers in relation to gender and nature of job whereas insignificant differences were noted in relation to subject streams. Results also revealed insignificant differences for coping strategies in relation to gender and subject streams but significant differences for nature of job. The linear regression model showed a significant negative relationship between occupational stress and coping strategies.

Sultan and Rasid(2014) conducted a study on Perceived Social Support Mediating the Relationship between Perceived Stress and Job satisfaction. This research was conducted to examine the mediating effect of perceived social support between perceived stress and job satisfaction among employees. A conveniently selected sample of 280 employees provided the information on Perceived Social Support Scale, Perceived Stress Scale, and Job Satisfaction Survey. Employing Regression analyses, findings revealed the significant negative effect of perceived stress and positive effect of perceived social support on job satisfaction. Perceived stress was found non-significant in predicting perceived social support. However, perceived social support partially mediated the

relationship between perceived stress and job satisfaction.

Singh and Singhi(2015) conducted a study on Organizational Role Stress and Social Support as Predictors of Job Satisfaction among Managerial Personnel. The study was conducted on 210 managerial personnel to examine the role of organizational role stress and social support in job satisfaction among managerial personnel. The results of correlation coefficients indicate that social support (Person and Satisfaction) was significantly positively correlated with satisfaction (Job). Social support (satisfaction) was significantly positively correlated with satisfaction (Management and Total). Role overload was significantly negatively correlated with satisfaction (Management and Total). Role ambiguity was also found to be significantly negatively correlated with satisfaction (Management). Role conflict and role stress total were found significantly negatively correlated with satisfaction (Job, Management and Total). The results of hierarchical regression analysis support the results of correlation analysis. It can be concluded from the obtained results that reducing role stress and increasing social support (Satisfaction) at workplace can play a crucial and effective role in increasing job satisfaction among managers in the organizations.

Prashad, Vaidya and Kumar (2016) conducted a study on Occupational Stress and Coping Strategies Effect on Teacher Performance: A Comparative Analysis among Women and Men Teachers Affiliated to CBSE Schools in and around Hyderabad. A survey of 300 CBSE affiliated school teachers consisting of 200 Women and 100Men from in around Hyderabad carried out to assess the nine independent occupational stress causing factors Work Overload, Role Overload, Role Ambiguity, Students Behaviour, Co-workers, School Environment, Social Support and effect of Approach and Avoidance coping strategies on employees' Performance a dependent factor. To measure the reliability of the scale used in this study, and internal consistencies of the survey questionnaire, the reliability statistics Cronbach's alpha (C-Alpha) was measured. The overall C-Alpha value is 0.81 and 0.71 and 0.80 for Women and Men respectively; whereas and the C-Alpha values ranged from 0.70 to 0.82 for Women and from 0.68-0.87 for Men for all the nine independent factors, and one dependent factor .Health-wise, some teachers developed chronic leg pains due to mild varicose vein disorders may be because of continuous standing while teaching, and observed statistically significant differences with relation to among Women and Men on occupational stress, coping strategies and effect on performance.

Malik(2016) conducted a study on What Causes Stress among Academic Administrators: An Empirical Investigation. A sample of 200 administrators was

taken and different statements regarding causes of stress were asked. Factor analysis was applied to these statements to extract the main factor contributing to stress so that most important factors will be identified in order to make the effective strategies to cope up stress. The study revealed that the factor Role conflicts & Role ambiguity is the main stressor contributing more towards overall stress. Staff related problems are the second dimension contributing to the stress level. Work overload is considered as 3rd stressor while High self expectations and poor working conditions are ranked as 4th & 5th stressor. Bhui (2017), unfair political pressure in the group, Role Ambiguity and Role Overload are the three major stressors for the faculty members and administrative staff of Business Schools in West Bengal. Researcher recommends that job enrichment and greater sense of control should be provided to employees to mitigate occupational stress. Trainings should be also given on educational psychology and teaching methodology. Harmsen et.al (2018) are of the opinion that teacher student relationships are very important for teachers and hence any efforts in future to reduce the stress of teachers should be directed towards improving the relationships between teachers and students. Good teachersand students relationships can take away a great amount of pressure from teachers.

Rationale of study

In present days, the individuals know that how to handle coping strategies and functional social support when faced with stressful conditions. Principals are exposed to high stress, which directly impact on their job satisfaction and the quality of their work. Therefore, the present study tried to investigate the effect of functional social support and coping strategies on job stress and job satisfaction among Principals of Government senior secondary schools working in Himachal Pradesh.

Objectives

Following are the objectives of the study:

1. To determine the difference between the coping strategies (avoidance and approach) and organizational support with respect to organizational role stress and job satisfaction, (on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) among the Principals.
2. To determine the nature and magnitude of the relationship of coping strategies (avoidance and approach) and organizational support with organizational role stress and job satisfaction (on-the-job and off-the-job satisfaction) among the Principals.
3. To study how do coping strategies (avoidance & approach) and organizational support interact

together to determine the levels of organizational role stress and job satisfaction among Principals.

Hypotheses

1. The Principals using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping group will significantly differ from their counterparts using approach as a dominant mode of coping with respect to organizational role stress and job satisfaction.
2. The Principals having high organizational support group will significantly differ from their counterparts having low organizational support with respect to organizational role stress and job satisfaction.
3. Approach coping will be negatively related to organizational role stress among Principals.
4. Avoidance coping will be positively related to organizational role stress among Principals.
5. Approach coping will be positively related to job satisfaction among Principals.
6. Avoidance coping will be negatively related to job satisfaction among Principals.
7. Organizational support will be positively related to job satisfaction among Principals.
8. Organizational support will be negatively related to organizational role stress among Principals.
9. Coping strategies (avoidance and approach) in an interaction with organizational support will account for greater variance in organizational role stress among Principals.
10. Coping strategies (avoidance and approach) in an interaction with organizational support will account for greater variance in job satisfaction among Principals.

Method

Sample

This study was conducted on a sample of 250 Principals (Mean and SD age of the Principals was 50.45± 5.17 years) of Government senior secondary schools of Himachal Pradesh. Subjects were randomly selected from the government senior secondary schools of Himachal Pradesh and all districts were covered in this study. The percentage wise representation of districts were as: Bilaspur(31.7%), Una(14.1%), Sirmour(6%), Solan(5%), Shimla(6.5%), Kullu(7.5%), Mandi(6%), Lahul Spiti(3.5%), Kinnaur(3.5%), Hamirpur(3%), Chamba(7.5%) and Kangra(5.7%) respectively.

Tools

Organizational Role Stress Scale (Pareek, 1983): The organizational Role Stress Scale is a 5 point scale, indicating how true a particular statement is for the role. The following stresses are assessed by this instrument: Self role distance (SRD), role stagnation (RS), inter role distance (IRD), role ambiguity (RA), role overload (RO), role-isolation (RI), role expectation conflict (REC), personal inadequacy (PI), role erosion (RE) and resource inadequacy (RIn.).

Coping Strategies Scale(Professor A.K. Srivastva): It comprises 50 items, to be rated on five point scale.**Reliability:** Re-test reliability is 0.92(N=76) and Split – Half reliability of approach coping strategies is 0.78(N=120) and avoidance coping strategies is .69(N=120).

Validity: Content validity of Approach Coping varies from 0.18* to 0.53** and avoidance coping varies from 0.16* to 0.48** (**p>.01 and *p>.05)

Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction Employees Inventory (SDEI: Pestonjee, 1981): Job satisfaction has been assessed by Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction Employees-Inventory (SDEI). This inventory has been developed and standardized by Pestonjee (1973, 1981).

Functional Social Support Questionnaire - FSSQ (Singh and Srivastava, 1997): The self-administered, functional social support questionnaire consisting of 80 items has been developed by Srivastava and Singh to measure availability of support from various organizational (work-related) and extra-organizational (non-work) sources.

Results

Table.1 provides the comparison of Principals using either avoidance or approach coping strategies with respect to organizational role stress or its ten components. It is evident from the table.1 that with respect to Role stagnation (RS), Role erosion(RE), Self Role distance(SRD), Role ambiguity(RA) and Resource Inadequacy(RIn), the Principals using approach as dominant mode of coping style differed significantly from their counterparts using avoidance mode of coping style, (t = 2.50, p< .05 for Role stagnation, t=3.23,p<.01 for role erosion, t= 3.70, p<.01 for self role distance, t=2.65,p<.05 and t = 3.21, p< .01 for Resource Inadequacy). It is also evident from the table.1 with respect to role expectation conflict(REC) and Role Isolation(RI) that the Principals using avoidance as dominant mode of coping style differed significantly from their counterparts using approach coping style, (with t = 3.23, p< .01 for role expectation conflict and t=3.50<.01 for Role Isolation).Principals using approach as a dominant mode of coping did not significantly differ from their counterparts using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping with respect to job satisfaction dimensions i.e. on the job satisfaction as well as off the job satisfaction.

Table.2 provides the comparison of Principals having high organizational support with respect to organizational role stress or its ten components. It is evident from the table.2 that with respect to Role stagnation (RS), Role expectation conflict (REC), Role Erosion (RE) and Role Overload (RO), the Principals having high organizational support differed significantly from their counterparts having low organizational support, (t = 2.35, p< .05 for Role stagnation, t = 2.58, p< .01 for Role expectation

conflict, $t=2.50$, $p<.05$ for Role Erosion and $t=2.18$, $pp<.05$). It is also evident from the table with respect to overall organizational stress(ORS) the Principals

Inadequacy (RIn),($r=-.188$ · $p<.01$) and overall organizational role stress(ORS), ($r=-.232$ · $p<.01$).Thus greater the approach coping lower is the Inter Role

Table.1: Comparison of Principals using either avoidance or approach as dominant mode of coping with respect to organizational role stress

Sr. No.	Measures of ORS	Approach Coping(72)		Avoidance Coping(81)		t-value
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1	IRD	Mean	3.23	Mean	3.67	1.83
		SD	.67	SD	.45	
2	RS	Mean	2.78	Mean	2.43	2.50*
		SD	.54	SD	.98	
3	REC	Mean	3.45	Mean	3.69	1.41
		SD	.90	SD	1.21	
4	RE	Mean	3.12	Mean	3.67	3.23**
		SD	1.20	SD	.97	
5	RO	Mean	3.15	Mean	2.83	1.88
		SD	.98	SD	1.17	
6	RI	Mean	2.65	Mean	3.16	3.50**
		SD	.79	SD	.62	
7	PI	Mean	3.18	Mean	2.67	3.00**
		SD	1.16	SD	.86	
8	SRD	Mean	2.92	Mean	2.55	3.70**
		SD	.98	SD	.67	
9	RA	Mean	3.12	Mean	2.67	2.65*
		SD	.94	SD	1.23	
10	RIn	Mean	2.64	Mean	2.19	3.21**
		SD	1.03	SD	.85	
11	Total ORS	Mean	30.24	Mean	29.53	1.60
		SD	2.97	SD	2.95	
12	On the Job Satisfaction	Mean	21.590	Mean	21.342	.25
		SD	5.842	SD	5.123	
13	Off the Job Satisfaction	Mean	19.750	Mean	19.241	.69
		SD	5.342	SD	5.209	

* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$,

having high organizational support significantly differed from their counterparts having low organizational support($t=5.89$, $p<.01$). Principals having high organizational support did not significantly differ from their counterparts having low organizational support with respect to job satisfaction dimensions i.e. on the job satisfaction as well as off the job satisfaction. Table.3: indicates that in case of Principals, negative and significant relationship of approach coping was found with Inter Role Distance (IRD), ($r=-.162$, $p < .05$), role stagnation($r=-.204p<.01$), role expectation conflict($r=-.259p<.01$), role erosion($r=-.329p<.01$), role overload (RO), ($r = -.188$, $p < .01$), Personal Inadequacy (PI),($r= -.267$ · $p<.01$), Role ambiguity(RA),($r= --.442$ · $p<.01$), Resource

Distance (IRD), role stagnation, role expectation conflict, role erosion, role overload (RO), Personal Inadequacy(PI), Role ambiguity(RA), Resource Inadequacy(RIn), and overall organizational role stress(ORS) or vice versa. The results from table.3 also indicates that approach mode of coping did not relate significantly with dimensions; role erosion (RE) and role stagnation (RS. Table.3 further demonstrates that in case of Principals, avoidance mode of coping did not correlate with inter role distance(IRD), role stagnation(RS), role expectation conflict(REC), role erosion(RE), role overload(RO), role isolation(RI), personal inadequacy(PI), self role distance(SRD), role ambiguity(RA), resource inadequacy(RIn) and over all role stress(ORS). It is also evident from table.3 that in

case of Principals, negative and significant relationship emerged between organizational support and Inter role distance(IRD, $r=-.426$, $p<.01$), Role stagnation($t=-$

$p < .05$). Thus greater the approach coping higher is the on-the-job satisfaction or vice-versa. The results from table.4 also indicates that no significant relationship

Table.2: Comparison of Principals having either high or low organizational supports with respect to organizational role stress

Sr. No.	Measures of ORS	High Organizational Support(50)		Low organizational Support(90)		t-value
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1	IRD	Mean	3.56	Mean	3.74	1.80
		SD	.75	SD	.52	
2	RS	Mean	2.49	Mean	2.16	2.35*
		SD	1.01	SD	.65	
3	REC	Mean	3.78	Mean	3.34	2.58**
		SD	.89	SD	1.10	
4	RE	Mean	3.92	Mean	3.87	2.50*
		SD	1.13	SD	.87	
5	RO	Mean	3.35	Mean	2.98	2.18*
		SD	.87	SD	1.03	
6	RI	Mean	2.85	Mean	2.67	1.29
		SD	.86	SD	.72	
7	PI	Mean	2.87	Mean	3.12	1.47
		SD	1.19	SD	.93	
8	SRD	Mean	2.99	Mean	2.79	1.43
		SD	.86	SD	.87	
9	RA	Mean	2.78	Mean	2.56	1.29
		SD	1.03	SD	.97	
10	RIn	Mean	2.35	Mean	2.12	1.30
		SD	1.01	SD	.87	
11	Total ORS	Mean	30.94	Mean	29.35	5.89***
		SD	3.06	SD	2.75	
12	On-the –Job Satisfaction	Mean	20.96	Mean	20.12	.98
		SD	5.23	SD	5.01	
13	Off-the Job-Satisfaction	Mean	19.54	Mean	20.17	.79
		SD	5.18	SD	4.87	

* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$, *** $p<.001$

.345, $p<.01$), Role expectation conflict($t=-.341$, $p<.01$), role erosion($t=-.261$, $p<.01$), role overload(RO, $r=-.243$, $p<.01$) personal inadequacy(PI, $r=-.376$, $p<.01$), role ambiguity(RA, $r=-.203$, $p<.01$), and overall role stress(ORS, $r=-.616$, $p<.01$) Thus greater is the organizational support lower is the Inter role distance, role stagnation, Role Expectation conflict, role erosion, role overload, personal inadequacy, role ambiguity and overall role stress. Table.3 also indicates that there is no significant relationship between organizational support with Role isolation (RI), self role distance (SRD) and resource inadequacy & vice versa.

It is evident from table.4 that in case of Principals, a positive and significant relationship emerged between approach coping and on-the job satisfaction ($r = .168^*$,

emerged between approach mode of coping and Off-the-job satisfaction Table.4 further demonstrates that negative and significant relationship emerged between avoidance mode of coping and on-the-job satisfaction ($r = -.143$, $p < .05$) and a negative and -significant relationship was found between avoidance coping and off-the-job satisfaction ($r = -.283^{**}$, $p < .01$). This means that greater the avoidance mode of coping lower is the on-the-job-satisfaction and off-the-job satisfaction or vice-versa. Table.4 also further demonstrates that positive and significant relationship occurred between organizational support and on-the-job satisfaction ($r = .146$, $p < .05$) and the off –job satisfaction ($r = .274$, $p < .01$). Thus it can be concluded that greater the organizational support higher is the on-

the-job satisfaction and off-the-job satisfaction or vice-versa.

Table.5 further shows that in case of role expectation conflicts (REC) dimension of ORS, approach mode of

Table.3: Relationship of Organizational Role Stress and Job Satisfaction On the Job Satisfaction & Off the Job Satisfaction) with Coping Strategies (Approach Coping and Avoidance Coping) and Organizational Support.

Measures	IRD	RS	REC	RE	RO	RI	PI	SRD	RA	RIn	Total ORS
Approach Coping	-.162*	-.204**	-.259**	-.329* *	-.188* *	-.076	-.267**	.089	-.442**	.188**	-.232**
Avoidance Coping	.096	.048	.025	-.014	.025	.070	.045	-.084	-.069	-.105	-.004
Organizational Support	-.426**	-.345**	-.341**	-.261* *	-.243* *	.016	-.376**	-.060	-.203**	-.023	-.329**

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

The results of multiple regression analyses with each of the indicator of organizational role stress and total organizational role stress being predicted by coping strategies i.e. avoidance and approach, and organizational support among Principals are reported in table It is evident from table.5 that approach mode of coping and organizational support were considered for the prediction of Inter role distance (IRD). The t-test for the test of significance of regression coefficient shows

coping and organizational support were considered for the prediction. Approach coping was not added in the prediction of role expectation conflict (REC). The t - test for the test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that only approach mode of coping (t = -6.755, p< .001) and organizational support (t = -7.784, p< .001) have significant regression weight. This means that avoidance mode of coping and organizational support contributes significantly to the

Table.4: Relationship of Job Satisfaction

Measures	On The Job Satisfaction	Off the Job Satisfaction
Approach Coping	.168*	-.003
Avoidance Coping	-.143*	-.283**
Organizational Support	.146*	.274**

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

that approach mode of coping (t=-5.768,p<.001) and social support (t= -8.546 p< .001) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping and organizational support contributes to the regression explaining 31.9% variation (R² = .319, F = 30.29, p< .001).

In case of Role stagnation (RS) dimension of ORS, approach modes of coping and organizational support were considered for the prediction role stagnation (RS). The t-test for the test of significance of regression coefficient shows that approach mode of coping (t=-5.675, p<.001) and organizational support(t=-7.194,p<.001) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping contributes to the regression explaining 26.3% variation (R²= .263, F=23.131, p<.001)

regression explaining 30.9% variation (R² = .309, F = 28.919, p< .001) in REC dimension of ORS.

It further clear from the table.5 that in case of role erosion(RE) dimension of ORS, approach mode of coping and organizational support were considered for the prediction. Avoidance coping was not added in the prediction of role erosion (RE). The t - test for the test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that approach mode of coping (t = -7.420, p< .001) and organizational support (t = -6.751, p< .001) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping and organizational support contributes significantly to the regression explaining 29.7% variation (R² = .297, F = 27.311, p< .001) in RE dimension of ORS.

It is clear from the table.5 that in case of role overload dimension of ORS, approach mode of coping and organizational support were considered for the prediction. The t - test for the test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that approach mode of coping ($t = -4.463, p < .001$) and organizational support ($t = -4.996, p < .001$) have significant regression weight.

regression explaining 35.6% variation ($R^2 = .356, F = 35.709, p < .001$) in PI dimension of ORS.

In case of Self Role distance (SRD) dimension of ORS, only avoidance mode of coping was considered for the prediction. The t - test for the test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that avoidance coping ($t = -2.332, p < .05$) have significant regression weight. This

Table.5: Multiple Regression Analysis for indicators of Organization Role Stress and Job Satisfaction (On the Job Satisfaction and Off the Job Satisfaction) as Predicted by Coping Strategies (Approach and Avoidance Strategies) and Organizational Support.

Sr. No.	Dependent Variables	Independent Variables (Beta values)			R	R ²	R ² Change	F-value	Significant
		Approach Coping(Beta Value)	Avoidance Coping(Beta Value)	Organizational Support(Beta Value)					
1	IRD	-.395	-.034	-.606	.565	.319	.308	30.29	.001
2	RS	-.404	-.039	-.530	.513	.263	.252	23.131	.0.01
3	REC	-.466	-.046	-.556	.556	.309	.298	28.919	.001
4	RE	-.516	-.027	-.486	.545	.297	.286	27.311	.001
5	RO	-.340	-.021	-.394	.399	.159	.146	12.227	.001
6	RI	-.128	.149	.040	.144	.021	.006	1.372	.253
7	PI	-.497	-.033	-.597	.596	.356	.346	35.709	.001
8	SRD	.137	-.202	-.107	.189	.036	.021	2.384	.05
9	RA	-.624	.406	-.473	.611	.374	.364	38.612	.001
10	RIn	.291	-.256	-.034	.287	.082	.068	5.805	.01
11	Total ORS	-.413	-.096	-.548	.526	.276	.265	24.681	.001
12	On the Job Satisfaction	.207	.227	.347	.343	.118	.104	8.641	.001
13	Off the Job Satisfaction	.210	-.263	.225	.368	.136	.122	10.146	.001

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

This means that avoidance mode of coping and organizational support contributes significantly to the regression, explaining 15.9% percent variation ($R^2 = .159, F = 12.227, p < .001$) in role overload (RO) dimension of ORS.

It is further clear from the table.5 that in case of Role Isolation (RI) dimension of ORS, approach coping, avoidance coping and organizational supports were not considered for the prediction. In case of Personal Inadequacy (PI) dimension of ORS, the table.5 indicates that approach coping and organizational support were considered for the prediction. The t - test for the test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that approach coping ($t = 12.227, p < .01$) and organizational support ($t = -8.657, p < .001$) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping contributes significantly to the

means that avoidance mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression explaining 3.6% variation ($R^2 = .036, F = 2.384, p < .05$) in self role distance (SRD) dimension of ORS.

Further the table indicates that in case of role ambiguity (RA) dimension of ORS, approach coping and organizational support were considered for the prediction. The t - test for the test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that approach mode of coping ($t = -9.508, p < .001$), and organizational support ($t = -6.953, p < .001$) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression, explaining 37.4% variation ($R^2 = .374, F = 38.612, p < .001$) in Role ambiguity (RA) dimension of ORS.

In case of Resource Inadequacy (RIn) dimension of ORS, table reveals that approach mode of coping and

avoidance mode of coping were considered for the prediction. The t-test for the test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that approach mode of coping ($t=3.659, p<.01$) and avoidance mode of coping ($t=-3.034, p<.01$) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping and organizational support contributes significantly to the regression explaining 8.2% variation ($R^2 = .082, F = 5.805, p < .001$) in Role Inadequacy (RI_n) dimension of ORS.

Table.5 further explains that in case of the overall organizational role stress (ORS), approach mode of coping and organizational support was considered for the prediction. The t-test for the test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that approach mode of coping ($t=-5.845, p<.001$) and organizational support ($t=-7.492, p<.001$) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping and organizational support contributes significantly to the regression explaining 27.6% variation ($R^2 = .276, F = 24.681, p < .001$) of total ORS.

Table also explains that in case of, on-the -job satisfaction dimension of Job satisfaction only approaching mode of coping, avoidance mode coping as well as organizational support were considered for prediction. The t-test for the test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that approach mode of coping ($t=-2.650, p<.01$), avoidance mode of coping ($t=2.738, p<.01$) and organizational support ($t=4.302, p<.001$) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression explaining 11.8% variation ($R^2 = .118, F = 8.641, p < .010$) on-the-job satisfaction dimension of job satisfaction. In case of, off-the -job -satisfaction dimension of Job satisfaction approach mode of coping, avoidance mode of coping as well as organizational support were considered for prediction. The t-test for the test of significance of the regression coefficient shows that approach mode of coping ($t=-2.717, p<.01$), avoidance mode of coping ($t=-3.215, p<.01$) and organizational support ($t=2.822, p<.01$) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping, avoidance mode of coping and organizational support contributes significantly to the regression explaining 13.6% variation ($R^2 = .136, F = 10.146, p < .001$) of job satisfaction.

Discussion

The present study aimed to assess the predicting role of coping strategies and social support on the association between organizational role stress/job stress and job satisfaction among Principals of Government senior secondary schools in Himachal Pradesh. Study results showed coping strategies and social support predicting the relationship between stress and job satisfaction among Principals of Government senior secondary schools. The primary effect model suggests that coping

and social support protect workers from the adverse effects of work stress in two ways. First, coping and social support directly affects psychological well-being, regardless of exposure to stress. In other words, coping and support have a prominent effect on job satisfaction. Second, when coping and social support are high; the adverse effects of work stress on well-being are reduced.

In the study it is found that Principals using approach as a dominant mode coping significantly differed from their counterparts using avoidance mode of coping in role stagnation and Resource Inadequacy dimension of Organizational role stress while Principals using avoidance mode of coping as dominant significantly differed from their counterparts using approach as a mode of coping in case of role erosion, Role Isolation, Personal Inadequacy, Self Role distance, Role ambiguity dimensions of Organizational role stress (with $t = 3.23, p < .01$ for role erosion, $t = 3.50, p < .01$ for Role Isolation, $t=3.00, p < .01$ for Personal Inadequacy, $t=3.70, p < .01$ for Self Role distance and $t=3.21 < .01$ for Role Ambiguity).

It is also found that a positive and significant relationship emerged between approach coping and on-the job satisfaction ($r = .171, p < .05$). Thus greater the approach coping higher is the on-the-job satisfaction or vice-versa. Results also indicate that there was no significant relationship emerged between approach mode of coping and Off-the-job satisfaction. A negative and significant relationship emerged between avoidance mode of coping and on-the-job satisfaction ($r = -.198^*, p < .05$) and a positive and -significant relationship was found between avoidance coping and off-the-job satisfaction. This means that greater the avoidance mode of coping lower is the off-the-job satisfaction or vice-versa.

It is found that Principals having high organizational support with respect to Role stagnation (RS), Role expectation conflict (REC), Role Erosion (RE) and Role Overload (RO), differed significantly from their counterparts having low organizational support, ($t = 2.35, p < .05$ for Role stagnation, $t = 2.58, p < .01$ for Role expectation conflict, $t=2.50, p < .05$ for Role Erosion and $t=2.18, p < .05$ overall organizational stress(ORS) the Principals having high organizational support significantly differed from their counterparts having low organizational support($t=5.89, p < .01$).

The results of multiple regression analyses shows that approach mode of coping and organizational support contributes to the regression explaining 31.9% variation($R^2 = .319, F = 30.29, p < .001$) in IRD, approach mode of coping contributes to the regression, explaining 4.4% variation ($R^2 = .044, F=2.971, p < .01$), avoidance mode of coping and organizational support contributes significantly to the regression explaining 31.9% variation ($R^2 = .319, F = 30.251, p <$

.001) in REC, avoidance mode of coping and organizational support contributes significantly to the regression, explaining 18% variation ($R^2 = .180$, $F = 14.201$, $p < .001$) in RE, approach mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression explaining 8.0% variation ($R^2 = .080$, $F = 5.614$, $p < .001$) in PI, approach mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression explaining 5% variation ($R^2 = .051$, $F = 3.481$, $p < .01$) in SRD, approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression explaining 42.3% variation ($R^2 = .423$, $F = 47.367$, $p < .001$) in Role ambiguity (RA), approach mode of coping and organizational support contributes significantly to the regression explaining 5.7% variation ($R^2 = .057$, $F = 3.915$, $p < .01$) in Resource Inadequacy (RI) and approach mode of coping and organizational support contributes significantly to the regression explaining 42.3% variation ($R^2 = .423$, $F = 47.318$, $p < .001$) of total ORS.

It is also found that approach mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression, explaining 4.7% variation ($R^2 = .047$, $F = 3.029$, $p < .01$) on-the-job satisfaction dimension of job satisfaction and approach mode of coping, avoidance mode of coping and organizational support contributes significantly to the regression explaining 13.6% variation ($R^2 = .136$, $F = 10.146$, $p < .001$) of job satisfaction.

Reported coping mechanisms and organizational supports in this study were similar to those reported in previous studies (Ceslowitz, 1989; Lees, 1990; Moynihan, 1984; Vachon, 1987). Various studies also show positive correlation between social support and job satisfaction (Kozey, 2008; Collins, 2008; Pienaar, 2007). Saharay E. Cosio and Lynn Olson and Joseph P. Francis (2011) in their study on social support and occupational stress among University employees observed a significant inverse relationship was found between work-related social support and occupational stress. The perceived supervisor support had a greater impact on improved levels of job satisfaction, as compared to support received from work colleagues (Paula Brough & Judi Pea, 2004).

In sum results of the present study partially supported the all hypotheses, although we could not find complete support for these hypotheses.

Conclusion

The findings of the study suggest that Coping strategies (approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping) and organizational social support play important role in predicting organizational role stress/job stress i.e. Inter role distance (IRD), Role stagnation (RS), Role ambiguity (RA), Role expectation conflict (REC), Role Erosion (RE), Role Overload (RO) & overall Role stress and Job satisfaction i.e. on – the-job satisfaction & off-the job-satisfaction.

Limitation and Scope of Future Research

In this study only Principals are taken as participants, therefore in future study, other employees should be taken into account. These findings are based on a sample taken from Government Senior secondary Schools of Himachal Pradesh. Cross-cultural studies should also be conducted for generalization of the results. In future there is need to take more predictor variables which influence the job satisfaction, organizational role stress/job stress effectively and the study can be done with increased samples size.

References

- Aronson, K. R., Laurenceau, J. P., Sieveking, N. and Bellet, W. (2005). Job satisfaction as a function of job level. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health Services Research*, 32(3), 285–291.
- Bacharach, S.B., Bomberger, P. and Mitchell, S. (1990). Work design, work conflict and work ambiguity: The case of elementary and secondary schools. *Educational And Evaluation And Policy Analysis*, 12 (4), 415-432.
- Bedeian, A.G., Ferris, G. R. & Kacmar, K.M. (1992). Age, tenure and Job satisfaction : A Tale of two perspectives. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 40(1), 33-48
- Beehr, T.A., King, L.A. and King, O.W. (1990). Social support and occupational stress. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 36, 61-68.
- Beehr, Terry A., Jex, Steve M., Stary, Beth A., and Murry, Marshall A. (2000). Work stressors and co-workers support as predictors of individual strain and job-performance. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 21(4), 391-405.
- Beehr, Terry A., Jex, Steve M., Stary, Beth A., and Murry, Marshall A. (2000). Work stressors and co-workers support as predictors of individual strain and job-performance. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 21(4), 391-405.
- Bradely, J.R. and Cartwright, S. (2002). Social Support, Job Stress, Health and Job Satisfaction Among Nurses in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 9(3), 163-181.
- Capel, S.A. (1993). Anxieties of beginning physical education teachers. *Educational Research*, 35, 281-289.
- Ceslowitz, S.B. (1989). Burnout and coping strategies among hospital staff nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 14(7), 553-557.
- Chen, H., Wong, Y. C., Ran, M. S. and Gilson, C. (2009). Stress among Shanghai University Students. The Need for Social Work Support Collins, P.
- Collins, S. (2008). Statutory social workers; Stress, job satisfaction, coping, social support and Individual differences. *British Journal of Social Work*. 38 (6), 1173-1193.
- Cooper, C.L. and Payne, R. (Eds.). (1978). *Stress at Work*. Chichester: Wiley.

- Early, C.R. (1990). Elements of job related stress of superintendents of unified school districts in California. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50(7-A), 1863.
- Franken Haueser, M. (1986), A Psychological framework for research on human stress and coping. In M.H. Appley and R. Trumbull (Eds.). *Dynamics of Stress* (pp.183-206). New York: Plenum.
- Ganster, D. C., Fusilier, M. R., & Mayes, B. T. (1986). Role of social support in the experience of stress at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(1), 102–110.
- Gardner, L.E., and Leak, J.K. (1994). Characteristics and correlates of teaching anxiety among college psychology teachers. *Teaching of Psychology*, 2(1), 28-32
- Harmsen R, Lorenz MH, Maulana R & Veen KV (2018), “The relationship between beginning teachers’ stress causes, stress responses, teaching behavior and attrition”, 24, 6,626-643.
- Hulin, C. L., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Job attitudes. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, R. J. Klimoski, & I. B. Weiner (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology*, 12: Industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 255–276). New York, NY: Wiley
- Karasek, R. and Theorell, T. (1990). *Healthy work stress, productivity and the reconstruction of working life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Khanna, M. J. (2010). A comparative study of leadership behaviour of principals in relation to job satisfaction of teachers in government and non-government schools of U.T. Retrieved from http://www.academicleadership.org/empirical_research/index/shtml.
- Kniveton, B.H. (1991). An investigation of factors contributing to teachers' job satisfaction. *School Psychology International*, 12(4), 361-371.
- Koeske, G.F., Kirk, S.A. and Koeska, R.D. (1993). Coping with job stress: which strategy work best? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 66(1), 319-335.
- Kozey, R. S. (2008). The impact of social support and organizational commitment on network centrality and job satisfaction in a faith-based. *Journal of Organization*, 33, 206-219
- Langan-fox, J.; Deery, T. and Van Vliet, S. (2009). Power motivation, illness, coping strategies and psychological stress in police trainees. *Policing, International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 32, 3, 541.
- Lazarus, R.S. (1993). Coping theory and research: Past, present and future *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 55, 234-247.
- Lazarus, R.S., and Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal and coping*. New York: Springer.
- Lees, S., & Ellis, N. (1990). The design of a stress-management program for nursing personnel. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 15(8), 946-961.
- Malik, Seema (2016). What Causes Stress among Academic Administrators: An Empirical Investigation. *Pacific Business Review International*, Vol.8(11), Pages 101-112
- Mariya Aftab and Tahira Khatoon. (2012). Demographic differences and occupational stress of secondary school teachers. *European Scientific Journal* 8(5), 159-175.
- Marshall, J. and Cooper, C.L. (1979). *Executive under Pressure: Psychological Study*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Mojahed, A., Fallah, M., Ganjali, A., Heidari, Z. (2019). The role of social support and coping strategies in the prediction of psychological well-being in type 2 diabetic patients of Zahedan. *Bali Medical Journal (Bali Med J)*, 8,1: 281-286 P-ISSN.2089-1180, E-ISSN.2302-2914.
- Moos RH, Holahan CJ (2003). Dispositional and contextual perspectives on coping: Toward an integrative framework. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 59(12):1387-403.
- Moos, R. H., & Holahan, C. J. (2003). Dispositional and Contextual Perspectives on Coping: Toward an Integrative Framework. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 59, 1387-1403.
- Okebukola, P.A.O. & Jegede, O.J. (1992). Survey of factors that stress science teachers and an examination of coping strategies. *Science Education*, 76(2), 199-210.
- Paula Brough & Judi Pears. (2004). Evaluating the influence of the type of social support on job satisfactions and work related psychological well-being. *International Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 8 (2), 472-485
- Paula Brough & Judi Pears. (2004). Evaluating the influence of the type of social support on job satisfactions and work related psychological well-being. *International Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 8 (2), 472-485
- Rice, R.W., McFarlin, D.B., Hunt, R.G., and Near, J.P. (1985). Job importance as a moderator of the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 6, 297-316.
- Saharay E. Cosio, Lynn Olson and Joseph P. Francis. (2011). Social Support and Occupational Stress among University Employees. *Graduate Student Journal of Psychology* 13: 30-38.

- Schuler, R.S. (1982). An integrative transactional process model of stress in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 3, 5-20.
- Schwals, R.L. and Iwanicki, E.F. (1982). Perceived role conflict, role ambiguity and teacher burnout. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(1), 60-74.
- Shrestha, A.K. and Mishra, A.K.(2012). Relationship of Job Stress, Locus of Control, Organizational Support and Social Support to Psychological Strain, Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions: A Study in Nepali Commercial Banks. Paper presented at 12th Hawaii International Conference on Business, Hawaii, USA.
- Singh, A. P., Amish, and Singhi ,Nitu (2015). Organizational Role Stress and Social Support as Predictors of Job Satisfaction among Managerial Personnel. *Journal of Psychosocial Research*,10,1,1-10.
- Stephens, Christine, and Long, Nigel (2000). Communication with police supervisors and peers as a buffer of work' related traumatic stress *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 21(4), 407-424.
- Stephens, Christine, and Long, Nigel (2000). Communication with police supervisors and peers as a buffer of work' related traumatic stress *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 21(4), 407-424.
- Sultan, Saewat and Rasid, S.(2014). Perceived Social Support Mediating the Relationship between Perceived Stress and Job satisfaction. *Journal on Educational Psychology*,8(3).
- Tobin, D. L., Holroyd, K. A., Reynolds, R. V., & Wigal, J. K. (1989). The hierarchical factor structure of the Coping Strategies Inventory. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 13(4), 343–361.
- Received on 19-12-2021
Revised on 30-12-2021
Accepted on 31-12-2021