

Role Stress as Determinant of Quality of Life

Saima K. Beigh¹ & Humera Shafi²

1 Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, University of Kashmir, Adjacent to café coffee day, Naseem Bagh, Dargah, Srinagar, J&K, 190006. Saima.beigh11@gmail.com.

2 Sr. Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Kashmir, Adjacent to café coffee day, Naseem Bagh, Dargah, Srinagar, J&K, 190006. Humershafi11@gmail.com.

Abstract

The roles of women have changed throughout the world due to economic conditions and social demands. This has resulted in a scenario in which working women have tremendous pressure to develop a career as robust as their male counterparts while sustaining active engagement in personal life. This ever-increasing work pressure is taking a toll on the working women leaving them with less time for themselves. The objectives of the study were to assess role Stress and quality of life among working women and to examine the relationship pattern of Role Stress and quality of life among working women. The sample of the present study comprised of 500 working women from different sectors of Srinagar district. The tools used were Role Stress Scale developed by Pareek, (1983) and Quality of Life scale by World Health Organization Quality of Life BREF Assessment (WHOQOL-BREF; 2004). The collected data was analyzed by various statistical techniques like descriptive statistics, correlational analysis, and regression analysis by use of IBM-SPSS (20). To test the correlations and regression, Pearson's product moment method & multiple regression analysis were utilized respectively. The analysis revealed that Role Stress is significantly and negatively correlated with quality of life in working woman and Role Stress predicts 47% of the variance in the model of quality of life among working women.

Introduction

Today women can compete with men in all walks of life, and both the spouses are employed in different organizations. Women's entrenched participation in the market was expected to launch "a revolution in the gendered division of labor," but the rate of change has been slow in the Asian culture. Industrialization brought a huge expansion of service occupations which, accompanied by increased education for girls, has created many more work opportunities and brought to the fore

problems concerning "women's two roles." Even today, looking after the family and children is generally perceived to be primary responsibility of women. This expansion in their role is expected to increase stress both in the home and the work setting because responsibilities of women are more than those of men (Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005). The women's participation in workforce has increased but the participation of men in household chores has remained relatively constant i.e., it has neither increased nor decreased. This means that working women are juggling both work and family roles. This juggling leads to the multitasking, the simultaneous performance of several tasks or the rapid alternation between them (Spink, Cole, & Waller, 2008) and an attempt to meet the conflicting demands of different roles at home and workplace often leads to role stress (Wetzels, Ruyter, & Bloemer, 2000). Therefore, women are more likely than men to feel overburdened with work & family responsibilities and will have too little time to attend both (Coltrane, 2000). The stress level of females are more than males because working women spend significantly more time multitasking at home (Kousar, Fatima & Bashir, 2004; Jreige, 2011; Offer & Schneider, 2011; Ravichandran & Rajendran, 2007). Married individuals with or without children are likely to be confronted with conflicts in the work– family interface (Frone, 2000; Netemeyer, Maxim & Pullig, 2005) & these conflict in these roles and/or responsibilities is associated with a number of detrimental outcomes employees who experience high levels of conflict between work and non-work roles and/or responsibilities tend to have lower levels of job performance (Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002), withdraw from work (Hammer, Bauer, & Grandey, 2003), and experience greater sickness absence (Jansen, Kant, van Amelsvoort, Kristensen, Swaen, & Nijhuis 2006) and intentions to leave the organization (O'Neill, Harrison, Cleveland, Almeida, Stawski, & Crouter, 2009).

Quality of life

Renwick and Brown (1996) define quality of life as "The degree to which a person enjoys the important possibilities of his or her life". Their Quality of Life Model is based on the World Health Organization (W.H.O) Quality of Life model. It has three categories "being", "belonging", and "becoming. Possibilities result from the opportunities and limitations each person has in his/her life and reflect the interaction of personal and environmental factors. Enjoyment has two components: the experience of satisfaction and the possession or achievement of some characteristic, as illustrated by the expression: "She enjoys good health."

Three major life domains are identified: Being, Belonging, and Becoming.

The Being domain includes the basic aspects of "who one is" and has three sub-domains. Physical being includes aspects of physical health, personal hygiene, nutrition, exercise, grooming, clothing, and physical appearance. Psychological being includes the person's psychological health and adjustment, cognitions, feelings, and evaluations concerning the self, and self-control. Spiritual being reflects personal values, personal standards of conduct, and spiritual beliefs which may or may not be associated with organized religions.

Belonging includes the person's fit with his/her environments and has three subdomains. Physical Belonging is defined as the connections the person has with his/her physical environments such as home, workplace, neighborhood, school and community. Social Belonging includes links with social environments and includes the sense of acceptance by intimate others, family, friends, co-workers, and neighborhood and community. Community belonging represents access to resources normally available to community members, such as adequate income, health and social services, employment, educational and recreational programs, and community activities.

Becoming refers to the purposeful activities carried out to achieve personal goals, hopes, and wishes. Practical Becoming describes day-to-day actions such as domestic activities, paid work, school or volunteer activities, and seeing to health or social needs. Leisure Becoming includes activities that promote relaxation and stress reduction. These include card games, neighborhood walks, and family visits, or longer duration activities such as vacations or holidays. Growth Becoming activities promote the improvement or maintenance of knowledge and skills.

Role Stress

A role refers to the function a person fulfils in his or her own environment. Role Stress signifies stress experienced in any role. Individual learns about the expectations of their roles through communication & interaction with others. The concept of role stress was introduced by Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek and Rosenthal (1964) who identified three role stressors (i.e., role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload). Pareek (1982) significantly expanded the framework of role stress by identifying eight role stressors which closely represented problems encountered in organizational roles as well as non-organizational. The model is based on the observation that people behave in a predictable way, and that an individual's behavior is context specific, based on social position and other factors.

Role stress components include:

- Stressors that exist outside the organization (extra organizational stressor e.g., traffic to and from work, Home Chores).
- Stressor that comes from within the organization (organizational stressors i.e., job security).
- Stressors that are related to various work roles (individual role stressors).

Everyone is a member of social systems and the expectation as well as demand of one may put pressure on the other. There are 2 role systems: Role Space and Role Set. Both have a built-in potential for conflict and stress (Pareek, 1983).

Role conflict and role overload can result in severe physiological and psychological impact (Gupta & Adhikari, 2008), low job performance (Tubre & Collins, 2000) and can end up in a chronic state of exhaustion or burnout (Tang, Au, Schwarzer & Schmitz, 2001). Research shows that employees at senior level face more workloads and more role-overload (Winter, Taylor & Sarros, 2000). Lackritz (2004) found that female faculty members had significantly higher scores on emotional exhaustion than males. Working women report more health complaints than men, particularly stress-related illness and fatigue. Elucidating these causes has been imperative for it may have direct implications for the assessment of the demands on the physical, psychological and emotional wellbeing of the employees as stressors may lead to ill health, anxiety, dissatisfaction, irritation and depression amongst employees (Kaplan, 1993; Sparks, Faragher, & Cooper, 2001). Not only health, stress at workplace also impacts capability to solve problems and subsequent satisfaction with the job (Elfering, Grebner, Semmer, Freiburghaus, Ponte, & Witschi, 2005; Jonge, Dormann, Janssen, Dollard, Landeweerd, & Nijhuis, 2001). Role stress can make people more susceptible to major illnesses. High stress managers are twice as prone to heart attacks as low stress managers. (Friedman & Rosenman, 1971). If work is demanding it results in negative family outcomes and vice versa (Adebola, 2005). Srivastava (1991) surveyed 300 employees of the Life Insurance Corporation and reported that there is a significant positive correlation between various dimensions of role stress and symptoms of mental ill health. Research has demonstrated that those who experience work–family conflict tends to report decreased psychological health (Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair, & Shafiro, 2005) decreased family satisfaction and performance (Aryee, 1992; Carlson & Kacmar, 2000; Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004). Stress can put individuals at increased risk of diseases (Collins, Karasek, & Costas, 2005; Segerstrom & Miller, 2004; Bongers, de Winter, Kompier, & Hildebrandt, 1993; Boufous & Williamson, 2006). Exposure to stressors has been linked to depressive symptoms (Dormann & Zapf, 1999),

psychosomatic complaints (Sonnetag & Frese, 2003) and burnout. Burnout comprises three features: emotional exhaustion or the depletion of emotional resources; depersonalization or negative, cynical perceptions of clients and decreased feelings of personal accomplishment (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). work–family conflict is associated with increased distress and burnout (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999), intentions to quit work (Greenhaus, Collins, Singh, & Parasuraman, 1997), absenteeism (Hammer, Bauer, & Grandey, 2003), and alcohol abuse (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1993) and life satisfaction (Allen, Herst, Bruck & Sutton, 2000; Higgins, Duxbury, & Irving, 1992; O’Driscoll, Ilgen, & Hildreth, 1992; Parasuraman, Greenhaus, Rabinowitz, Bedeian, & Mossholder, 1989). Job stress is the recognized problem in health care workers (Burbeck, Coomber, Robinson & Todd, 2002; Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007). Delina and Raya (2013) found that work family balance of individuals affects their quality of life. Multiple roles have been found out to lead out to lead to stressors (work overload & inter-role conflict). Stressful life events are thought to trigger a potential for disease as a person feels overwhelmed by the stress and when it is more than they can handle (Cohen & Janicki-Deverts 2012). Individuals who have difficulty in managing conflicts between work and family domains or family and work domains have low levels of satisfaction with their family life (Wayne, Musisca & Fleeson, 2004). In addition to an individual, stress can contribute to various dysfunctional outcomes for the organization like job related tensions, job satisfaction, lower performance (Beehrman & Perreault, 1984; Shahu & Gole, 2008). Bhuian, Menguc and Bell (2005) found job stress as one of the determinants of Life satisfaction.

Methodology

Objectives

1. To assess Role Stress and Quality of life among working women
2. To study correlation between Role stress and Quality of Life.
3. To identify significant determinants of quality of life in role stress

The research setting for the study includes five prominent organizations in the Kashmir Province of J&K i.e., Medicine, Education, Banking, judiciary & Jammu and Kashmir State Forest Corporation.

Research Instrument

Quality of Life

For the assessment of Quality of Life, The World Health Organization Quality of Life BREF Assessment (WHOQOL-BREF; 2004) was used to assess quality of life in working women. It consists of 26 items, measuring four dimensions of quality of life namely physical, psychological, social and environmental on 5-point scale. The items inquire ‘how much’, ‘how completely’, how often’, ‘how good’ or ‘how satisfied’ the respondent felt in the last 2 weeks.

Role Stress

For the assessment of Role Stress, the Role Stress Scale developed by Pareek, (1983) was used. It is 50 item scales used to measure 10 role stresses. It is a five-point scale (0-4) containing five items for each role stress and a total of 50 statements. The scale measures Inter-Role distance (IRD), Role Stagnation(RS), Role Expectation Conflict(REC), Role Erosion(RE), Role Overload(RO), Role conflict(RC), Personal inadequacy(PI), Self-Role distance (SRD), Role Ambiguity(RA), Resource Inadequacy(RI).

Sample Description

From every organization graduate females with at least two years of experience were considered. All the employees included in the strata were working full-time basis at their respective organizations and from each division sampling elements were selected randomly. The total population consisted of 500 working women. The approximate age range of the sample was 25-40 years.

Results

Table 1.1 showing range of scores on different levels of dimensions of Role Stress

Dimensions	Mean	S. D	Lower Limit – Upper Limit	Low	Average	High
Inter role distance	2.47	.978	0.49 – 3.44	≤ 0.49	0.50 – 3.44	≥ 3.45
Role Stagnation	1.78	.85	0.92 – 2.63	≤ 0.92	0.93 – 2.64	≥ 2.65

Role Expectation conflict	1.66	.81	0.84 – 2.47	≤ 0.84	0.85 – 2.47	≥ 2.48
Role Erosion	1.55	.78	0.76 – 2.33	≤ 0.76	0.77 – 2.33	≥ 2.34
Role Overload	2.20	.946	1.25 – 3.14	≤ 1.25	1.26 – 3.14	≥ 3.15
Role Isolation	1.77	.711	1.05 – 2.48	≤ 1.05	1.06 – 2.48	≥ 2.49
Personal Inadequacy	1.39	.710	0.68 – 2.11	≤ 0.68	0.69 – 2.11	≥ 2.12
Self – Role Distance	1.45	.769	0.68 – 2.21	≤ 0.68	0.69 – 2.21	≥ 2.22
Role Ambiguity	1.42	.722	0.69 – 2.14	≤ 0.69	0.70 – 2.14	≥ 2.15
Resource Inadequacy	1.30	.765	0.54 – 2.07	≤ 0.54	0.55 – 2.14	≥ 2.15
Role Stress	1.70	.600	11.0 – 23.0	≤ 11.0	11.1 – 23.0	≥ 23.1

Table 1.2 showing frequency distribution of working women on different levels of role stress

Levels	Low		Average		High	
Dimensions	<i>f</i>	%age	<i>f</i>	%age	<i>f</i>	%age
Inter-role distance	82	16.4%	306	61.2%	112	22.4%
Role stagnation	76	15.2%	351	70.2%	73	14.6%
Role Expectation conflict	92	18.4%	327	65.4%	81	16.2%
Role erosion	87	17.4%	328	65.6%	85	17%
Role overload	96	19.2%	291	58.2%	113	22.6%
Role isolation	66	13.2%	348	69.6%	86	17.2%
Personal inadequacy	78	15.6%	347	69.4%	75	15%
Self – role distance	88	17.6%	344	68.8%	68	13.6%
Role ambiguity	94	18.8%	319	63.8%	87	17.4%
Resource inadequacy	71	14.2%	368	73.6%	61	12.2%
Role Stress	92	18.4%	350	70%	58	11.6%

The above table indicates that of 16.4% working women have low level, 61.2% have average level and 22.4% of working women have high level of Inter-Role Distance. 15.2% of working women

have low level, 70.2% have average level and 14.6% of working women have high level of Role Stagnation.18.4% of working women have low level, 65.4% have average level and 16.2% of working women have high level of Role Expectation Conflict.17.4% of working women have low level, 65.6% have average level and 17% of working women have high level of Role Erosion. 19.2% of working women have low level, 58.2% have average level and 22.6% of working women have high level of Role overload.13.2% of working women have low level, 69.6% have average level and 17.2% of working women have high level of Role Isolation.15.6% of working women have low level, 69.4% have average level and 15% of working women have high level of Personal Inadequacy.17.6% of working women have low level, 68.8% have average level and 13.6% of working women have high level of Self-role Distance.18.8% of working women have low level, 63.8% have average level and 17.4% of working women have high level of Role Ambiguity.14.2% of working women have low level, 73.6% have average level and 12.2% of working women have high level of Resource Inadequacy.18.4% of working women have low level, 70% have average level and 11.6% of working women have high level of Role Stress.

Table 1.3 showing range for different levels of dimensions of Quality of life among working women

Dimensions	Mean	S. D	LL -UL	Low	Average	High
Physical	5.22	.65	3.83-6.61	≤ 3.83	3.84– 6.61	≥ 6.62
Psychological	5.44	.57	4.20-6.67	≤ 4.20	4.21– 6.67	≥ 6.68
Social	5.19	.51	4.02-6.37	≤ 4.02	4.03– 6.37	≥ 6.38
Environmental	5.28	.53	12.4 –19.2	≤ 12.4	12.5– 19.2	≥ 19.3
Quality of life	3.18	.46	10.8-14.59	≤ 10.8	10.9– 14.59	≥ 14.60

Table 1.4 presenting frequency distribution of working women on different levels of Quality of life

Levels	Low		Average		High	
Dimensions	<i>f</i>	%age	<i>f</i>	%age	<i>f</i>	%age
Physical	106	21.2%	312	62.4%	82	16.4%
Psychological	79	15.8%	328	65.6%	93	18.6%
Social	110	22%	322	64.4%	68	13.6%

Environmental	82	16.4%	360	72%	58	11.6%
Quality of life	74	14.8%	330	66%	96	19.2%

The above table indicates that of 21.2% have low level, 62.4% have medium level and 16.4% of working women have high level of Physical dimension. 15.8% have low level, 65.6% have average level and 18.6% of working women have high level of psychological dimension. 22% of working women have low level, 64.4% have average level and 13.6% of working women have high level of social trait. 16.4% of working women have low level, 72% have average level and 11.6% of working women have high level of environmental dimension. 14.8% of working women have low level, 66% have average level and 19.2% of working women have high level of Quality of life.

Table 1.5 showing Pearson's correlation between Role Stress and Quality of life

Dimensions	Physical	Psychological	Social	Environmental	Quality of Life
Inter – Role Distance	-.534**	-.547**	-.236**	-.161**	-.464**
Role stagnation	-.555**	-.563**	-.479**	-.421**	-.617**
Role Expectation Conflict	-.651**	-.557**	-.313**	-.330**	-.577**
Role Erosion	-.321**	-.289**	-.333**	-.325**	-.384**
Role Overload	-.601**	-.558**	-.324**	-.273**	-.547**
Role Isolation	-.564**	-.552**	-.401**	-.362**	-.579**
Personal Inadequacy	-.452**	-.360**	-.337**	-.424**	-.481**
Self-role Distance	-.433**	-.366**	-.407**	-.469**	-.483**
Role Ambiguity	-.428**	-.427**	-.381**	-.473**	-.508**
Resource Inadequacy	-.340**	-.362**	-.465**	-.443**	-.519**
Role Stress	-.662**	-.624**	-.489**	-.483**	-.693**

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level

The above table indicates that inter role distance ($r = -.464$, $p < .001$), role stagnation ($r = -.617$, $p < .001$), role expectation conflict ($r = -.577$, $p < .001$), role erosion ($r = -.384$, $p < .001$), role overload ($r = -.547$, $p < .001$), role isolation ($r = -.579$, $p < .001$), personal inadequacy ($r = -.481$, $p < .001$), self-role distance ($r = -.483$, $p < .001$), role ambiguity ($r = -.508$, $p < .001$), resource

inadequacy ($r = -.519$, $p < .001$) and Role Stress ($r = -.693$, $p < .001$) are significantly and negatively correlated with quality of life in working woman.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Table 1.6 showing multiple regression analysis of Role Stress and Physical dimension of quality of life.

ANOVA Summary

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	112.596	10	11.260	54.315	
Residual	101.371	489	.207		.001
Total	213.966	489			

Summary of predictor variables

Outcome	Predictors	B	SE	B	T	Sig.
Physical	Constant		4.44	.011	62.2	.001
	Inter - Role Distance	.024	.044	.035	.540	.589
	Role Stagnation	-.163	.036	-.214	- 4.56	.001
	Role Expectation Conflict	-.232	.046	-.289	-5.00	.001
	Role Erosion	.096	.042	.115	2.27	.023
	Role Overload	-.218	.043	-.316	-5.08	.001
	Role Isolation	-.022	.051	-.024	-.435	.664
	Personal Inadequacy	-.123	.046	-.134	-2.66	.008
	Role Ambiguity	-.073	.044	-.080	-1.65	.099
	Resource Inadequacy	.011	.047	.013	.243	.808
	Self – Role Distance	.044	.043	.052	1.01	.309

$R^2 = .51$, ($P = .001$)

The above table displays that role stagnation ($\beta = -.214$, $p = .001$), role expectation conflict ($\beta = -.289$, $p = .001$), role erosion ($\beta = .115$, $p = .023$), role overload ($\beta = -.316$, $p = .001$) and personal inadequacy ($\beta = -.134$, $p = .008$) predicts 51 % of the variance ($R^2 = .51$, $F(54.31)$, $p = .001$) in the physical dimension of quality of life among working women.

Table 1.7 showing multiple regression analysis of Role Stress and Psychological dimension of quality of life.

ANOVA summary					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	78.874	10	7.887	44.468	.001
Residual	86.736	489	.177		
Total	165.610	499			

Summary of Predictor Variables						
Outcome	Predictors	B	SE	B	T	Sig
Psychological	Constant	4.06	.066		61.5	.001
	Inter-Role Distance	-.117	.041	-.199	-2.88	.004
	Role Stagnation	-.229	.033	-.341	-6.90	.001
	Role Expectation Conflict	-.028	.043	-.039	-.650	.516
	Role Erosion	.114	.039	.156	2.34	.003
	Role Overload	-.053	.040	-.087	-1.33	.184
	Role Isolation	-.129	.047	-.159	-2.75	.006
	Personal Inadequacy	.010	.043	.012	.224	.823
	Role Ambiguity	.026	.041	.033	.639	.523
	Resource Inadequacy	-1.21	.040	-.028	-.524	.600
	Self-Role	-.021	.040	-.028	-.524	.600

Distance

$R^2 = .46$, ($P = .001$)

The above table displays that inter role distance ($\beta = -.199$, $p = .004$), role stagnation ($\beta = -.341$, $p = .001$), role erosion ($\beta = .156$, $p = .003$), role isolation ($\beta = -2.75$, $p = .006$), predicts 46 % of the variance ($R^2 = .466$; $F (44.4)$, $p = .001$) in the psychological dimension of quality of life among working women.

Table 1.8 showing multiple regression analysis of Role Stress and Social dimension of quality of life.

ANOVA Summary

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	14.244	10	4.124	22.476	
Residual	89.733	489	.184		.001
Total	130.977	489			

Summary of Predictor Variables

Outcome	Predictors	B	SE	B	T	Sig
	Constant	3.98	.067		59.3	.001
	Inter-Role Distance	.010	.041	.018	.232	.817
	Role Stagnation	-.172	.034	-.288	-5.09	.001
	Role Expectation	.101	.044	.160	2.30	.021
Social	Conflict					
	Role Erosion	.087	.040	.134	2.20	.028
	Role Overload	-.067	.040	-.123	-1.64	.100
	Role Isolation	-.103	.048	-.142	-2.15	.032
	Personal					
	Inadequacy	.001	.044	.001	.024	.981
	Role Ambiguity	-.084	.041	-.118	-2.03	.043

Resource Inadequacy	-.015	.044	-.022	-.333	.739
Self-Role Distance	-.176	.041	-.265	-.4.32	.001

$R^2 = .30$, ($P = .001$)

The above table shows that role stagnation ($\beta = -.288$, $p = .001$), role expectation conflict ($\beta = .160$, $p = .021$), role erosion ($\beta = .134$, $p = .028$), role isolation ($\beta = -.142$, $p = .032$), role ambiguity ($\beta = -.118$, $p = .043$), and self-role distance ($\beta = -.265$, $p = .001$), could predict 30 % of the variance ($R^2 = .315$; $F(22.47)$, $p = .001$) in the social dimension of quality of life among working women.

Table 1.9 showing multiple regression analysis of Role Stress and Environmental dimension of quality of life.

ANOVA Summary

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	44.762	10	4.476	22.305	
Residual	98.132	489	.201		.001
Total	142.894	499			

Summary of predictor variables

Outcome	Predictors	B	SE	B	T	Sig
Environmental	Constant	3.791	.070		53.98	.001
	Inter-Role Distance	.086	.043	.156	1.98	.048
	Role Stagnation	-.114	.035	-.183	-3.22	.001
	Role Expectation Conflict	.033	.046	.051	.732	.465
	Role Erosion	.125	.041	.185	3.03	.003
	Role Overload	-.101	.042	-.179	-2.39	.017
	Role Isolation	-.025	.050	-.034	-.509	.611
	Personal Inadequacy	.081	.046	-.107	-1.77	.077

Role Ambiguity	-.119	.043	-.160	-2.74	.006
Resource Inadequacy	-.129	.046	-.185	-2.82	0.05
Self-Role Distance	-.109	.043	-.156	- 2.55	.011

$R^2 = .29, (P = .001)$

The above table shows that inter role distance ($\beta = .156, p = .048$), role stagnation ($\beta = .183, p = .001$), role erosion ($\beta = .185, p = .003$), role overload ($\beta = -.179, p = .017$), role ambiguity ($\beta = -.160, p = .006$), resource inadequacy ($\beta = -.185, p = 0.05$), and self-role distance ($\beta = -.265, p = .011$), predicts 29 % of the variance ($R^2 = .29$; $F (22.47), p = .001$) in the environmental dimension of quality of life among working women.

Table 1.10 showing multiple regression analysis of Role Stress and Quality of Life.

ANOVA Summary

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	57.814	10	5.781	54.246	
Residual	52.117	489	.107		.001
Total	109.93	499			

Summary of Predictor Variables

Outcome	Predictors	B	SE	B	T	Sig
QOL	Constant	4.10	.046		90.05	.001
	Role Stress	- 5.41	.025	-.693	- 21.46	.001

$R^2 = .47, (P = .001)$

The above table displays that Role Stress ($\beta = -.69, p = .001$), predicts 47 % of the variance ($R^2 = .47$; $F (54.246), p = .001$) in the model of quality of life among working women.

Discussion and Conclusion

Findings revealed that 18.4% of working women have low level, 70% have medium level and 11.6% of working women are at high level of Role Stress. 14.8% of working women fall at low level, 66% fall at medium level and 19.2% of working women fall at high level of Quality of Life. The Correlational analysis further revealed that role stress was significantly and negatively correlated with quality of life. This is in line with the studies of Sparks, Faragher and Cooper, 2001; Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair and Shafiro, 2005; Delina and Raya, 2013; Wayne, Musisca,

and Fleeson, 2004. Regression Analysis found that the role stress could predict 47 % of the variance in the quality of life among working women. This is in consonance with previous studies of Bray and Born, 2004; Vuillemin et al., 2005.

References

Adebola, H. E. (2005). *Emotional expression at workplace: Implications for workfamily role ambiguities*. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32 (21), 102-115.

Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). *Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: a review and agenda for future research*. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 5(2), 278.

Anderson, S. E., Coffey, B. S., & Byerly, R. T. (2002). *Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes*. *Journal of management*, 28(6), 787-810.

Aryee, S. (1992). *Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict among married professional women: Evidence from Singapore*. *Human relations*, 45(8), 813-837.

Behrman, D. N., & Perreault Jr, W. D. (1984). *A role stress model of the performance and satisfaction of industrial salespersons*. *The Journal of Marketing*, 9-21.

Bhuian, S. N., Menguc, B., & Bell, S. J. (2005). *Just entrepreneurial enough: the moderating effect of entrepreneurship on the relationship between market orientation and performance*. *Journal of business research*, 58(1), 9-17.

Bongers, P. M., de Winter, C. R., Kompier, M. A., & Hildebrandt, V. H. (1993). *Psychosocial factors at work and musculoskeletal disease*. *Scandinavian journal of work, environment & health*, 297-312.

Boufous, S., & Williamson, A. (2006). *Work-related traffic crashes: A record linkage study*. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 38(1), 14-21.

Burbeck, R., Coomber, S., Robinson, S. M., & Todd, C. (2002). *Occupational stress in consultants in accident and emergency medicine: a national survey of levels of stress at work*. *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 19(3), 234-238.

Bray, S. R., & Born, H. A. (2004). *Transition to university and vigorous physical activity: Implications for health and psychological well-being*. *Journal of American College Health*, 52(4), 181-188.

Carlson, D. S., & Kacmar, K. M. (2000). *Work-family conflict in the organization: Do life role values make a difference?*. *Journal of Management*, 26(5), 1031-1054.

Cohen, S., & Janicki-Deverts, D. E. N. I. S. E. (2012). *Who's Stressed? Distributions of Psychological Stress in the United States in Probability Samples from 1983, 2006, and 2009*. *Journal of applied social psychology*, 42(6), 1320-1334.

Collins, S. M., Karasek, R. A., & Costas, K. (2005). *Job strain and autonomic indices of cardiovascular disease risk*. *American journal of industrial medicine*, 48(3), 182-193.

Coltrane, S. (2000). *Research on household labor: Modeling and measuring the social embeddedness of routine family work*. *Journal of Marriage and family*, 62(4), 1208-1233.

De Jonge, J., Dormann, C., Janssen, P. P., Dollard, M. F., Landeweerd, J. A., & Nijhuis, F. J. (2001). *Testing reciprocal relationships between job characteristics and psychological well-being: A cross-lagged structural equation model*. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 74(1), 29-46.

Delina, G., & Raya, R. P. (2013). *A study on work-life balance in working women*. *International Journal of Commerce, Business and Management*, 2(5), 274-282.

Dormann, C., & Zapf, D. (1999). *Social support, social stressors at work, and depressive symptoms: testing for main and moderating effects with structural equations in a three-wave longitudinal study*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(6), 874.

Elfering, A., Grebner, S., K Semmer, N., Kaiser-Freiburghaus, D., Lauper-Del Ponte, S., & Witschi, I. (2005). *Chronic job stressors and job control: Effects on event-related coping success and well-being*. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(2), 237-252.

Friedman, M., & Rosenman, R. H. (1971). *Type A Behavior Pattern: its association with coronary heart disease*. *Ann. Clin. Res.*, 3(6), 300-312.

Frone, M. R. (2000). *Work-family conflict and employee psychiatric disorders: The national comorbidity survey*. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 85(6), 888.

Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1993). *Relationship of work-family conflict, gender, and alcohol expectancies to alcohol use/abuse*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(6), 545-558.

Grandey, A. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1999). *The conservation of resources model applied to work-family conflict and strain*. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 54(2), 350-370.

Grandey, A. A., Fisk, G. M., & Steiner, D. D. (2005). *Must "service with a smile" be stressful? The moderating role of personal control for American and French employees*. *Journal of applied psychology*, 90(5), 893.

Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., Singh, R., & Parasuraman, S. (1997). Work and family influences on departure from public accounting. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 50(2), 249-270.

Gupta, P. R., & Adhikari, A. (2008). Role Stress in Nurses. *The ICFAI Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, VII, 1, 49-56.

Hammer, L. B., Bauer, T. N., & Grandey, A. A. (2003). Work-family conflict and work-related withdrawal behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(3), 419-436.

Hammer, L. B., Cullen, J. C., Neal, M. B., Sinclair, R. R., & Shafiro, M. V. (2005). The longitudinal effects of work-family conflict and positive spillover on depressive symptoms among dual-earner couples. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 10(2), 138.

Higgins, C. A., Duxbury, L. E., & Irving, R. H. (1992). Work-family conflict in the dual-career family. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 51(1), 51-75.

Jansen, N. W., Kant, I., van Amelsvoort, L. G., Kristensen, T. S., Swaen, G. M., & Nijhuis, F. J. (2006). Work-family conflict as a risk factor for sickness absence. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 63(7), 488-494.

Jreige, T. (2011). *Stress and Coping Strategies of Faculty Members*. HEIC.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*.

Kaplan, R. (1993). *The role of nature in the context of the workplace. Landscape and*

Kousar, S., Fatima, N., & Bashir, F. (2004). A study of stress management strategies adopted by elementary school principles. *University of the Punjab, Lahore*.

Lackritz, J. R. (2004). Exploring burnout among university faculty: incidence, performance, and demographic issues. *Teaching and teacher education*, 20(7), 713-729.

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual review of psychology*, 52(1), 397-422.

Netemeyer, R. G., Maxham III, J. G., & Pullig, C. (2005). Conflicts in the work-family interface: Links to job stress, customer service employee performance, and customer purchase intent. *Journal of Marketing*, 69(2), 130-143.

O'Neill, J. W., Harrison, M. M., Cleveland, J., Almeida, D., Stawski, R., & Crouter, A. C. (2009). Work-family climate, organizational commitment, and turnover: Multilevel contagion effects of leaders. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(1), 18-29.

O'Driscoll, M. P., Ilgen, D. R., & Hildreth, K. (1992). Time devoted to job and off-job activities, interrole conflict, and affective experiences. *Journal of applied psychology*, 77(3), 272.

Offer, S., & Schneider, B. (2011). Revisiting the gender gap in time-use patterns: Multitasking and well-being among mothers and fathers in dual-earner families. American Sociological Review, 76(6), 809-833.

Parasuraman, S., Greenhaus, J. H., Rabinowitz, S., Bedeian, A. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1989). Work and family variables as mediators of the relationship between wives' employment and husbands' well-being. Academy of management Journal, 32(1), 185-201.

Pareek, U. (1982). A Survey of Research in Psychology, 1971-76, Part-2.

Pareek, U. (1983). Organizational role stress scale. ORS Scale Booklet, Answer Sheet and Manual. Ahmedabad: Navin Publications.

Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential challenge stressor-hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: a meta-analysis. Journal of applied psychology, 92(2), 438.

Ravichandran, R., & Rajendran, R. (2007). Perceived sources of stress among the teachers. Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 33(1), 133-136.

*Renwick, R., & Brown, I. (1996). The center for health promotions conceptual approach to quality of life: Being, Belonging and Becoming. Quality of life in health promotion and rehabilitation: conceptual approaches, issues and applications, 75-86.
role ambiguities. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32 (21), 102-115.*

Segerstrom, S. C., & Miller, G. E. (2004). Psychological stress and the human immune system: a meta-analytic study of 30 years of inquiry. Psychological bulletin, 130(4), 601.

Shahu, R., & Gole, S. V. (2008). Effect of job stress and job satisfaction on performance: An empirical study. AIMS International Journal of Management, 2(3), 237-246.

Skevington, S. M., Lotfy, M., & O'Connell, K. A. (2004). The World Health Organization's WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment: psychometric properties and results of the international field trial. A report from the WHOQOL group. Quality of life Research, 13(2), 299-310.

Sonnentag, S., & Frese, M. (2003). Stress in organizations. Comprehensive handbook of psychology, 12, 453-491.

Sparks, K., Faragher, B., & Cooper, C. L. (2001). Well-being and occupational health in the 21st century workplace. Journal of occupational and organizational psychology, 74(4), 489-509.

Spink, A., Cole, C., & Waller, M. (2008). *Multitasking behavior. Annual review of information science and technology*, 42(1), 93-118.

Srivastava, A. K. (1991). *A study of role stress-mental health relationship as moderated by adopted coping strategies. Psychological Studies*.

Tang, C. S. K., Au, W. T., Schwarzer, R., & Schmitz, G. (2001). *Mental health outcomes of job stress among Chinese teachers: Role of stress resource factors and burnout. Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 22(8), 887-901.

Tubre, T. C., & Collins, J. M. (2000). *Jackson and Schuler (1985) revisited: A meta-analysis of the relationships between role ambiguity, role conflict, and job performance. Journal of management*, 26(1), 155-169.

Vuillemin, A., Boini, S., Bertrais, S., Tessier, S., Oppert, J. M., Hercberg, S., ... & Briançon, S. (2005). *Leisure time physical activity and health-related quality of life. Preventive medicine*, 41(2), 562-569.

Wayne, J. H., Musisca, N., & Fleeson, W. (2004). *Considering the role of personality in the work–family experience: Relationships of the big five to work–family conflict and facilitation. Journal of vocational behavior*, 64(1), 108-130.

Wetzels, M., De Ruyter, K., & Bloemer, J. (2000). *Antecedents and consequences of role stress of retail sales persons. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 7(2), 65-75.

Winter, R., Taylor, T., & Sarros, J. (2000). *Trouble at mill: Quality of academic worklife issues within a comprehensive Australian university. Studies in Higher Education*, 25(3), 279-294