Moderating Effect of Emotional Intelligence on Stress-Effectiveness Relationship

Dr (Mrs) Pushpa Misra*
Shalini Srivastava**

Abstract

This research examines the moderating effect of Emotional Intelligence on the relationship between Organizational role stress and Managerial Effectiveness. Two hundred and eighty six managers randomly drawn from fifteen private sector organizations constituted the study's sample. Variables in the study were assessed using three validated Instruments. Descriptive statistics, Pearson Product Moment Correlation and Hierarchical regression analysis were employed to analyze the data. The significant findings of the study reveal that there was significant and negative impact of organizational role stress on Managerial effectiveness and that Emotional Intelligence mediates the relationship between Organizational role stress and Managerial effectiveness. Based on the findings, it is suggested that Emotional Intelligence could be used as an intervention to enhance Managerial Effectiveness.

Keywords : Managerial Effectiveness, Emotional Intelligence, Organizational Role Stress, Private Sector Managers

1. Introduction

Stress has become an inevitable part of human life in recent times. It makes life more challenging and charming, however within a limit. In the past two decades, empirical researches on the theme of stress have increased manifold Faced with new challenges of the Indian economy, corporate are today increasingly realizing the fact that their people, especially those at the managerial levels, are the only source of competitive advantage. This has resulted in a renewed focus on HR strategies that can ensure retention, commitment, as well as continued growth and effectiveness of the managerial personnel.

There is a tremendous impact of emotional intelligence (EI) on the rapidly changing corporate world. A strong relationship between EI and work success has been observed using both, the Trait based as well as the Ability based models of emotional intelligence.

Studies relating personality variables and emotional intelligence (EI) with job effectiveness became manifold in the last two decades wherein emotional intelligence has emerged as an effective predictor of job performance in several work settings (Bar-On, 2004; Handley, 1997; Ruderman, & Bar-On, 2003).

*Head (Rtd.) Department of Psychology, Lucknow University, Lucknow, India
**Associate Professor (OB & HR), IILM-College of Management Studies, Greater Noida, India

Researches along such stream have found that people with high levels of EI have enjoyed more career success (Dulewicz,& Higgs, 1998; Weisinger, 1998), feel less job insecurity (Jordan,Ashkanasy, & Hartel, 2002) lead more effectively (Cooper, & Sawaf, 1997; Palmer, Walls, Burgess, & Stough, 2000; Prati, 2004), are more adaptable to stressful events (Slaski, &Cartwright, 2002), posses better coping strategies (Bar-On, 2000)and show greater sales success (Johnson, & Indvik, 1999; Geiser,2001) than those with low EI. Bar-On (2002) the most widely read researcher of EI-trait explained that emotional intelligence includes one's emotional, personal and social dimensions of intelligence:

"Emotional intelligence involves abilities, competencies and skills related to understanding of oneself and others, relating to peers and family members, and adapting to changing environmental situations and demands (p.1)"

The trait conceptualization of EI as a behavioral tendency has been however reported to overlap with personality traits (Ciarrochi, Chan, & Caputi, 2000; Dawda, & Hart, 2000;Bedwell, 2003) Newsome, Day and Catano (2000) reported significant positive relationships between major personality traits and factors of emotional intelligence. The role of emotional intelligence in managerial effectiveness has been investigated in several studies (Jae, 1997; Sipsma, 2000; Sitarenios, 2001) but studies about personality characteristics and emotional intelligence as predictors of managerial effectiveness are rather few. Exploring the nature of personality variables that are mediated by emotional intelligence in their influence on managerial success is the focus of inquiry in this study.

2. Organisational Role Stress

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

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

Stress is associated with impaired individual functioning in the workplace. A number of aspects of working life have been linked to stress. Aspects of work itself can be stressful, namely work overload (Defrank & Ivancevich, 1998; Sparks & Cooper, 1999, Taylor et al., 1997) and role-based factors such as lack of power, role ambiguity, and role conflict (Burke, 1988; Nelson and Burke, 2000).

In the past three decades, empirical researches on the theme of stress have increased many folds. Researchers have focused their attention on causal factors of stress, stress manifestations, moderators of stress-strain relationship, types of stresses experienced by diverse work populations, and various coping strategies adopted by organizational entities to cope with stress (Pestonjee, 1992).

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

Pareek (1983) has pioneered work on role stress by identifying as many as ten different types of organizational role stresses namely: IRD, RS, REC, RE, RO, RI, PI, SRD, RA, RIN.

3. Managerial Effectiveness

The study of managerial effectiveness should be central to any organization. It is a topic that has been actively pursued by managerial researchers for many years.

Most research on Managerial effectiveness or competence focuses on personal attributes of the individual. This understates the impact of context, which can assist or hinder job performance. A national (New Zealand) survey assessed the impact of 16 environmental variables, four management development variables and two variables reflecting personal skills and abilities, on the ability to be effective as a manager. Analysis revealed eight factors explaining the majority of perceived management effectiveness (Page & Inkson,2003) .

In recent years, there has been a focus on the skills, abilities and characterstics of "effective" managers at the level of the individual, the organization, and the nation (see for example, Boyatsis, 1982, Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000: Grugulis, 1998: Page et al., 1994)

Change is one of the most common phenomena in this universe. Therefore, it is not change which is new to business and industry, but it is the speed of change that is challenging for the contemporary organisations. The answer lies in upgrading the competitive skills of people to manage and adapt to changing environments not only efficiently but also effectively too. It is going to be essentially a matter of concern for the winning organisations to choose appropriate strategies for not only retaining talented people with them but also to create opportunities for enhancing the effectiveness of their managerial workforce. Managerial effectiveness has been defined from different perspectives over the years and there have been number of attempts to arrive at a single definition of this vitally important variable.

Managerial stress has been the major area of research. Causes of stress, or the "stresssors", have been studied in great detail. Stressors have been studied from different perspectives. Some

have focused on organizational characteristics, some on task characteristics and still others on the personality characteristics of the managers. Role demands and expectations have also been empirically found to lead to stress. (Kahn et al., 1964). Still other studies on job stress focus on the occupational differences in stressors. (Smith et al.,1978). Personality factors such as Type A and Negative Affectivity have also been found to play a part in the stress experienced (Payne, 1975; Watson and Clark, 1984). Studies in India have also attempted to establish the degree of association or find out casual relationships of stress with other variables such as organizational, job, leadership, communication and personal factors (Pestonjee, 1992). Most studies with managerial stress used the general category "managers" as a unit for their analysis. A few studies look at different managerial levels in terms of junior, middle and top level managers with the aim of identifying or understanding the different causes of stress that act on them (Gemmill and Heisler, 1972; Singh, 1990).

4. Managerial Effectiveness and Organizational Role Stress

Likert (1961) had emphasised that a manager must be adaptive to a specific situation and needs of his/her followers resulting in high degree of effectiveness in meeting personal and organizational goals. According to Reddin (1970), managerial effectiveness is nothing more than the output, and it is dependent upon the output with regards to one's position in the organisation. He emphasised upon the output without any mention of morale and satisfaction of group members. In the situation of complexity and ambiguity, an effective manager is an optimiser of resources for better organizational functioning (Campbell et al.,1970.) Results have also indicated that coping with organizational change was related to extrinsic (salary, job level, plateauing, job performance) and intrinsic (organizational commitment, job satisfaction) career outcomes and that coping mediated roughly half of the relationships between the dispositional factors and these career outcomes.

French, Kast, and Rosenzweig (1985) state that the challenge is to minimize *distress* and maintain *eustress*. They point out that the conditions of organizational life create a series of paradoxes that demonstrate the need for balance and equilibrium. The role of management becomes one of maintaining an appropriate level of stress by providing an optimal environment, and "by doing a good job in areas such as performance planning, role analysis, work redesign/job enrichment, continuing feedback, ecological considerations, and interpersonal skills training." (p. 709).

There are essentially three strategies for dealing with stress in organizations (Jick and Payne, 1980): 1) treat the symptoms, 2) change the person, and 3) remove the cause of the stress. When a person is already suffering from the effects of stress, the first priority is to treat the symptoms. This includes both the identification of those suffering from excessive stress, as well as providing health-care and psychological counseling services. The second approach is to help individuals build stress management skills to make them less vulnerable to its effects. Examples would be teaching employees time management and relaxation techniques, or suggesting changes to one's diet or exercise. The third approach is to eliminate or reduce the environmental situation that is creating the stress. This would involve reducing environmental stressors such as noise and pollution, or modifying production schedules and work-loads.

Many modern organizations view the management of stress as a personal matter. An effort to monitor employee stress levels would be considered an invasion of privacy. However, Lawless (1991) found that nine out of ten employees felt that it was the employer's responsibility to reduce worker stress and provide a health plan that covers stress illnesses. She emphasized that "employees have no doubt that stress-related illnesses and disability should be taken seriously. Employees expect substantive action by their employer and hold their employer financially responsible for the consequences of job stress." (p. 12)

Lawless (1991) reported that four different employer programs were effective in reducing job burn out, where the percent of people reporting burn out was reduced by half. Furthermore, when these programs were offered, there were also half as many stress related illnesses. They are: 1) supportive work and family policies, 2) effective management communication, 3) health insurance coverage for mental illness and chemical dependency, and 4) flexible scheduling of work hours. This study also reported that the success rate for treating stress related disabilities was considerably less than the average for all disabilities, and that the average cost to treat stress related conditions was $1,925 (both successful and unsuccessful).

An important step in reduction of stress is establishing one's priorities. (Williams and Huber, 1986). The demands of many managerial positions cause the neglect of other areas of one's life, such as family, friends, recreation, and religion. This neglect creates stress, which in turn affects job performance and health. Value clarification is linked to time management, since we generally allocate our time according to our priorities. By setting personal priorities, managers and subordinates can reduce this source of stress. It is typically the first step in any stress reduction program.

Many sources of stress in organizations cannot be changed. These might include situations like a prolonged recessionary period, new competitors, or an unanticipated crisis. Organizational members generally have little control over these kinds of stressors, and they can create extended periods of high-stress situations. People who adjust to these stressors generally use a form of perceptual adaptation, where they modify the way in which they perceive the situation.

Quick and Quick (1984) suggest several diagnostic procedures for determining stress levels in organizations. Interviews allow in-depth probing, but they are time consuming and depend primarily on the listening skills of the interviewer. Questionnaires have the advantage of being able to process higher volumes of data, but they often lose the "flavor" or feel of the responses. Observational techniques (both medical and behavioral) can be either quantitative or qualitative. Quantitative techniques might involve gathering company records, such as the rates of absenteeism, tardiness, turnover, and production. Qualitative techniques involve observing workers for signs of stress-related behavior.

5. Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence is a relatively new construct stemming from the increased interest in emotions in the workplace. Initiated by Salovey and Mayer (1990), who perceived emotional

intelligence as a subset of social intelligence, they defined emotional intelligence as "the ability to monitor one's own and other's feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions" (p. 189).

Goleman (1995) has related emotional intelligence to knowing and managing emotions, self-motivation, and handling relationships. More recently, research on the implications of emotional intelligence in the workplace suggests that emotional intelligence may have a substantial role in organizational activities. In his work on positive organizational behavior (POB), Luthans (2002) listed emotional intelligence as one of five constructs capable of being developed and managed for improved performance in organizations.

Also, the contemporary theories of leadership (i.e., transformational, and charismatic), because of their interpersonal connection with followers, are affected by a leader's emotional intelligence level. Furthermore, emotional intelligence has been discussed as an important characteristic to investigate in leadership in the future (e.g., Caruso, Mayer, & Salovey, 2002; George, 2000; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002). Within these theories of leadership, emotional intelligence appears to be a catalyst for articulating vision and developing constructive relationships with organizational members (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002).

Finally, in the work team development context, empirical research suggests that emotional intelligence might influence teamwork. A recent study reported that untrained teams with high emotional intelligence members performed as well as trained teams with low emotional intelligence members (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002). With the growing importance of teams and team-based work structures within organizations, emotional intelligence might provide a mechanism to better understand the interactive process dynamics and outcomes that take place among team members, and to serve as a useful developmental tool in team-building efforts.

6. Method

The sample consisted of 300 Managers from Private Sector Organizations comprising of BPO, Banks and IT Sectors. The organizations within the private sector were located in Delhi and NCR. The employees were males 20-60 years of age group, with a mean of 40 years and standard deviation of 4.6 years. They had spent at least two years in the same organization.

The data was collected day administering questionnaires mainly during office hours, with the consent of relevant representatives of the employer as well as the respondents. The participants were chosen randomly from each organization and belonged to different departments of the organization. Most of the participants showed their willingness to participate in the study after a short meeting.

7. Measures

Questionnaire measures were used to obtain data on three variables included in the study: Managerial Effectiveness, Organizational role stress, and Emotional Intelligence. Managerial effectiveness was conceptualized as dependent variable whereas, Organizational role stress, and Emotional Intelligence as Independent variables. Self-report measures were used to obtain the data. Managerial Effectiveness was measured through a questionnaire adapted from Gupta (1986), which consisted of 45 items divided into 16 dimensions. Organizational role stress was measured through a questionnaire developed by Udai Pareek, consisting of 50 items divided into 10 dimensions. Emotional Intelligence was again measured through a questionnaire developed by Schuttle et al.,(1997) consisting of 30 items.

The measures used in this study were borrowed from their original source and adapted from Indian work setting.

8. About the Scales

8.1 Emotional Intelligence(EI): Emotional Intelligence was measured through a questionnaire developed by Schuttle et al.,(1997) consisting of 30 items with a response s ranging from strongly disagree(1) to strongly agree(5).The scale has a Cronbach Alpha of .81. (*Refer to Table 2*)

8.2 Managerial Effectiveness Questionnaire (MEQ): This scale developed by Gupta (1996) consists of 45 items, which describes managerial behaviors incorporating 16 factors of managerial effectiveness. The respondents are required to indicate how frequently they behave or act in that way. A five point Likert rating scale was used to get the response (namely:5=Always;4 =Usually;3-Doubtful;2=sometimes;1=never).A high score on the scale indicates high managerial effectiveness. The scale is reported to have satisfactory reliability as well as validity (Gupta, 1996).In the present study, instead of taking 16 factors separately, overall managerial effectiveness was taken into account. Overall effectiveness was found to be significant (α=.87) (*Refer to Table 2*)

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

- 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)

The present study yielded only six factors significant on factor analysis. These were: Self-role distance (α=.84), Resource Inadequacy (α=.71), Role ambiguity (α=.94), Role expectation conflict (α=.89), Role erosion (α=.94) and Personal Inadequacy (α=.76) (*Refer to Table 1 & to Table 2*)

9. Data Analysis and Results

The section that follow provide a brief description of factors extracted by factor analysis according to the criterion of factor loadings greater that or equal to .30.

The result indicated that factor analysis can be conducted as the KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) measure of sampling adequacy is 0.60. The Bartlett test of sphericity is significant and the KMO measure of sampling adequacy is greater than 0.6 (Refer Kaiser criterion, 1960). Factor Analysis with principal axis factoring method and varimax rotation was then used to cluster the variables into several factors that explain the respondent's entrepreneurial orientation with respect to culture in the presence of effective leadership. In order to control the number of factors extracted, a minimum Eigen value of one (1) was used in the factor analysis. Factors with Eigen value less than one were considered insignificant and were excluded. Only Six(6) factors in the Organizational role stress and one in Managerial Effectiveness were found to have a meaningful relationship and therefore the factors were retained and interpreted. These factors are depicted in Table 1.

Table 1 : Summary of Factor Analysis results

Factor & Item No.	Item	Loading
	Organisational Role Stress	
	Factor 1 : Self role Distance	
1	Doing things against better judgment	.49
2	Unable to use training & expertise in my role	.53
3	Work not related to my interest	.48
4	Doing things differently if given freedom	.40
5	Conflict between my values and what I have to do in my role	.51
	Factor 2 : Resource Inadequacy	
1	Insufficient information to carry out the duties	.41
2	Insufficient resource to be effective in my role	.58
3	not enough people to work with me in my role	.66
4	worried that I lack necessary facilities	.59
5	I wish I had more financial resources for the work assigned	.53
	Factor 3 : Role Ambiguity	
1	Not clear in the scope and responsibility of my role	.49
2	Do not know what the people I work with expect of me	.50
3	Several aspects of my role are vague and unclear	.74
4	My role has not been defined clearly and in detail	.72
5	I am not clear what the priorities are in my role	.58
	Factor 4 : Role Expectation Conflict	
1	Not able to satisfy the conflicting demands of various people	.56
2	Not able to satisfy the conflicting demands of peers & Juniors	.72
3	Not able to satisfy the demands of clients and others	.75
4	The expectations of my seniors conflict with those of my juniors	.48
5	I am bothered with the contradictory expectations different people have	.52
	Factor 5 : Role Erosion	
1	My role has recently been reduced in importance	.44
2	My functional role has been assigned to others	.37
3	I would like to take on more responsibility than I am handling at present	.45
4	I can do much more than what I have assigned	.57
5	I wish I had been given more challenges tasks to do	.62
	Factor 6 : Personal Inadequacy	
1	I do not have adequate knowledge to handle the responsibility	.58
2	I wish I had more skills to handle the responsibilities of my role	.62
3	I have not had the right training for my role	.66
4	I wish I had prepared myself well for my role	.48
5	I need more training and preparation to be effective in my work role	.56

Hypotheses :

H1: Organizational Role Stress is significantly and negatively related to Managerial Effectiveness

H2: Emotional Intelligence moderates the effect of organizational role stress on Managerial effectiveness.

Table 2 : Reliability Coefficients of the Instruments

Variables	Factors	No. of items	Cronbach's α
Organisational Role stress			
	Self-role distance	5	.84
	Resource Inadequacy	5	.71
	Role ambiguity	5	.94
	Role expectation conflict	5	.89
	Role erosion	5	.94
	Personal Inadequacy	5	.76
Emotional Intelligence		30	.81
Overall managerial effectiveness		45	.87

As seen from Table 2, the instruments used in this study were reliable, with coefficients ranging from 0.71 to 0.94, which exceeded the minimum acceptance level of 0.70.

The mean score for each study variable can be seen from Table 2.

Table 3 : Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of the Study Variables

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation
Self-role distance	2.26	0.63
Resource Inadequacy	2.32	0.71
Role ambiguity	3.56	0.79
Role expectation conflict	2.54	0.78
Role erosion	2.24	0.76
Personal Inadequacy	2.22	0.52
Emotional Intelligence	4.63	1.24
Overall managerial effectiveness	42.32	14.34

From Table 3, it can be observed that the mean value for each of the dimensions of organizational role stress ranges from 2.22 to 3.56, with the standard deviation of 0.52 to 0.79. The mean score computed for Internal locus of control was 4.63 and standard deviation was 1.24. The mean for overall managerial effectiveness was 42.32 with a standard deviation score of 14.34.

Table 4 : Coefficients of Correlations among the Variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.SRD	1							
2.RIn	.56	1						
3.RA	.57	.66	1					
4.REC	.66	.75	.76	1				
5.RE	.67	.75	.67	.65	1			
6.PI	.55	.64	.76	.75	.55	1		
7.EI	.77	.66	.67	.66	.66	.75	1	
8 ME	-.62	- .73	- .56	-.49	- .55	- .72	.54	1

Note: All the variables are significant at .05 levels.
SRD=Self-role distance, RIn=Resource Inadequacy, RA=Role Ambiguity, REC=Role Expectation Conflict, PI=Personal Inadequacy, EI=Emotional Intelligence, ME-Managerial Effectiveness

Table 5 : Hierarchical Regression Results

Independent Variables	Std Beta (Model 1)	Std Beta (Model 2)	Std Beta (Model 3)
Model Variables			
Self-role distance	-.66**	-.84*	
Resource Inadequacy	-.38**	-.76**	
Role ambiguity	-1.09*	-2.43*	
Role expectation conflict	-.53**	.68**	
Role erosion	-.34*	..57*	
Personal Inadequacy	-2.57**	3.52	
Moderating Variable			
Emotional Intelligence		3.48**	3.96**
Interaction			
Self-role distance× Emotional Intelligence			2.134**
Resource Inadequacy× Emotional Intelligence			3.126**
Role ambiguity× Emotional Intelligence			2.348**
Role expectation conflict× Emotional Intelligence			2.128**
Role erosion× Emotional Intelligence			3.062**
Resource Inadequacy× Emotional Intelligence			2.134**
R^2	0.232	0.624	0.938
Adj. R^2	0.218	0.629	0.634
R^2 Change	0.232	0.392	0.314
F Change	24.326**	2.432**	0.284**
Sig. F Change	0.000	0.000	0.000

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

As shown in Table 5, when the six Organizational stress variables were entered into the regression analysis in the first step, the coefficient of determination (R^2) was found to be 0.232 indicating that 23.2% of managerial effectiveness is explained by the Independent variable (ORS) variables. In step 2, to test whether Emotional Intelligence serves as an independent variable, a second regression was undertaken. By adding Internal Locus of control as independent variables, the R^2 increased to 62.4%. This R^2 change (0.392) is significant. This implies that the additional 39.2% of the variation in managerial effectiveness is explained by Emotional Intelligence. The F-statistics is significant ($p<0.01$) suggesting that the proposed model was adequate. As can be seen from Table 4, Emotional Intelligence had a positive relationship with managerial effectiveness.

From the first regression model, it can be observed that role ambiguity (β = -1.09), and role erosion (β = -.34) had a significant and negative relationship with managerial effectiveness at 0.05 level. Additionally, self role distance, (β = -.66), Resource Inadequacy (β = -.38), role expectation conflict (β = -.53) and personal inadequacy (β = -.257) had a significant effect on managerial at the 0.01 level. These results provided full support for the first hypothesis of the study.

To examine the moderating effects of Emotional Intelligence, a third regression model was developed by adding the interaction

terms. Emotional Intelligence was found to significantly moderate the relationships between six Organisational role stressors (Self-role distance, Resource Inadequacy, Role expectation conflict, role erosion and Personal Inadequacy) and Managerial Effectiveness. As shown in Table 5, the R2 change of 31.4% is significant. This means that Emotional Intelligence did serve as a moderator in seeing the effect of organizational role stress variables on managerial effectiveness. Thus, our second hypothesis is also proved.

10. Interpretation and Discussion

Organisational stress is considered to be rising and has become a challenge for the employer and because of high level of stress, it results in low productivity and effectiveness (Meneze, 2005). As per our first result, it is being analyzed that Organizational role stress is negatively related to Managerial effectiveness. In other words, manager who is able to tackle with stress in a healthy and positive way will be more effective as compared to manager who considers stress as a barrier. This is being supported by the previous studies. Ahmed A. Abdel-Halim (1978)examines (a) the relative importance of each of three role variables—role conflict, ambiguity, and overload—as sources of stress and dissatisfaction among managerial-level personnel. Results show that role ambiguity has the strongest relationships with role responses in the predicted directions. Another study by Joachim Quah & Kathleen Campell(2004) on Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity as factors in Work Stress among Managers in Singapore found that role conflict and role ambiguity were positively and significantly related to work stress among Singaporean managers and work stress was negatively and significantly related to job satisfaction. A study conducted by Elovainio et al., (2002) indirectly supports the present study. It suggests that Organizational Stress inadvertently consequences low organizational performance. Stress makes the person strained which reflects in his performance. So, if a manger is able to face the stress boldly, he will perform well and as a result will be considered more effective.

The second hypothesis that Emotional Intelligence moderates the effect of organizational role stress on Managerial effectiveness is also proved by our results. A positive correlation was also found between emotional intelligence and organizational commitment (Nikolaou & Tsaousis 2005). Nikolaou and Tsaousis (2002) explored the relationship between emotional intelligence and source of occupational stress and outcomes on a sample of professional in mental health institution. The results showed a negative correlation between emotional intelligence and stress at work, indicating that high scores in over all EI suffered less stress related to occupational environment. Carmeli (2003) attempted to narrow this gap by empirically examining the extent to which senior managers with a high emotional intelligence employed in public sector organizations developed positive work attitude, altruistic behavior and work outcomes. The result indicated that emotional intelligence augments positive, altruistic behavior, work outcomes, and moderated the effect of work- family conflict on career commitment but not the effect on job satisfaction.

11. Conclusion

It can be concluded from the above study that Emotional Intelligence, which represents an important personality dimension, is associated with managerial effectiveness. As predicted, Emotional Intelligent managers have been found to be higher on overall managerial effectiveness. In order to be effective as managers, it is very much essential that managers should try to reduce the stress faced due to organizational variables. The findings of this study are indeed significant for HR practitioners. The results of this study also indicate that it is possible to identify the potentials of existing employees for higher level managerial jobs based on their Emotional Intelligence beliefs and accordingly develop career plans for them. The findings of this study can assist administrators and policy makers to provide an attractive working climate in order to decrease side effects and increase productivity of managers. By better understanding the current situation, managers may develop coping strategies to reduce role related stress. There should be more social and organisational support as well as better resources and opportunity to extend collaborative relationship among managers, and to develop appropriate coping strategies and eventually other forms of possible interventions considered suitable. The knowledge of the relationships undertaken in the present study may be utilized, by the organisations regarding the enhancement of effectiveness at individual level.

12. References

1. *Ahmed a. Abdel-halim (1978)* ***personnel psychology*** *volume 31 issue 3 page 561 - september 1978 to cite this article: employee affective responses to organizational stress: moderating effects of job characteristics personnel psychology 31 (3), 561–579.*
2. *Amatea, E. S., & Fong, M. L. 1991. The impact of role stressors and personal resources on the stress experience of professional women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15: 419-430.*
3. *Amatea, E. S., Cross, E. G., Clark, J. E., & Bobby, C. L. 1986. The life role salience scale. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43: 831-383.*
4. *Andrew D. Szilagyi, Jr., Henry P. Sims, Jr., Robert T. Keller, Role Dynamics, Locus of Control, and Employee Attitudes and Behavior,The Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Jun., 2007), pp. 259-276*
5. *Arbuckle, J. L. 1999. Amos 4.0. Chicago: smallwaters Corporation.*
6. *Ashkanasy, N. M., & Daus, C. S. (2002). Emotion in the workplace: The new challenge for managers. Academy of Management Executive, 16, 76-86.*
7. *Barnett, R. C. 1998. Toward a review and reconceptualization of the work/family literature. Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 124(2): 125-182.*
8. *Baruch, G. K., & Barnett, R. C. 1987. Role quality and psychological well-being. In F. J. Crosby (Ed.), Spouse, parent, worker: 62-73. New Haven: Yale University Press.*
9. *Baruch, G. K., Barnett, R. C., & Rivers, C. 1983. Life prints: New patterns of love and work for today's women. New York: New American Library.*
10. *Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. 1980. Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. Psychological Bulletin, 88: 588-606.*
11. *Bollen, K. A. 1989. Structural equations with latent variables.*

New York: Wiley.

12. *Boyatzis, R. E. 1998. Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*
13. *Buck, V.E. (1972), Working under Pressure, Staples Press, London.*
14. *Caruso, D.R., Mayer, J.D., & Salovey, P. (2002). Emotional intelligence and emotional leadership. In R.E. Riggio, S.E. Murphy, & F.J. Pirozzolo (Eds.), Multiple intelligence and leadership (pp. 55-74). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.*
15. *Catalyst. 1996. Women in corporate leadership: Progress and prospects. New York: Catalyst.*
16. *Coleman, L. M., Antonucci, T. C., & Adelmann, P. K. 1987. Role involvement, gender, and well-being. In F. J. Crosby (Ed.), Spouse, parent, worker: 138-153. New Haven: Yale University Press.*
17. *Crosby, F. J. 1991. Juggling: The unexpected advantages of balancing career and home for women and their families. New York: Free Press*
18. *Cummins, R.C. Perceptions of Social Support,receipt of supportive behaviors and Locus Of Control as a Moderator of the effects of chronic stress. American Journal of Community Psychology,1988,16,685-700*
19. *Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. 1985. The satisfaction with life scale. Journal of Personality Assessment, 49: 71-75.*
20. *Doherty, W. J., and C. Baldwin. (1985) Shifts and stability in locus of control during the 1970's: Divergence of the sexes. American Psychologist April: 1048-1053.*
21. *Drasgow, F., & Hulin, C. L. 1990. Item response theory. Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (2nd ed.): 577-635. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.*
22. *Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R, S. 1985. If it changes it must be a process: Study of emotion and coping during three stages of a college examination. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48: 150-170.*
23. *French, W. L.., Kast, F. E., and Rosenzweig, J. E. 1985. Understanding Human Behavior in Organizations. New York: Harper & Row.*
24. *Friedman, S. D., degroot, J., & Christensen, P. M. (Eds.). 1998. Integrating work and life. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.*
25. *Ghosh, S. (2001), "Ethnic diversity and managerial effectiveness in South Africa", Academy of Management Executive, Vol. 15 No.3, pp.136.*
26. *Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. 1967. The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine.*
27. *Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam Books. Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.*
28. *Goode, W. J. 1960. A theory of role strain. American Sociological Review, 25: 483-496.*
29. *Gough, H. G., & Bradley, P. 1996. California Psychological Inventory. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.*
30. *Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. 1985. Sources of conflict between work and family roles. Academy of Management Review, 10: 76-88.*
31. *Hersay, P., Blanchard, K.H. (1977), Management of Organizational Behaviour: Utilising Human Resource, Prentice-Hall India Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi, .*
32. *Hill, C.N. (1979), Increasing Managerial Effectiveness: Keys to Management and Motivation, Addison-Wesley, London,.*
33. *Hofstede, G. (1980), Cultures and Consequences: International differences in Work-related Values, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, CA, .*
34. *J. Hurrell, Jr. (Eds.), Job stress in a changing workforce: Investigating gender, diversity, and family issues: 301-310. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.*
35. *Jones, C., and S. Page. (1986) Locus of control, assertiveness, and anxiety as personality variables in stress related headaches. Headache July: 369-374.*
36. *Kaplan, R. E., Drath, W. H., & Kofodimos, J. R. 1991. Beyond ambition: How driven managers can lead better and live better. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.*
37. *Kobasa, S.C., and Puccetti,M.C. Personality and Social resources in stress resistance.Journal of Personality & Social Psychology,1983,45,839-850.*
38. *Kobasa, S.C., Maddi, S.R. and Kahn, S. (1982), "Hardiness and health: a prospective study", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 168-77.*
39. *Kofodimos, J. R. 1993. Balancing act: How managers can integrate successful careers and fulfilling personal lives. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.*
40. *Kren, L. (1992), "The moderating effects of locus of control on performance incentives and participation", Human Relations, Vol. 45 No. 9, pp. 991-1003.*
41. *Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. 1984. Stress, appraisal and coping. New York: Springer.*
42. *Lee, T. W. 1999. Using qualitative methods in organizational research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*
43. *Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., & Sablynski, C. J. 1999. Qualitative research in organizational and vocational psychology, 1979-1999. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 55: 161-187.*
44. *Lefcourt, Herbert M. 1982 Locus of Control: Current Trends in Theory and Research. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers: Hillsdale, New Jersey.*
45. *Linder, F. (1986) Locus of control, values, and political perspectives. Perceptual and Motor Skills February: 278.*
46. *Lobel, S. A. 1991. Allocation of investment in work and family roles: Alternative theories and implications for research. Academy of Management Review, 16: 507-521.*
47. *Malley, J. E., & Stewart, A. J. 1988. Women's work and family roles: Sources of stress and sources of strength. In S. Fisher & J. Reason (Eds.), Handbook of life stress, cognition and health: 175-190. New York: Wiley.*
48. *Marks, S. R. 1977. Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. American Sociological Review, 42: 921-936.*
49. *Marks, S. R., & macdermid, S. M. 1996. Multiple roles and the self: A theory of role balance. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58: 417-432.*
50. *Mcallister, L. W. 1988. A practical guide to CPI interpretation (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.*
51. *Mccall, M. W., Jr., Lombardo, M. M., & Morrison, A. M. 1988. The lessons of experience: How successful executives develop on the job. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.*
52. *Mccauley, C. D., Ruderman, M. N., Ohlott, P. J., & Morrow, J. E. 1994. Assessing the developmental components of managerial jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79: 544-560.*
53. *Meneze M. M, 2005, The impact of stress on productivity at Education Training & Development Practices: Sector Education and Training Authority.*
54. *Merriam, S. B., & Clark, M. C. 1991. Lifelines: Patterns of work, love, and learning in adulthood. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.*
55. *Michael R. Frone ,Intolerance of Ambiguity as a Moderator of the Occupational Role Stress-Strain Relationship: A Meta-Analysis Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 11, No. 4 (Jul., 1990), pp.*

309-320

56. *Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. 1994. Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*
57. *Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., & Van Velsor, E. 1992. Breaking the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporations? Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.*
58. *Peter Brownell ,Participation in Budgeting, Locus of Control and Organizational Effectiveness ,The Accounting Review, Vol. 56, No. 4 (Oct., 1981), pp. 844-860*
59. *Pietromonaco, P. R., Mauls, J., & Frohardt-Lane, K. 1986. Psychological consequences of multiple social roles. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 10: 373-382.*
60. *Powell, G. N., & Mainiero, L. A. 1992. Cross-currents in the river of time: Conceptualizing the complexities of women's careers. Journal of Management, 18: 215-237.*
61. *Quah, J., & Campbell, K. M., (1994). Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity as Factors in Work Stress among Managers in Singapore: Some Moderator Variables, Research and Practice in Human Resource Management, 2(1), 21-33.*
62. *Rahim, A. (1996), "Stress, strain, and their moderators: an empirical comparison of entrepreneurs and managers", Journal of Small Business Management, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 46-58.*
63. *Reitzes, D. C., & Mutran, E. J. 1994. Multiple roles and identities: Factors influencing self-esteem among middle-aged working men and women. Social Psychology Quarterly, 57: 313-325.*
64. *Robert H. Miles A Comparison of the Relative Impacts of Role Perceptions of Ambiguity and Conflict by Role, ,The Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Mar., 2001), pp. 25-35*
65. *Roodin, P. A., A. Broughton, and G. M. Vaught. (1974) Effects of birth order, sex, and family size on field dependence and locus of control. Perceptual and Motor Skills 39:671-676.*
66. *Rosenberg, M. 1989. Society and the adolescent self-image. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.*
67. *Rothbard, N. P. In press. Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family. Administrative Science Quarterly.*
68. *Rotter, J.B. (1966), "Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of*
69. *Ruderman, M. N., & Hughes-James, M. W. 1998. Leadership development across race and gender. In C. D. Mccauley, R. S. Moxley, & E. Van Velsor (Eds.), The Center for Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development: 291-335. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.*
70. *Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. 1995. The structure of psychological well-being revisited. Journal of Personality and Psychological Studies, 69:719-727.*
71. *Salovey, P., & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9, 185-211. Sieber, S. D. 1974. Toward a theory of role accumulation. American Sociological Review, 39: 567-578.*
72. *Stogdill, R. C., & Coons, A. E. 1957. Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Research monograph no. 88, Ohio State University, Columbus.*
73. *Stryker, S., & Serpe, R. T. 1994. Identity salience and psychological centrality: Equivalent, overlapping, or complementary concepts? Social Psychology Quarterly, 57: 16-35.*
74. *Williams, J. C., and Huber, G. P. 1986. Human Behavior in Organizations. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing.*