The International Journal of Indian Psychology
ISSN 2348-5396 (Online) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (Print)
Volume 13, Issue 3, July- September, 2025
DIP: 18.01.033.20251303, DOI: 10.25215/1303.033
https://www.ijip.in

Research Paper

Coping Strategies as predictors of Organizational Role Stress among Trained Graduate Teachers working in Government schools of Himachal Pradesh

Prakash Sankhyan[1]*

ABSTRACT

This research was conducted on 1000 TGTs to examine the predicting effect of coping strategies on organizational role stress. Findings revealed that TGTs using approach as dominant mode of coping style differed significantly from their counterparts using avoidance coping in inter role distance, role stagnation, role expectation conflict, personal inadequacy and resource inadequacy dimensions of ORS. Similarly, TGTs using avoidance as a dominant mode of coping significantly differed from their counterparts using approach coping in role erosion and self role distance and role ambiguity dimensions of ORS. There is negative and significant correlation between approach mode coping and organizational role stress and its all components & similarly there is a positive and significant correlation between avoidance mode of coping and organizational role stress and its all components. Regression analyses, findings revealed that approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping explaining 25.1% variation in IRD, 14.8% variation in RS, 17.6% variation in REC, 28.5% variation in RE, 15.3% percent variation in RO, 27.4% variation in RI, 19.2% variation in PI, 23.9% variation in SRD, 24.4% variation in RA, 25.1% variation in RIn dimensions of ORS and 41.8 variation in total ORS.

Keywords: *Organizational role stress, Trained Graduate Teachers (TGTs), Coping Strategies, Approach coping and Avoidance coping*

The occupational stress or job stress is common across the globe for working women and men and is unavoidable. Present day living has brought plenty of stressors, incalculable methods for comfort, as well as a plenty of requests that assessment human body and psyche. Stress is an inevitable part of day to day life because of growing competition and dynamicity of the environment. In the dynamic work environment, no individual is free from stress and no calling is free from stress. Everybody has to encounters pressure whether it is at the domestic end, business, academics, professional, or some other social or financial action. Stress has become centre point of attention because of its negative consequences. Everyone wants peaceful life but Stress is unavoidable factor and no one can stay away from it. Every day one has to encounter stressful situation.

[1]Lecturer Psychology
*Corresponding Author

Received: February 20, 2025; Revision Received: July 13, 2025; Accepted: July 17, 2025

Lazarus and Folkman (1987), coping strategies are classified into two dimensions, namely problem-focused and emotion-focused coping. On the one hand, if individuals are capable of taking responsible actions in changing the environment in the future, such as controlling the stressful environment, then it is advisable to use problem-focused coping. On the other hand, it is best to use emotion-focused intervention where emotions can respond better in reducing the emotional discomfort of individuals in a stressful environment (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

Coping strategies adopted to deal with work related stress are generally classified in the research literature as problem focussed or emotion-focussed (Greenglass, 2002) – that is, aimed at managing the source of the stress, or the individual's response to it. In their qualitative study of beginning teachers, Lindqvist et al. (2020) found that new teachers experienced conflicts that were both interpersonal (with students, parents and colleagues) and intrapersonal (being 'good enough'; establishing boundaries related to time and engagement; suppression of emotions) as they started out in teaching. In order to cope with these challenges, the beginning teachers used various strategies including collaboration, conformity, influencing and autonomy.

In addition to problem-focused and emotion-focused coping, other scholars suggest a diverse range of coping strategies including active coping, planning, suppressing competing activities, seeking instrumental support, seeking social support, positive framing, acceptance, denial, seeking a religious soothing, emotional ventilation, behavioural or mental disengagement (Amirkhan, 1990; Carver et al., 1989; Scheier et al., 1986). In this sense, coping strategies are necessity when dealing with work-related stress and accompanying stressors (Labrague et al., 2016) as well as impacting better outcomes of particular studies.

REVIEW RELATED LITERATURE

Upadhyay and Singh (1999) conducted a study on studied the occupational stress level experienced by the 20 college teachers and 20 executives. The studied found that the teachers showed significant higher levels of stress than executive's. They experienced more stress because their personal wishes and strong desire for better and prosperous career were felt to be blocked by others.

Kumar and Madialagan(2001) did a study on Relationship Between Occupational Stress and Coping Strategies Among Physical Education Teachers on a sample consisted of 288 physical education teacher respondents working in secondary schools of Dakshina Kannada District of Karnataka State. Results revealed that five coping strategies out of 8 were best predicted occupational stress of the teachers. They are spiritual related coping, unproductive coping mechanism, unhealthy coping habits, social support coping, and physical activity related coping. Other coping strategies like problem solving coping strategy, healthy cognitive coping and high risk coping were less predicted.

Yamashita et al. (2012) found nursing students, when faced by stress, engaged in the coping strategies such as sleeping, eating and talking to someone. Other remaining studies reported a mixture of coping approaches such as praying, talking to relatives and friends, ignoring their stress, crying and separating themselves from others (Bam et al., 2015; Evans & Kelly, 2004; Reeve et al., 2013; Seyedfatemi et al., 2007).

Ganesan et.al. (2018) conducted a study on Stress Level and Coping Strategies among Undergraduate Students. The result of this study indicated that majority of the university students have moderate level of stress. There was a significant inverse relationship between stress level and coping strategies among undergraduates.

Tiwari (2018) conducted a study on A study on Occupational Stress and Coping Strategies with Reference to Educational Institutions in Bhopal. 100 college teachers were selected by using convenient and snowball sampling method. The result showed that 59% percent members used avoidance strategy, whereas 47 % used approach strategy. Among all the styles most dominant style of stress coping was the defensive style. 47 % of respondents are using this style. Whereas intro persistive coping style was used by 43 %respondents as there backup style followed by defensive style shown by 27 % people. extrapunitive, impersistive were not exhibited by the respondents. Interpersistive and intropunitive were not shown as dominant style though they were exhibited by a few in the backup style Extrapersistive was shown as a dominant style by 7 % whereas it was shown as a backup style by 13 % respondents. Impunitive style was dominant in 17 % whereas it was also the backup in 17 %.

Bjordnal et.al (2021) studied Stress-coping Strategies amongst Newly Qualified Primary and Lower Secondary School Teachers with a Master's Degree in Norway on 27 teachers. The study shows that the teachers manage stress through: a) openness with and support from colleagues and family, b) shielding and escape, c) learning established stress-coping strategies and d) planning, structuring, and lowering ambitions.

Jain (2021) conducted a study on work stress and coping among primary teachers New Zealand on 12 teachers from eight primary schools in the Wellington region of New Zealand. Results reveals that certain positive coping strategies, such as teaching experience, cognitive reframing, and seeking social support, are learned over time and come with experience.

Shen & Slater (2021) examined The Effect of Occupational Stress and Coping Strategies on Mental Health and Emotional Well-Being Among University Academic Staff During the COVID-19 Outbreak. A cross-sectional online survey was conducted using a sample size of 87 academic staff working in a university in Northern Ireland. The results revealed that Occupational stress has a significant effect on mental health and emotional well-being. Positive reframing and acceptance coping styles have an impact on emotional well-being. The findings can help to develop reliable methods to inform policy on health and well-being for university academics, which in turn lead to increased productivity at work.

Objectives: Following are the objectives of the study as:

- To determine the difference between the coping strategies (avoidance and approach) with respect to organizational role stress among the TGT (Arts, medical & non-medical).
- To determine the nature and magnitude of the relationship of coping strategies (avoidance and approach) with organizational role stress among the TGT (Arts, medical & non-medical).
- To study how do coping strategies (avoidance & approach) and organizational support interact together to determine the levels of organizational role stress among the TGT (Arts, medical & non-medical).

METHODOLOGY

Sample

This study was conducted on a sample of 1000 TGTs (Mean and SD age of the TGTs was 41.34± 5.2 years) teaching in Government schools of Himachal Pradesh. Subjects were randomly selected from the government senior secondary & High schools of Himachal Pradesh and only four districts out of 12 districts were covered in this study.

Tools:

1. 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 (Rl), role erosion (RE) and resource inadequacy (RIn.). Originally, the instrument was named as "your feelings about your role" and consisted of 40 items (5 for each of the eight role stresses mentioned above). Later, this instrument was named as Organizational Role Stress Scale. In the light of findings of factor analysis two stressors, namely role ambiguity and role inadequacy were split into four. Role ambiguity was split into role ambiguity (i.e. lack of clarity) and role expectation conflict (or conflict expectation). Role inadequacy was split into personal-inadequacy (i e inadequacy of internal or personal resources and resource inadequacy (i.e. lack of external resources for effective performance of the role). Thus the new instrument i.e, ORS-scale has 50 items. The score of each role stress may range from 0 to 20 and the total organizational role stress score may range from 0 to 200. The answer sheet is given separately to facilitate quick calculations of the role stress scores. The ratings of the respondents can be added row-wise to have the scores on 10-role-stress dimensions which added together provide total ORS score. Test-retest reliability coefficients were calculated on a sample of 500 employees from three banks (Sen, 1982) for the eight identified stresses and the total role stress score The reliability coefficients, except one are significant at .001 level, one coefficient was significant at .003 level. The scale has acceptable reliability (Pareek, 1981, 1983). Some evidences about validity is provided by a measure of self-consistency of an instrument, such items being correlated with the total score on the instrument for 500 respondents. All but two correlations were significant at .008 levels. The result depicts high internal consistency of the scale (Pareek, 1981, 1983).

2. Coping Strategies Scale (Professor A.K. Srivastva): It comprises 50 items, to be rated on five point scale, describing verities of coping behavior underfying following five major categories based on the combinations of operation and orientation of the coping behavior:
Active/Approach Coping (Problem Focused Coping):

- Behavioural-Approach Coping Strategies
- Cognitive-Approach Coping Strategies
- Cognitive –Behavioual- Approach Coping Strategies
- Avoidance Coping (Emotion –Focused Coping)
- Behavioural –Avoidance Coping Strategies
- Cognitive- Avoidance Coping Strategies

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)

Concurrent Validity: Concurrent validity of scale was ascertained by examining the correlation of the scores obtained on the coping strategies scale with the scores on the measures of psychological well being (Mental Health Inventory-Srivastva, 1987) and sympotoms of neuroticism (PGI) Health questionnaire-Wig & Verma, 1978) on a sample of 126 subjects. The obtained coefficients of correlation are as:

Sub- scales	MH Inventory	PGI HQ
Approach -behavioural	0.37**	-0.26**
Approach- Cognitive	0.33**	-0.29**
Approach – Cognitive behavioural	0.39**	-0.34**
Avoidance –behavioural	0.21**	-0.19*
Avoidance-Cognitive	0.19*	0.09*

(**p>.01 and *p>.05

Procedure of Data Collection:
Data were collected through online mode from self reported and administered questionnaire survey from November, 2023 to June, 2024. Completion of the questionnaire implied the consent to participate in the study. Participants were assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of the data.

Statistical Analysis:
Group comparisons were made by employing t-test.: In the present study sub grouping was done to compare TGTs on ORS in terms of dominant coping styles (approach versus avoidance Further, grouping of Principals on dominant coping styles (approach and avoidance) was done on the basis of formula given by Pareek (1983).

The Pearson's product moment coefficients of correlation were computed for studying the relationship of ORS among TGTs with avoidance and approach coping strategies.
Step wise multiple regression analysis was performed to ascertain the effects of the two modes of coping (avoidance and approach) on the indicators of organizational role stress (ORS) as well as total organizational role stress (ORS).

RESULTS

Table.1: Comparison of TGT (Arts, medical & Non-medical) using either avoidance or approach as dominant mode of coping with respect to organizational role stress

Sr. No.	Measures of ORS	Approach Coping (267)		Avoidance Coping (345)		t-value
1	IRD	Mean	2.87	Mean	2.68	3.80**
		SD	.57	SD	.71	
2	RS	Mean	2.97	Mean	2.83	2.88*
		SD	.66	SD	.82	
3	REC	Mean	2.94	Mean	2.79	2.50*
		SD	.73	SD	.91	
4	RE	Mean	2.60	Mean	2.79	2.38*
		SD	.82	SD	.97	
5	RO	Mean	2.81	Mean	2.67	1.75
		SD	.82	SD	.95	
6	RI	Mean	2.58	Mean	2.96	5.43**
		SD	.69	SD	.93	

Sr. No.	Measures of ORS	Approach Coping (267)		Avoidance Coping (345)		t-value
7	PI	Mean	2.89	Mean	2.67	4.44**
		SD	.52	SD	.83	
8	SRD	Mean	2.90	Mean	3.14	3.43**
		SD	.68	SD	.92	
9	RA	Mean	2.45	Mean	2.59	2.33*
		SD	.52	SD	.89	
10	RIn	Mean	2.71	Mean	2.49	3.66**
		SD	.69	SD	.88	
11	Total ORS	Mean	27.72	Mean	27.61	1.83
		SD	**2.67**	**SD**	**2.88**	

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

IRD-Inter Role Distance
RS-Role Stagnation
REC-Role Expectation Conflict
RE- Role Erosion
RO- Role Overload
RI-Role Isolation
PI-Personal Inadequacy
SRD- Self Role Distance
RA- Role Ambiguity
RIn – Resource Inadequacy
ORS- Organizational Role Stress

Table.1 shows the comparison of TGTs using either avoidance or approach coping strategies with respect to organizational role stress or its ten components. It is clear from the table.1 that with respect to inter role distance(IRD), Role stagnation (RS), Role Expectation Conflict(REC), Personal Inadequacy(PI) and Resource Inadequacy(RIn), the TGTs using approach as dominant mode of coping style differed significantly from their counterparts using avoidance mode of coping style, (t = **3.80**,** p< .01 for inter role distance , t=2.88*, p< .05 for Role stagnation, t=2.50*, t = p< .05 for Role Expectation Conflict, t= 4.44**, p< .01 for Personal Inadequacy and t=3.66**, p< .01 for Resource Inadequacy). It is also evident from the table.1 with respect to role erosion(RE), Role Isolation(RI), Personal Inadequacy(PI),Self Role distance(SRD),and Role Ambiguity(RA) that the TGTs using avoidance as dominant mode of coping style differed as significantly from their counterparts using approach coping style, (with t = 2.38*, p< .05 for role erosion, t = 5.43**, p< .01 for Role Isolation, t=4.44**, **p<.01 for** Self Role distance and t=**3.21<.01 for** Role Stagnation).

Table. 2: Relationship of Organizational Role Stress with Coping Strategies (Approach Coping and Avoidance Coping).

Measures	IRD	RS	REC	RE	RO	RI	PI	SRD	RA	RIn	Total ORS
Approach Coping	-.168**	-.069	-.096*	-.139**	-.112*	-.189**	-.118**	-.165**	-.191**	-.180**	-.271**
Avoidance Coping	.205**	.137**	.158**	.261**	.107*	.214**	.165**	.180**	.169**	.190**	.342**

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

Table.2: reflects that in case of TGTs, negative and significant relationship of approach coping was found with Inter Role Distance (IRD), (r=-.168**, p < .01, role expectation conflict(r=-.096*p<.05), role erosion(r=-.139** p<.01), role overload (RO), (r = -.112*, p < .05), role isolation(RI)(r=-.189**, p<.01), Personal Inadequacy (PI),(r= -.118*, p<.05), self role distance(SRD)(r=-.165**, p<.05), Role ambiguity(RA),(r= --.191**, p<.01), Resource

Inadequacy (RIn),(r=-.180** p<.01) and overall organizational role stress(ORS), (r=-.232,p<.01).Thus greater the approach coping lower is the Inter Role Distance (IRD), role expectation conflict, role erosion, role overload (RO), role isolation(RI) Personal Inadequacy(PI), self role distance(SRD), Role ambiguity(RA), Resource Inadequacy(RIn), and overall organizational role stress(ORS) or vice versa. The results from table.2 also shows that approach mode of coping did not relate significantly with dimensions; role stagnation (RS). Table.2 further demonstrates that in case of TGTs, positive and significant relationship avoidance mode of coping was found with inter role distance (IRD) (r=.205**, p<.01), role stagnation(RS)(r=.137**, p<.o1), role expectation conflict (REC) (r=.158**, p<.01), role erosion(RE)(r=..261**, p<.01), role overload(RO)(r=.107*, P<.05), role isolation (RI)(r=.214**,p<.01), personal inadequacy(PI)(r=.165**.p<.01), self role distance (SRD) (r=.180**, p<.01), role ambiguity(RA) (r=.169**, p<.01), resource inadequacy(RIn)(r=.190** , p<.01) and over all role stress(ORS)(r=..342** , p<.01).

Table.3: Multiple Regression Analysis for indicators of Organization Role Stress as Predicted by Coping Strategies (Approach and Avoidance Strategies).

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)					
1	**IRD**	-.147	.190	.251	.063	.060	17.61	.001
2	**RS**	-.055	.131	.148	.022	.018	5.816	.001
3	**REC**	-.077	.150	.176	.031	.027	8.317	.001
4	**RE**	-.116	.249	.285	.081	.078	23.14	.001
5	**RO**	-.109	.096	.153	.023	.020	6.222	.001
6	**RI**	-.171	.197	.274	.075	.071	21.171	.001
7	**PI**	-.098	.155	.192	.037	.033	9.974	.001
8	**SRD**	-.157	.164	.239	.057	.053	15.752	.001
9	**RA**	-.176	.151	.244	.059	.056	16.46	.001
10	**RIn**	-.165	.173	.251	.063	.060	17.583	.001
11	**Total ORS**	-.242	.317	.418	.175	.172	55.395	.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 among TGTs are reported in table-3. It is evident from table.3 that approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping were considered for the prediction of Inter role distance (IRD). The t-test for the test of significance of regression coefficient shows that approach mode of coping (t---3.441, p<.001) and avoidance mode of coping (t=4.454, p<.001) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping contributes to the regression explaining 25.10% variation (R^2 = .063, F = 17.61, p< .001).

In case of Role stagnation (RS) dimension of ORS, avoidance mode of coping was 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=3.015, p<.01) has significant regression weight. This means that avoidance mode of coping has contributes to the regression explaining 14.8% variation (R^2= .022, F=5.816, p<.001)

Table3 further shows that in case of role expectation conflicts (REC) dimension of ORS, 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 only avoidance mode of coping (t = 3.461, p< .001) has significant regression weight. This means that avoidance mode of coping and approach mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression explaining 17.6% variation (R^2 = .031, F = 8.317, p< .01) in REC dimension of ORS.

Table.3 also indicates that in case of role erosion (RE) dimension of ORS, again 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 = -2.747, p< .01) and avoidance coping (t = 5.906, p< .001) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression explaining 28.5%variation (R^2 = .081, F = 23.14, p< .001) in RE dimension of ORS.

It is clear from the table.3 that in case of role overload (RO) dimension of ORS, 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 = -2.515, p< .01) and avoidance mode of coping (t = 2.201, p< .05) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression explaining 15.3% percent variation (R^2 = .023, F = 6.222, p< .01) in RO dimension of ORS.

Table.3 shows that in case of role isolation (RI), 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 = -4.048, p< .001) and avoidance mode of coping (t = 4.649, p< .001) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression explaining 27.4% percent variation (R^2 = .075, F = 21.171, p< .001) in RI dimension of ORS.

It is clear from the table.3 that in case of personal inadequacy (PI), dimension of ORS, 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 = -2.279, p< .01) and avoidance mode of coping (t = 3.585, p< .05) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression explaining 19.2% percent variation (R^2 =. 037, F = 9.974 p< .001) in PI dimension of ORS.

Table.3 shows that in case of self role distance (SRD) 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 = -3.684, p< .001) and avoidance mode of coping (t = 3.832, p< .001) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression explaining 23.9% percent variation (R^2 = .057, F = **15.752**, p< .001) in SRD dimension of ORS.

It is clear from the table.3 that in case of role ambiguity (RA) dimension of ORS, 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 = -4.122, p< .01) and avoidance mode of coping (t = 3.544, p< .001) have significant regression weight. This means that aproach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression explaining 24.4% percent variation (R^2 = .059, F = 16.46, p< .001) in RA dimension of ORS.

In case of resource inadequacy (RIn) dimension of ORS, approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping were considered for the prediction resource inadequacy (RIn). The t-test for the test of significance of regression coefficient shows that approach mode of coping (t=-3.878, p<.001) and avoidance mode of coping (t = 4.061, p< .05) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping contributes to the regression explaining 25.1% variation (R^2= .063, F=17.583, p<.001) in RIn dimension of ORS.

It is also clear from the table.3 that in case of overall ORS, 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 = -6.052, p< .01) and avoidance mode of coping (t = 7.940, p< .001) have significant regression weight. This means that approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping contributes significantly to the regression explaining 41.8% percent variation (R^2 = .175, F = 55.395, p< .001) in overall ORS.

DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between organizational role stress/job stress level and the coping strategies that teachers use to deal and handle with the situations and re solve the issues. Results of study reveal that the use of emotion-focused coping i.e. avoidance and acceptance increase organizational role stress instead of reducing them, and they do not moderate the relationship between organizational stress. The literature shows that when employees cannot reduce stress by using problem-focused coping actions, then tend to opt for avoidance actions [Lazarus & Folkman, 1984]. This type of emotion-focused coping strategy produces greater psychological distress instead of reducing distress (Endler & Parker, 1990). In conclusion, feelings of stress are a part of teachers' life. Some levels of stress can be good, as the right kind of stress encourages them toward change and growth. However, when teachers are unable to cope with stress, they can become a burden.

As teachers they have to manage the stressful situation because teaching job demands more patience as they have to deal with different types of students. Teachers are not supposed to show aggression as they have to deal tactfully with the students in many situations. Teacher has to manage stress situation by adopting right strategy of coping. It's very useful for organizations to understand what coping styles employees are adopting and whether that style is appropriate or not because wrong style and high stress may be lead to performance deficiency. The act of coping itself as opposed to non-coping is related to satisfaction and is more important than any other coping strategy.

CONCLUSION

Results of comparison shows that TGTs using approach as dominant mode of coping style differed significantly from their counterparts using avoidance mode of coping style, (t = **3.80**,** p< .01 for inter role distance, t=2.88*, p< .05 for Role stagnation, t=2.50*, t = p< .05 for Role Expectation Conflict, t= 4.44**, p< .01 for Personal Inadequacy and t=3.66**,

p< .01 for Resource Inadequacy). Results also reflects with respect to role erosion(RE), Role Isolation(RI), Self Role distance(SRD),and Role Ambiguity(RA), TGTs using avoidance as dominant mode of coping style differed significantly from their counterparts using approach coping style, (with t = 2.38*, p< .05 for role erosion, t = 5.43**, p< .01 for Role Isolation, t=4.44**, **p<.01 for** Self Role distance and t=**3.21**, p<.01 for** Role Stagnation).

Results of relationship shows that there is a negative and significant correlations between ORS and its components with approach mode of coping which mean that as approach mode of coping score increased the ORS and its nine components score decreased or vice-versa (r=-.168**, p < .01with IRD, r=-.096*p<.05 with REC, r=-.139** p<.01with RE, r = -.112*, p < .05 with RO, r=-.89**, p<.01 with RI, r= -.118*, p<.05 with PI, r=-.165**, p<.05 with SRD, r= -.191**, p<.01 with RA, r=-.180** p<.01with RIn and r=-.271**,p<.01 with total ORS). Similarly there was a positive and significant correlation between avoidance mode of coping and ORS and its all ten components(r=.205**,p<.01 with IRD, r=.137** ,p<.01 with RS, r=.158**,p<.01 with REC, r=.261** ,p<.01 with RE, r=.107* ,p<.05 with RO, r=.214**,p<.01 with RI, r=.165**.p<.01 with PI, r=.180**,p<.01, with SRD, r=.169**, p<.01 with RA, r=.190** ,p<.01 with RIn and r=.342**,p<.01 with overall ORS). Which mean that as score of avoidance mode of coping increased the score of ORS and its ten components also increased or vice- versa.

Further the results of regression analysis indicates that both approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping were considered for the prediction of ORS and its ten components i.e. IRD, RS, REC, RE, RO, RI, PI, SRD, RA and RIn. Approach mode of coping and avoidance mode of coping contributes to the regression explaining 25.10% variation in IRD,14.8% variation in RS, 17.6% in variation REC, 28.5% variation in RE, 15.3% variation in RO, 27.4% variation in RI,19.2% variation in PI, 23.9% variation in SRD, 24.4% variation in RA, 25.1% variation in RIn and 41.8% variation in overall ORS.

Limitation and Scope of Future Research

In this study only TGTs were taken as participants, therefore in future study, all the employees should be taken into account. These findings are based on a sample taken from Government Senior secondary & High 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

Bam VB, Oppong GA, Ibitoye MB. (2015). Stress and coping mechanisms of nursing students during clinical practice in Ghana. J Sci Technol (Ghana), Vol. (34), Page 50–59.

Bjorndal, W., Antonsen, Y. & Jakhelln, R. (2021). Stress-coping Strategies amongst Newly Qualified Primary and Lower Secondary School Teachers with a Master's Degree in Norway. ScandInavian Journal of Educational Research. VOL. 66(7), Page 1253–1268 https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2021.1983647

Carver, C., Scheier, M., & Weintraub, J. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56(2), 267–283.

Endler, N. S.; Parker, J. D. (1990), "Multidimensional assessment of coping: A critical evaluation", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, vol. 58, (5), p. 844-854.

Evans W, Kelly B. (2004). Pre-registration diploma student nurse stress and coping measures. Nurse Educ Today, 24, Page 473–82.

Ganesan Y., Talwar P., Norsiah, F. and Oon Y.B. (2018). A Study on Stress Level and Coping Strategies among Undergraduate Students. Journal of Cognitive Sciences and Human Development. Vol. 3(2)

Greenglass, E. R. (2002). Work stress, coping, and social support: Implications for women's occupational well-being. In D. L. Nelson & R. J. Burke (Eds.), Gender, work stress, and health (pp. 85–96). American Psychological Association.

Jain, S. (2021). A study of work stress and coping among primary school teachers in New Zealand. New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work, Volume 18(1), Page: 18-35.

Kumar,A. & Madialagan, S. (2001). Relationship Between Occupational Stress and Coping Strategies Among Physical Education. International Journal of Physical Education, Fitness and Sports, Vol.2. (3).

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. New York, NY: Springer.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1987). Transactional theory and research on emotions and coping. European Journal of Person Centered Healthcare, 1, 141–69.

Lindqvist, H., Weurlander, M., Wernerson, A., & Thornberg, R. (2020), Conflicts viewed through the micro-political lens: Beginning teachers' coping strategies for emotionally challenging situations, Research Papers in Education, 35(6), 746-765

Reeve KL, Shumaker CJ, Yearwood EL, et al. (2013). Perceived stress and social support in undergraduate nursing students' educational experiences. Nurse Educ Today, Vol. (33), Page 419–24.

Scheier, M. F., Weintraub, J. K., & Carver, C. S. (1986). Coping with stress: Divergent strategies of optimists and pessimists. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51(6), 1257–1264.

Shen, P. & Slater, P. (2021). The Effect of Occupational Stress and Coping Strategies on Mental Health and Emotional Well-Being Among University Academic Staff During the COVID-19 Outbreak. International Education Studies. Vol. 14(3), 2021 ISSN 1913-9020 E-ISSN 1913-9039

Yamashita K, Saito M, Takao T. (2012). Stress and coping styles in Japanese nursing students. Int J Nurs Pract, Vol (18), Page 489–96.

Acknowledgment

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Sankhyan, P. (2025). Coping Strategies as predictors of Organizational Role Stress among Trained Graduate Teachers working in Government schools of Himachal Pradesh. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *13*(3)*,* 366-376. DIP:18.01.033.20251303, DOI:10.25215/1303.033