Do personality variables determine the Emotional Intelligence, Role Conflict, Occupational Stress, Depression and Adjustment among women employees of Govt Sector in Haryana

Ujita Ballyan[1]
Asst. Director, SACS, Health Dept., Govt of Haryana, Panchkula.
Jyotsana[2]
Professor, Applied Psychology, GJU, Hisar

ABSTRACT

The present study is oriented towards finding out various personality predispositions of the women employees and relationship between Personalities Factors A, B, I, Q2 and Emotional Intelligence and degree of Role Conflict, Occupational Stress, Depression and Adjustment being faced by them . As various personality factors plays a dominant role in deciding degree of Role Conflict, Occupational Stress, Depression and Adjustment among working women. The study was conducted involving *210 working women in the age group of 30-45 years of Govt. sector of Haryana.* Tests were administered in three session. Correlation Analysis has been used to interpret the data collected.

In case of all women employees, negative correlation existed between Personality Factor I and **Emotional Intelligence** where as in case of Personality Factors A and Q2, the correlation was positive. No correlation was found between Personality Factor B and Emotional Intelligence among women employees.

There was positive correlation existed between Personality Factor I and **Role Conflict** among all categories of women employees where as in case of Personality Factors A , Factor B and Q2, the correlation was negative.

The studies also show that personality has a relationship with role conflicts. There was positive correlation existed between Personality Factor I and **Occupational Stress** among all categories of women employees where as in case of Personality Factors A , Factor B and Q2, the correlation was negative.

In case of all women employees, positive correlation existed between Personality Factor I and **Depression** where as in case of Personality Factors A, Factor B and Q2, the correlation was negative . There was strong negative correlation between Personality Factor Q2 and Depression. Depression decreases with the Personality Factor Q2 of women employees.

The correlation between Personality Factor I and **Adjustment** was positive in case of all the categories of women employees. where as in case of Personality Factors A, Factor B and Q2, the correlation was negative .

Key words : C**orrelations, Personality Factors A (Sizothymia vs Affectothymia) , Personality Factor B** (**Lower Scholastic Mental Capacity vs Higher Scholastic Mental Capacity)**, **Personality Factor I (Harria vs Premsia), Personality Factor Q2 (Group adherence vs Self – sufficiency), Emotional Quotient, Adjustment, Depression, Occupational Stress, Women employees**

INTRODUCTION

Women globally belonging to any class or creed have progressed and reached a new paradigm. With the increasing number of women getting into employment in India, there has been an explicit change observed with regard to the conventional norms regarding the position and status assigned to them in the family and in society. It is a common belief that the role of women has changed dramatically since today women are entering and graduating from professional school at rates that are equal to or greater than men **(National Centre for Educational Statistics, 2000; Hennesy, 2005).** They have established their freedom, self autonomy and personal growth, are better able to express themselves, and are striving hard to achieve their objectives. These new roles are the additional to traditional roles and responsibilities of bearing and rearing children and management of domestic and household. They are moving out of their domestic sphere more and more in search of employment in the jobs like teaching, nursing, medicine, family welfare and administration etc. The major problems for working women arise out of their dual responsibilities - house work and the office work. Even though the employment of women is accepted, most of the relatives, in-laws of working women and majority of husbands have not accepted the changing life pattern. Being simultaneously confronted with dual responsibilities or demands of home and work, they are liable to face depression & adjustment problems.

Personality has key influence on work performance. In jobs, particularly with high human relations content where most of the working day is spent interacting with other people, personality is a major determinant of what will be done & how it will be done. Each man's personality reveals itself in the way he works with his superior, his subordinates & other people. Some of the important personality factors that determine what kind of performance will be achieved or what kind of behavior is exhibited at work are self concept & self esteem, need patterns, machiavellianism, locus of control, tolerance for ambiguity, Type A & B personalities, introversion–extroversion & work–ethic orientation. **Noor 1995** found that after taking into account factors such as initial well-being, personality and demographic variables; work overload is the only variable which predicts psychological distress in working women.

Employment may result in increased stress for certain groups of women but decreased stress for other groups such as women who are employed part-time. Increased social contact and social support on the job may reduce the risk of illness for employed women.

Working women have to face this problem of adjustment among their varied role expectations. They are required by their position to play a dual set of roles - one as home makers, wives and

mothers, and the other as employees. Being simultaneously confronted with dual responsibilities or demands of home and work, they are liable to face adjustment problems. The problems of working women because of their dual responsibilities are multi-dimentional. Even the atmosphere at the work place, attitude of fellow workers, age of women working, kind of work, timing of work and distance of work place from the house etc, are important factors in the lives of working women. Working women experience environmental, social and psychological problems in each of them the problems emerge due to the strained situations at home and at the work place. Intern they are due to two factors; one is the concern and other is the practical difficulty of combining the dual commitment**.(Kapur ,P.1947)**

Malhotra et al. (2005) stated that in both unmarried as well as married level of social roles, the lecturers had significantly less role conflict than doctors and nurses. Nurses were found to experience maximum role conflict at all the levels of social roles.

Srivastava (2005) undertook a study on the assessment of Personality and mental health among Primary and secondary school teachers.and found that Extrovert secondary teachers enjoy better mental health as compared to introvert teachers.

Gramstad T, Gjestad .R and Haver .B (2013) conducted the study on personality traits predict job stress, depression, anxiety among junior physicians and found that personality traits should be considered one of many potential vulnerability factors that constitute the foundation for mental health deterioration among junior physicians. Assessing personality traits may prove useful in detecting individuals at risk of developing mental health problems.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study comprised of 210 working women (70 Administrators, 70 lecturers, 70 Doctors) in age group 30-45 years selected from different Government departments in Haryana .They were divided into three groups- Lecturer, Administrator, Doctor. First, the tests of Personality, Emotional Intelligence, Role Conflict, Occupational Stress, Depression and Adjustment were administered on the women employees. Tests were administered in three sessions.

In first session: First of all three tests were administered namely Emotional Intelligence, Role Conflicts, Beck Depression Inventory. Total time taken by them was approximately one hour.

In second session : Two tests were administered namely 16 P.F, Occupational Stress Index. Total time taken was approximately one hour.

In third session : One test was administered namely, Bell Adjust Inventory. Total time taken by subjects was approximately 40 minutes.

Then on the basis of the scores obtained on the above mentioned tests, subjects were divided into two groups. The first group comprised of the subjects scoring Emotional Quotient, Role Conflict, Occupational Stress, Depression and Adjustment level. The second group comprised of the subjects who were having none of these variables. Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy and Yoga therapy was given to the subjects of the first group for the period of one month and the relevant observations were recorded. , Post testing was done on the variables of Personality, Emotional Intelligence, Occupational Stress, Role Conflict, Depression and Adjustment of the first group. Correlation Analysis has been used to interpret the data collected.

ANALYTICAL TOOLS

The correlation coefficient is a statistical measure that calculates the strength of the relationship between the relative movements of two variables. The values range between -1.0 and 1.0. A calculated number greater than 1.0 or less than -1.0 means that there was an error in the correlation measurement. A correlation of -1.0 shows a perfect negative correlation, while a correlation of 1.0 shows a perfect positive correlation. A correlation of 0.0 shows no relationship between the movement of the two variables.

The simple sample correlation coefficient is $$r = \frac{\sum XY - n\bar{X}\bar{Y}}{\sqrt{\sum X^2 - n\bar{X}^2}\sqrt{\sum Y^2 - n\bar{Y}^2}}$$

Where,

X,Y are variables, n is the number of observations.

Or

$$r = \frac{Sxy}{\sqrt{SS_x}\sqrt{SS_y}}.$$

Where,

$SS_x = \sum X^2 - n\bar{X}^2$, $SS_y = \sum Y^2 - n\bar{Y}^2$ and $S_{xy} = \sum XY - nXY$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

CORRELATIONS AMONG VARIABLES OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, ROLE CONFLICT, OCCUPATIONAL STRESS, DEPRESSION AND ADJUSTMENT WITH PERSONALITY

1. PERSONALITY AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Referring to table 1, correlation coefficient between the variable of Personality Factor A (Sizothymia vs Affectothymia) and Emotional Intelligence of lecturers was 0.83 which was significant at 0.01 level of significance. This indicates that there was positive relationship between the Personality Factors A and Emotional Intelligence. If the Personality Factor A was higher, Emotional Quotient was also high among lecturers. The results show that extrovert people have capacity to tactfully respond to emotional stimuli elicited by various situations, responding effectively to competition, enjoying emotions, capacity to tackle emotional upsets such as frustration, conflicts and inferiority complexes and avoid emotional exhaustion such as stress and depression. She has a capacity of expressing the feeling and flexibility delaying gratification of immediate psychological satisfaction. She is having emotional sensitivity. The correlation coefficient between the variable of Personality Factor B (Lower Scholastic Mental Capacity vs Higher Scholastic Mental Capacity) and Emotional Intelligence of lecturers was -0.08 which was not significant. This indicate that there was no significant relationship between the Personality Factor B and Emotional Intelligence of lecturers. The correlation coefficient between the variable of Personality Factor I (Harria vs Premsia) and Emotional Intelligence of

lecturers was -0.70 which was significant at 0.01 level, indicated that there was negative relationship between the Personality Factor I and Emotional Intelligence. The score for Personality Factor I decreased with the increasing score of Emotional Intelligence among lecturers. The Correlation coefficient between the variable of Personality Factor Q2 (Group adherence vs Self – sufficiency) and Emotional Intelligence of lecturers was 0.71 which was significant at 0.01 level which indicate that there was positive relationship between the Personality Factor Q2 and Emotional intelligence. If the Personality Factor Q2 is higher then Emotional Intelligence score also tends to be high among lecturers.

Table.1 Inter Correlations between variables of Personality and Emotional Intelligence

Category of respondent	Personality Factors							
	A		B		I		Q2	
	r.coeff	tvalue	r.coeff	t value	r.coeff	t value	r.coeff	t value
Lecturer	0.83**	12.48**	0.08 NS	-0.65NS	-0.70**	-8.01**	0.71**	8.26**
Administrator	0.79**	10.82**	0.16 NS	1.36 NS	-0.64**	-6.85**	0.68**	7.73**
Doctor	0.73**	8.89**	0.20 NS	1.72 NS	-0.65**	-7.06 **	0.75**	9.29 **
All women employees	0.79**	18.91**	0.09 NS	1.27 NS	-0.63**	-11.68**	0.70**	14.30**

The correlation coefficient between the variable of personality Factor A and Emotional Intelligence of administrators was 0.79 which was significant at 0.01 level. This indicates that there was positive relationship between the Personality Factor A and Emotional Intelligence of administrators. If the Personality Factor A is higher then Emotional Quotient is also high among women administrators. No significant correlation was found between Personality Factor B and Emotional Intelligence of these women administrators. The correlation coefficient between the variable of Personality Factor I and Emotional Intelligence of administrators was -0.64 which was significant at 0.01 level of significance. This indicates that there was negative relationship between the Personality Factor I and Emotional Intelligence. If the Personality Factor I am lower then EQ is likely to be high. The correlation coefficient between the variable of Personality Factor Q2 and Emotional Intelligence of administrators was 0.68 which was significant on 0.01 level of significance. This indicate that there was positive relationship between the Personality Factor Q2 and Emotional intelligence. If the Personality Factor Q2 is higher then Emotional Intelligence is also high among women administrators.

In case of doctors, the correlation coefficient between the variable of Personality Factor A and Emotional Intelligence was 0.73 which was significant on 0.01 level of significance. It shows that there was positive relationship between the Personality Factor A and Emotional Intelligence. If Personality Factor A is higher then EQ is also high. The correlation coefficient between the variable of Personality Factor B (and Emotional Intelligence of doctors was 0.20 which was non significant. That of with the variable of Personality Factor I and Emotional Intelligence was -

0.65, significant at 0.01 level of significance, indicating negative relationship. If the Personality Factor I is lower then Emotional Intelligence is likely to be high. The correlation coefficient with the variable of Personality Factor Q2 and Emotional Intelligence was 0.75 significant on 0.01 level of significance which indicate that there was positive relationship between the Personality Factor Q2 and Emotional intelligence. If the Personality Factor Q2 is higher then Emotional Intelligence is also high .

In case of .all women employees, strong correlation existed between Emotional Intelligence and Personality Factors A, I and Q2 as the value of their r coefficient was 0.79, -0.63 and 0.70 respectively. All were significant at 0.01 level of significance. Negative correlation existed between Personality Factor I and Emotional Intelligence where as in case of Personality Factors A and Q2 , the correlation was positive. Over all, table 3.1.1 reveals that Emotional intelligence of women employees had strong positive correlation with Personality Factors A and Q2 where as correlation with Personality Factors I was negative, significant at 0.01 level of significance. No correlation was found between Emotional Intelligence and Personality Factor B among women employees.
It was hypothesized that there was correlation between variables of Personality Factors and Emotional Intelligence among women employees of different professions. Significant correlation was observed between all the personality factors and Emotional Intelligence exempting factor B. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted for Personality Factors A, I and Q2 and rejected for Factor B.

2 PERSONALITY AND ROLE CONFLICT

Table.2 indicates that correlation between Personality Factor A and Role Conflict was negative in case of all the categories of women employees. For lecturer group, the value of coefficient was -0.29 significant at 0.05 level of significance, it was -0.39 for administrators significant at 0.01 level and it was -0.36 for doctors, significant at 0.01 level of significance. In case of all women employees, the correlation coefficient was -0.38, significant at 0.01 level of significance. This shows that there was negative correlation between Personality Factor A and Role Conflict among women employees.

Table 2 Inter Correlations between variables of Personality Factors and Role Conflict

Category of respondents	Personality Factors							
	A		B		I		Q2	
	r.coeff	t value	r.coeff	t value	r.coeff	t value	r.coeff	t value
Lecturer	-0.29*	-2.55*	-0.01 NS	-0.08NS	0.30*	2.61*	-0.24*	-2.02*
Administrator	-0.39**	-3.49**	0.11 NS	0.88NS	0.20 NS	1.66 NS	-0.34**	-2.94**
Doctor	-0.36**	-3.23**	-0.02 NS	-0.18NS	0.43**	3.94 **	-0.45**	-4.11**
All women Employees	-0.38**	-5.86**	0.03 NS	0.40NS	0.29**	4.45**	-0.33**	-5.10**

The correlation coefficient in case of Personality Factor B and Role Conflict was also negative in all the categories of respondents but none of the coefficient was found significant. The value of the coefficient was – 0.01, 0.11, -0.02 and 0.03 for lecturers , administrators , doctors and all women employees respectively. Neither of the r coefficients was significant. The table indicate that there was no correlation between Role Conflict and Personality Factor B of women employees.

The correlation between Personality Factor I and Role Conflict among women employees was positive in all the categories of women employees. It was significant only among lecturer and doctor groups. For lecturers, the coefficient value was 0.30, significant at 0.05, for doctors, it was 0.43, significant at 0.01 level. For administrators, the correlation coefficient (r = 0.20) was not significant. In case of all women employees, it was 0.29, significant at 0.01 level of significance. So it may be inferred that there was positive correlation between personality Factor I and role conflict. The score of Role Conflict increases with the score of Personality Factor I.

In case of Personality Factor Q2 and Role Conflict, negative correlation existed among all the categories of women employees. The correlation coefficient was -0.24, significant at 0.05 level of significance for lectures, -0.34, significant at 0.01 level of significance for administrators and -0.45 significant at 0.01 level of significance for doctors. For all women groups, it was -0.33, also significant at 0.01 level of significance. This means that there was strong negative relation between Personality Factor Q2 and Role Conflict. It seems that Role Conflict decreases with increasing score of Personality Factor Q2.

The hypothesis that there was correlation between variables of Personality Factors and Role Conflict among women employees of different professions stands accepted in case of Personality Factor A, I, and Q2 but it is rejected in case of Personality Factor B.

The studies also show that personality has a relationship with role conflicts. Kahn et al (1964) said that open mindedness and other directedness in a flexible person expose him more to stress than a rigid person. Extroversion and neuroticism dimensions of personality differed significantly in their perception of various type of role stresses as well as on total role stress (Sharma, 1988). Role expectation conflict had a significantly negative relationship with extraversion/ introversion. and the effects of extroversion reduced the role conflict. (Ahmad et al, 1991)

3 PERSONALITY AND OCCUPATIONAL STRESS

Table 3 indicates that the correlation between Personality Factor A and Occupational Stress was negative in case of all the categories of women employees. For lecturer group, the correlation coefficient was -0.54, significant at 0.01 level of significance, for administrator group, it was -0.50, significant at 0.01 level and it was -0.41 for doctors, significant at 0.01 level of significance. In case of all women, the correlation coefficient was -0.49, significant at 0.01 level of significance. This shows that there was negative correlation between Personality Factor A and Occupational Stress among women employees.

Table 3 Inter Correlations between variables of Personality Factors and Occupational Stress

Category of respondents	Personality Factors							
	A		B		I		Q2	
	r.coeff	t value	r.coeff	t value	r.coeff	t value	r.coeff	t value
Lecturer	-0.54**	-5.27**	-0.06 NS	-0.48NS	0.44**	4.08**	-0.48**	-4.57**
Administrator	-0.50**	-4.75**	-0.27*	-2.29*	0.43**	3.91**	-0.41**	-3.74**
Doctor	-0.41**	-3.72**	- 0.32**	-2.76**	0.42**	3.80**	-0.48**	-4.54**
All women Employees	-0.49**	-8.09**	-0.22**	-3.27**	0.42**	6.70**	-0.46**	-7.46**

The correlation in case of Personality Factor B and Occupational Stress was also negative for administrators , doctors and all women employees. The correlation coefficient was -0.27 for administrators, significant at 0.05 level of significance, -0.32 for doctors significant at 0.01 level of significance and -0.22 for all women employees, significant at 0.01 level of significance. For lecturers group, the correlation coefficient (r = -0.06) was non- significant.

The correlation between Personality Factor I and Occupational Stress among women employees was positive in all the categories of women employees. It was 0.44, 0.43 and 0.42 and for lecturers, doctors, and administrators, significant at 0.01 level of significance. In case of all women, the correlation coefficient was 0.42, also significant at 0.01 level of significance . So it may be inferred that there was positive correlation between Personality Factor I and Occupational Stress. It seems that scores of Occupational Stress increases with the increasing scores of the personality Factor I.

In case of Personality Factor Q2 and Occupational Stress, negative correlation existed among women employees. The value of correlation coefficient was -0.48, -0.41 and -0.48 for lectures, administrators and doctors, significant at 0.01 level of significance. For all women employees, it was -0.46, also significant at 0.01 level of significance. This means that there was strong negative Correlation between personality Q2 and Occupational Stress. The score of Personality Factor Q2 increases with the decreasing score of the Occupational Stress.

So, the hypothesis that there was correlation between variables of Personality Factors and Occupational Stress among women employees of different professions has been accepted in the light of the findings.

Extroversion dimension was found negatively correlated with role ambiguity, depression (Pandey1998) found extroversion-introversion dimension as negatively associated with perceived organizational role stress. Personality traits such as authoritarianism, rigidity, masculinity, femininity, extroversion, supportiveness, spontaneity, emotionality, tolerance of ambiguity, anxiety, and need for achievement have been uncovered by research as being particularly relevant to individual stress (Brief, 1981).

4 PERSONALITY AND DEPRESSION

Table 4 indicate that correlation between Personality Factor A and Depression was negative in case of all categories of women employees. The value of the correlation coefficient was – 0.67, -0.37, -0.43 and -0.46 for lecturers , administrators , doctors and all women employees respectively significant at 0.01 level of significance. This shows that there was negative correlation between Personality Factor A and Depression among women employees.

Table 4 Inter Correlations between variables of Personality Factors and Depression

Category of respondents	Personality Factors							
	A		B		I		Q2	
	r.coeff	t value	r.coeff	t value	r.coeff	t value	r.coeff	t value
Lecturers	-0.67**	-7.44**	0.12 NS	1.02 NS	0.46**	4.29**	-0.55**	-5.44**
Administrators	-0.37**	-3.27**	-0.22 NS	-1.89NS	0.34**	2.98**	-0.47**	-4.37**
Doctors	-0.43**	-3.88**	-0.36**	-3.19**	0.40**	3.60**	-0.49**	-4.70**
All women Employees	-0.46**	-7.46**	-0.17 *	-2.46*	0.39**	6.17**	-0.49**	-8.16**

The correlation in case of Personality Factor B and Depression was negative for doctors and all women employees. The value of the correlation coefficient was – 0.36 for doctors, significant at 0.01 level of significance. In case of all women employees, the correlation coefficient was -0.17, significant at 0.05 level of significance. The correlation coefficient between Personality Factor B and Depression in case of lecturers (r = 0.12) and administrators (r = -0.22) was non significant. It shows that there was no correlation between Personality Factor B and Depression among lecturers and administrators.

The correlation between Personality Factor I and Depression among women employees was positive in all the categories of women employees. The correlation coefficient was 0.46, 0.34 and 0.40 for lecturers, doctors, and administrators, significant at 0.01 level of significance. In case of all women employees, the correlation coefficient was 0.39, also significant at 0.01 level of significance. So it may be inferred that there was positive correlation between Personality Factor I and Depression. The scores of Depression increases with the score of Personality Factor I.

In case of Personality Factor Q2 and Depression, negative correlation existed among women employees. The Correlation coefficient value was -0.55 for lectures, -0.47 for administrators and -0.49 for doctors, all significant at 0.01 level of significance. For all women employees, it was -

0.49 also significant at 0.01 level of significance. This means that there was strong negative correlation between Personality Factor Q2 and Depression. Depression decreases with the Personality Factor Q2 of women employees.

Hence, the hypothesis that there was correlation between variables of Personality Factors and Depression among women employees of different professions has been accepted based on the results of the study.

5 PERSONALITY AND ADJUSTMENT

Table5 reveal that the correlation between Personality Factor A and Adjustment was negative in case of all the categories of women employees. The value of the correlation coefficient was – 0.80, -0.59, -0.60 and -0.67 for lecturers, administrators, doctors and all women employees, all significant at 0.01 level of significance. This shows that there was negative correlation between Personality Factor A and Adjustment among women employees.

Table 5 Inter Correlations between variables of Personality Factors and Adjustment

Category of respondents	Personality Factors							
	A		B		I		Q2	
	r.coeff	t value	r.coeff	t value	r.coeff	t value	r.coeff	t value
Lecturers	-0.80 **	-10.98**	0.03 NS	0.27NS	0.63**	6.66**	-0.66**	-7.23**
Administrators	-0.59 **	-6.01**	-0.16 NS	-1.38NS	0.47**	4.36**	-0.54**	-5.25**
Doctors	-0.60 **	-6.25**	-0.37**	-3.33**	0.64**	6.80**	-0.69**	-7.78**
All women Employees	-0.67**	-12.94**	-0.17 *	-2.46*	0.57**	9.97**	-0.63**	-11.61**

The correlation in case of Personality Factor B and Adjustment was negative for doctors and all women employees. The value of the coefficient was – 0.37 for doctors, significant at 0.01 level of significance. In case of all women, the correlation coefficient was -0.17, significant at 0.05 level of significance. The correlation coefficient in case of lecturers and administrators was non-significant indicating no correlation between Personality Factors B and Adjustment.

The correlation between Personality Factor I and Adjustment was positive in all the categories of women employees. Its coefficient was 0.63, 0.47 and 0.64 for lecturers, doctors, and administrators, significant at 0.01 level of significance. In case of all women employees, the correlation coefficient was 0.57, significant at 0.01 level of significance. Its seems that the score of Adjustment increases with the score of Personality Factor I.

In case of Personality Factors Q2 and Adjustment, negative correlation existed in all the categories of women employees. The correlation coefficient value was -0.66 for lectures, -0.54 for administrators and -0.69 for doctors, all significant at 0.01 level of significance. For all women employees, the correlation coefficient was -0.63, also significant at 0.01 level of significance. Its seems that the score of Adjustment decreases with the Personality Factor Q2.
So, the hypothesis that there was correlation between variables of Personality Factors and Adjustment among women employees of different professions has been accepted.

CONCLUSION

The correlation coefficient between the variable of Personality Factor A and Emotional Intelligence of lecturers, administrator and doctors was significant at 0.01 level of significance. There was positive relationship between the Personality Factor A and Emotional Intelligence .The Correlation coefficient between the variable of Personality Factor B and Emotional Intelligence was non significant in case of all women employees groups. No correlation between Personality Factor B and Emotional Intelligence was observed. Negative correlation was observed between the variables of Personality Factor I and Emotional Intelligence of lecturers, administrators and doctors which was significant at 0.01 level. The Correlation between the variable of Personality Factor Q2 and Emotional Intelligence of lecturers administrators and doctors was positive and significant at 0.01 level. In case of all women employees, negative correlation existed between Personality Factor I and Emotional Intelligence where as in case of Personality Factors A and Q2, the correlation was positive. No correlation was found between Personality Factor B and Emotional Intelligence among women employees. The Correlation between Personality Factor A and Role Conflict was negative in case of all the categories of women employees. For lecturer group, the value of coefficient was significant at 0.05 level of significance, for administrators and doctors, significant at 0.01 level. In case of all women employees, the correlation coefficient was significant at 0.01 level of significance. The correlation between Personality Factor B and Role Conflict was also negative in all the categories of respondents but none of the coefficient was found significant. There was no correlation between Role Conflict and Personality Factor B of women employees. The correlation between Personality Factor I and Role Conflict among women employees was positive in all the categories. For lecturers, the coefficient value was significant at 0.05, for doctors, significant at 0.01 level and for administrators, it was not significant. In case of all women employees, the coefficient value was significant at 0.01 level of significance. In case of Personality Factor Q2 and Role Conflict, negative correlation existed among all the categories of women employees. The correlation coefficient value was significant at 0.05 level of significance for lectures, significant at 0.01 level of significance for administrators, doctors and all women employees. The correlation between Personality Factor A and Occupational Stress was negative in case of all the categories of women employees. The correlation coefficient was significant at 0.01 level of significance for lecturer, administrator and doctor groups. In case of all women, the correlation coefficient was significant at 0.01 level of significance. The correlation in case of Personality Factor B and Occupational Stress was also negative for administrators , doctors and all women employees. The correlation coefficient was significant at 0.05 level of significance for administrators. significant at 0.01 level of significance for doctors and for all women employees. For lecturers group, the correlation coefficient was non- significant. The correlation between Personality Factor I and Occupational Stress was positive in all the categories. For lecturers,

administrators, doctors and all women employees, the correlation coefficient was significant at 0.01 level of significance. In case of Personality Factor Q2 and Occupational Stress, negative correlation exists among women employees. The value of correlation coefficient was significant at 0.01 level of significance for lectures, administrators, doctors .The correlation between Personality Factor A and Depression was negative in case of all categories of women employees. The value of the correlation coefficient was significant at 0.01 level of significance for lecturers, administrators, doctors and all women employees. The correlation in case of Personality Factor B and Depression was negative for doctors The value of the correlation coefficient significant at 0.01 level of significance for doctors. In case of all women employees, the correlation coefficient was significant at 0.05 level of significance. The correlation between Personality Factor B and Depression in case of lecturers and administrators was non significant. It shows that there was no correlation between Personality Factor B and Depression among lecturers and administrators. The correlation between Personality Factor I and Depression among women employees was positive in all the categories of women employees. The correlation coefficient was significant at 0.01 level of significance for lecturers, doctors, and administrators and all women employees. In case of Personality Factor Q2 and Depression, negative correlation exists among women employees. The Correlation coefficient value was significant at 0.01 level of significance for lectures, administrators, doctors and all women employees. The correlation between Personality Factor A and Adjustment was negative in case of all the categories of women employees. The value of the correlation coefficient was significant at 0.01 level of significance for lecturers , administrators , doctors and all women employees. The correlation in case of Personality Factor B and Adjustment was negative for doctors and all women employees. The value of the coefficient was, significant at 0.01 level of significance for doctors. In case of all women, the correlation coefficient was significant at 0.05 level of significance. The correlation coefficient in case of lecturers and administrators was non- significant indicating no correlation between Personality Factors B and Adjustment of lecturers and administrators. The correlation between Personality Factor I and Adjustment was positive in all the categories of women employees. Its coefficient was significant at 0.01 level of significance for lecturers, doctors, and administrators. In case of all women employees, the correlation coefficient was significant at 0.01 level of significance. In case of Personality Factors Q2 and Adjustment, negative correlation was existed in all the categories of women employees. The correlation coefficient value was significant at 0.01 level of significance for lectures, administrators, doctors, and for all women employees.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, S, Jams, J.and Ahmad, S.(1991) organization Role stress, A pscological study of middle managers, Journal f personality & Clinical studies, Vol. 7(1). PP 43-48.

Brief, A.P. (1984). In Encyclopedia of psychology, volume 02, EdsRamond J. Corosini. New York wiley- interscience publication.

Hennesy, K.D. (2005). Work-family conflict self-efficacy: A scale validation study. University of Maryland.

Kapur, P. (1947). "The changing status of working women in India", Vikas PubUsher, New Delhi.

Misra, P and Chaturvedi, A. (1989) .Interrole conflict in working mothers as a function of occupational type and job tenure. Indian journal of clinical psychology vol 16(2), 61-63.

Noor, N.M. 1995. Work and family roles in relation to women's well-being: A longitudinal study. British Journal of Social Psychology, 34:87-106

Nye & Hoffman's (1963) study considers personality factors as important in motivating women to take up employment along with economic factors.

Rao,S.K.R (1984). The conception of stress in Indian thought: The theoretical aspects of stress in samkhya&Yoga system. NimhansJournal ;115-121

Sharma, N.R. (1981) A comparative study of extra version, neuroticism, achievement motivation and adjustment of tribal, rural and urban youth of Himachal Pradesh. Ph.D thesis, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Sharma B.R. (1983) Administraive stress, New Delhi, 11Pa.

Sharma, S. (1988) " Stress and Anxiety" in J. Pande (ed). "Psychology in India. The State- of the- Art: personality and mental processes, New Delhi: Sage Publications, Vol. 1.

Sharma, S ,Sood, N,&Speilberger, C.D. (1998) Occupational stress, anxiety, anger and Type- A behaviour. In D.M. pestonjee, U. Pareek, & R. Agrawal (Eds), studies in stress and its management (PP.111-120). New Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing co.