Self-Role Distance - Enhancing the Framework for Measurement

Avinash Kumar Srivastav
Bengaluru, India

Self-Role Distance (SRD) or lack of integration between the role and its occupant is an important dimension of role stress. SRD did not emerge as a clear factor during revalidation/validation of Pareek's Organizational Role Stress (ORS) and Srivastav's New Organizational Role Stress (NORS) frameworks. Enhanced framework was developed for measurement of SRD. Reconceptualization of SRD, development of enhanced SRD scale, and establishing its reliability and validity have been reported. Enhanced SRD scale was tested on 222 respondents from information technology industry and some other industries/organizations. Reliability of the scale was assessed and improved by computation of Cronbach's Alpha, Corrected Item-Total Correlation, Item-Deleted Cronbach's Alpha, and pruning of weak items. Enhanced SRD scale demonstrated satisfactory internal consistency reliability. Validity of enhanced SRD scale was confirmed by exploratory factor analysis. The new SRD scale can better identify roles that poorly integrate with their occupants for enhancing their effectiveness.

Keywords: Organizational Roles, Role Effectiveness, Role Stress, Measurement Scale, Self-Role Distance

Enhancing the Framework for Measurement

Every role is invariably connected with a set of other roles which influence its performance in the organization. Organizational role is therefore defined by the expectations held by the occupants of all the connected roles, including the focal role itself. Human behaviour in organizations is better understood when it is studied at the level of organizational roles (Pareek, 1993). Different kinds of problems are invariably encountered by a role occupant during the course of role performance and these lead to experiencing role stress.

Evolution of Role Stress Framework

Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek and Rosenthal (1964) gave the first framework of role stress comprising three role stressors – Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity and Role Overload. Stress created when the role occupant's concept of the role conflicts with the actual role or Self-Role Distance (SRD) was identified as a new role stressor by Pareek (1982). It formed a part of his eight dimensional role stress framework

called Your Feelings About Your Role (YFAYR). Apart from SRD, YFAYR defined and measured seven other role stressors - Inter-Role Distance, Role Stagnation, Role Ambiguity, Role Erosion, Role Overload, Role Isolation, and Role Inadequacy. Before YFAYR came into being, SRD was hidden in Role Conflict in the original role stress framework cited above. Definition of role stressors thus changed in 1982 from what it was in 1964.

YFAYR was expanded by Pareek (1983). Based on the cues from factor analysis, two role stressors of YFAYR were split into four different role stressors. Role Inadequacy of YFAYR was split into Personal Inadequacy (stress experienced in the role due to inadequacy of internal resources in the form of competence of the role occupant) and Resource Inadequacy (stress experienced in the role due to inadequacy of external resources in the form of materials, machines, infrastructure, facilities and human-resources required by the role occupant). Role Ambiguity in YFAYR framework included ambiguity due to lack of clarity in defining role expectations as also ambiguity perceived due

to conflicts among role expectations. It was split into new form of Role Ambiguity and Role Expectation Conflict. The expanded framework or role stress called Organizational Role Stress (ORS) comprised SRD and nine other role stressors - Inter-Role Distance, Role Stagnation, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Erosion, Role Overload, Role Isolation, Personal Inadequacy, Role Ambiguity, and Resource Inadequacy (Pareek, 1983). Definition of role stressors thus changed again in 1983 from what it was in 1982.

Unlike its predecessors, ORS framework exhaustively represented the actual problems encountered in role performance. It has been extensively used for research on role stress (Pestonjee, 1999) for long innings. Gordon (2004) has reported ORS Scale as a classic inventory. Revalidation of ORS framework (Srivastav & Pareek, 2008), however, identified new scope for enhancement of role stress framework. Role Erosion in ORS framework represented both the deprivation of the role (resulting from removal of some important functions from the role) and the desire to do more. Whereas the deprivation items represented real erosion of the role, the 'desire to do more' items represented Role Underload. There was a need for extracting the 'desire to do' items from Role Erosion and use them appropriately for designing a new scale for Role Underload. Role Stagnation and Role Erosion items also got mixed up during revalidation of ORS as above, calling for redesigning the two scales for distinguishing between the two concepts. Further, SRD did not emerge as a clear factor during revalidation of ORS as above and called for redesigning of the SRD scale.

On the basis of learning derived from the ORS revalidation study presented above, Srivastav (2009) developed New Organizational Role Stress (NORS) framework. NORS framework comprised 11 scales (viz., the first scale for the measurement of role underload and the modified forms of ORS scales for measuring its ten role stressors). Validation of NORS, however, was not successful as the constituent factors (including SRD) were mixed up and role underload was measured consistently higher (Srivastav, 2015) than other role stressors, irrespective of the reality.

Revalidation of ORS by Srivastav and Pareek (2008) triggered the process of enhancing its framework, introduction of a new role stressor in the form of role underload, and refining the definition of existing role stressors. The process started with the development of NORS (Srivastav, 2009) and it is still continuing. Lack of successful validation of NORS has given further leads for strengthening of role stress framework. Srivastav (2015) has reported the development of an enhanced role underload scale. Research is in progress for the desirable separation between role erosion and role stagnation. If the desired separation between the two concepts is not feasible, the two concepts will need to be merged together in the form of a new role stressor representing both the concepts. This paper is focused on the enhancement of SRD scale beyond its earlier versions in ORS and NORS frameworks.

Reconceptualization of Self-Role Distance

SRD results from lack of integration between the role and its role occupant who opts for distancing himself/herself from the role (Pareek, 2002), jeopardizing role effectiveness. SRD is a stress from role-taking (Pareek, 1993) when the role occupant takes on a poorly matched role. Prominence of SRD (Srivastav, 2007) at the individual or organizational level indicates that the organization needs to work on better matching of persons with roles. Even though SRD was not recognised as a role stressor until Pareek (1982) included it in YFAYR, Role Distance was identified and discussed well before role stress was identified by Kahn et al. (1964). According to Goffman (1961), role distance represents behaviour in which the person separates himself/herself from the assigned role. Role distance indicates that the role occupant does not identify himself/herself with the role enacted. Role distance is opposite to role embracing or role merger representing

complete identification with the role (Stryker & Statham, 1985). Role distance is a person-role conflict, which was apparently included in role conflict stressor defined by Kahn et al. (1964). An excellent disposition on role distance has been presented by Driver (2003).

SRD in ORS Framework

ORS framework (Pareek, 1983) conceived SRD as a role stressor resulting from the following five types of person-role conflicts.

1. Role occupant has to work against own judgement;
2. Role occupant's expertise is not used in the role;
3. Work in the role is not related to role occupant's interests;
4. Role occupant wants to do things differently from what needs to be done in the role;
5. Working in the role conflicts with role occupant's values.

Revalidation of ORS (Srivastav & Pareek, 2008) framework, however, did not validate SRD, which did not emerge as a clear factor. All the items of SRD scale except for the item related to working against judgement had unacceptable validity. Items on 'non-utilization of expertise' and 'uninteresting work' got merged with the factor representing role stagnation. Items on 'desire to do things differently' and 'conflict with role occupant's values' got merged with the factor representing role ambiguity. These findings necessitate redesigning of the framework and scale for the measurement of SRD.

SRD in NORS Framework

NORS framework conceived SRD with two additional types of person-role conflicts, viz., conflict with role occupant's needs and conflict with role occupant's beliefs, while retaining the five types of person-role conflicts used for defining ORS version of SRD. NORS version of SRD comprised seven items as follows.

1. My role demands me to do what is against my judgment;

2. My role provides me opportunities to use my expertise;
3. I would like to do things for the organization which are quite different from what I am doing in my role;
4. Work in my role is related to my interests;
5. Work in my role is conflicting with my values;
6. Work in my role is conflicting with my needs;
7. Work in my role is conflicting with my beliefs.

It is to be noted that items 2 and 4 above are reverse scoring items. Scoring of each item is done as 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5, depending on how strongly the item is applicable for a respondent's role (1 for never applicable and 5 for always applicable). Reverse score of an item (R_n) is obtained from direct score for the item (D_n) by using the formula: $R_n = 6 - D_n$. Direct scores of 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 are obtained when they are inverted and transformed as reverse scores of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively. Unlike the items of ORS, the items of NORS are scored from 1 to 5. Further, the number of items used for different scales under NORS is not uniform. It was, therefore, decided to convert the total scores for each NORS-scale to a unified range of 0-10 to facilitate direct comparison among different role stressors. SRD score for the respondent (in the range 0-10) is obtained by using the following formula, which computes respondent's average for the item scores (taken after inverting the score for reverse scoring items), subtracts 1 from the item average, and multiplies the remainder by 2.5.

SRD (NORS) = [{(D1 + R2 + D3 + R4 + D5 + D6 + D7) / 7 } – 1] x 2.5

NORS validation emphasized the need for improving the SRD framework and scale beyond what is done in its NORS version.

Method

Development of enhanced SRD scale was done on 222 respondents mainly from

information technology industry, including some other industries/organizations for promoting the diversity of respondents to cover a broader range of SRD experience from low to high. Respondents were approached through their respective human resource managers who were briefed about promoting the diversity of respondents as above. Qualitative feedback on appropriateness of SRD scale items for their roles was received through emails from the respondents and was duly considered for item generation and review explained below. Data collection was also done through emails.

Scale development is an iterative process. The desired improvement of the scale in terms of higher reliability, validity and discriminating power is generally realized in multiple steps. Each one of these steps represents some improvement in the psychometric properties of the scale. The following structured process of scale development (Rattray & Jones, 2007; Srivastav, 2015) was used for each step of improvement from a lower version to its next higher version.

Generation and Review of Items

Face validity of measurement scales is very important. The scale should appear to measure what it is designed to measure. It is an essential requirement for development and enhancement of measurement scales (Priest, McColl, Thomas & Bond, 1995; Rattray & Jones, 2007). Generation of items for a new scale and review of items for an existing scale (Oppenheim, 1992; Bowling, 1997) is done considering what needs to be measured, views of available experts in the field and possible feedback from respondents used for scale development, making use of wisdom from relevant published literature (Goffman, 1961; Kahn et al., 1964; Pareek, 1982 & 1983; Stryker & Statham, 1985; Pareek, 1993 & 2002; Driver, 2003; Srivastav, 2007; Srivastav & Pareek, 2008; Srivastav, 2009 & 2015).

Improvement Cues Identification

Improvement cues for SRD scale under development are identified through review of items explained above and through reliability and validity assessment explained below.

Reliability Assessment

Reliability of a measurement scale means stability and repeatability of measurements made. It is represented by internal consistency of items used in the scale (Jack & Clarke 1998). Assessment and enhancement of reliability is important for measurement scales under development. Demonstration of reliability of an established measurement scale is desirable before making inferences from measurements made.

Cronbach's Alpha (CA) (Kline, 1993) is used to assess internal consistency reliability of different versions of the SRD scale. To assure internal consistency reliability, CA should not be lower than 0.8 for established scales and not lower than 0.7 for scales under development. Lower values for CA reflect poor grouping of items in the scale (Bowling, 1997; Bryman & Cramer, 1997). CA is calculated with the help of Statistical Package for Social Science.

Reliability Improvement

Reliability of a scale is improved by pruning of weak items. Deleting a weak item from a measurement scale may sometimes lead to jeopardizing the theoretical construct of the scale. When this happens, the item needs to be redesigned and revaluated. Wording of items in a measurement scale plays an important role in determining its discriminating power. Weak items in the scale are identified by computing Corrected Item-Total Correlation (CITC) (Ferketich, 1991) and Item-Deleted Cronbach's Alpha (IDCA) (Santos, 1999) as explained hereunder.

CITC means correlation of an item with the scale's total after removing the item. It is computed by using SPSS. CITC enables identification of weak items. Higher than 0.8 value of CITC indicates that the item is merely a repetition of another item in the scale. Lower than 0.3 value of CITC denotes that the item does not represent the same construct as represented by the remaining items in the scale.

Either of these situations singles out a weak item in the scale.

IDCA for an item represents modified CA for the scale obtained by deleting the item. It is computed by using SPSS. A weak item in the scale yields IDCA value, which is higher than the original CA for the scale.

Validity Assessment

Validity of a measurement scale (Bryman & Cramer, 1997) means that the scale is measuring what it is designed for. Validity assessment and enhancement are necessary for measurement scales under development. Demonstrating the validity of an established measurement scale is desirable before making inferences from the measurements made.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) (Ferguson & Cox, 1993) is employed to determine the factor structure of different versions of the SRD scale. SRD has been conceived as a uni-dimensional concept. EFA should result in a single factor for proving the construct validity of the SRD scale. Eigen Value of higher than 1.0 (denoting higher than average variance) was specified for factor extraction by Principal Component Analysis (PCA). Varimax rotation is employed for better definition of factors if and when multiple factors are extracted.

Validity Improvement

When construct validity fails to be established for a measurement scale, the scale needs to be thoroughly redesigned. The construct needs to be revisited necessitating redesigning of constituent factors. This may entail introduction or elimination of one or more factors. Combining of two or more factors, or splitting of a factor into two or more factors, may be needed in some cases.

Finalizing Enhanced SRD Scale

The new SRD scale was finalized through successive improvements in reliability, validity and/or discriminating power. The process of improvement was continued until all the possible improvements were realized. Comparison was made between the older and the newer versions of the SRD scale.

Results and Discussion

Results obtained by scheduling and executing the above-mentioned assessment and improvement activities are reported and discussed in the order of their execution.

Item Review for NORS Version of SRD

Item review of NORS version of the SRD scale did not offer any cue for improvement. Feedback from respondents also did not throw new light on item wordings, except for suggesting a minor editorial correction (for replacing "is conflicting" with "conflicts" in the last three statements). Face validity of this version of the SRD scale, therefore, could not be doubted.

Labelled as SRD-1, the updated NORS version of SRD scale was taken up for enhancement in this study. Labelled as 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 1f, 1g, SRD-1 comprised the following items.

(1a) My role demands me to do what is against my judgment;

(1b) My role provides me opportunities to use my expertise;

(1c) I would like to do things for the organization which are quite different from what I am doing in my role;

(1d) Work in my role is related to my interests;

(1e) Work in my role conflicts with my values;

(1f) Work in my role conflicts with my needs;

(1g) Work in my role conflicts with my beliefs

Reliability Assessment of SRD-1

SRD was measured on 222 respondents described above, using SRD-1 scale. Reliability assessment of the scale was done after inverting the scores for reverse scoring items (1b and 1d).

Table-1 furnishes the result of SRD-1 reliability assessment. The scale has unacceptable reliability with CA = 0.323. CITC values for items 1a, 1e, 1f & 1g are in the acceptable range. CITC values for items 1b and 1d are negative and for item 1c, it is lower than 0.3, indicating weakness of items Ib, Ic and Id. IDCA for items 1a, 1c, 1e, 1f, and 1g are lower than scale CA, indicating

strength of these items. IDCA for items 1b and 1d, on the other hand, are higher than scale CA, reconfirming the weakness of 1b and 1d.

Table-1. Reliability Assessment of SRD-1
(N = 222; Scale CA = 0.323)

Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation (CITC)	Item Deleted Cronbach's Alpha (IDCA)
1a	0.364	0.147
1b	-0.319	0.518
1c	0.148	0.282
1d	-0.315	0.545
1e	0.510	0.054
1f	0.405	0.102
1g	0.468	0.077

Validity Assessment of SRD-1

There can be no acceptable validity with unacceptable reliability. EFA was done for SRD-1, however, to study its factor structure and explained variance. Two factors were obtained (instead of one) with Eigen values of 3.390 and 1.117, explaining the variance of 35.062% and 29.313%, respectively. Cumulative variance explained by the two factors was 64.374%. SRD-1 has obviously failed in its validity assessment.

Enhancement of SRD-1

It was clear from Table-1 that deletion of item 1b would lead to enhancing the CA of SRD-1 scale from 0.323 to 0.518 and deletion of item 1d would lead to enhancing the CA of SRD-1 scale from 0.323 to 0.545.

Deletion of Item 1b

Item 1b (My role provides me opportunities to use my expertise), a reverse scoring item, represents a person-role conflict from lack of opportunity to use own expertise in the role. This item was refined from a similar item (item 18) used in ORS framework (I am not able to use my training and expertise in my role). When the role occupant comes across lack of opportunity to use own expertise in the role, the role is not interesting for the role occupant and the importance of the role gets eroded in role occupant's perception. Item 1b, therefore, overlaps with Role Erosion. In other words, when the role occupant cannot use own expertise in the current role, he/she aspires for a higher role where own expertise would be better utilized. Thus, item 1b also overlaps with Role Stagnation. In their revalidation study of ORS, Srivastav and Pareek (2008) have reported clustering of item 18 on Role Stagnation (instead of SRD). Further, when own expertise is not utilized in the current role, it is possible that the role occupant would crave for higher responsibility or challenges in the current role to make a higher role contribution. In this way, item 1b overlaps with Role Underload. Inclusion of item 1b, therefore, promotes overlapping of SRD with Role Stagnation, Role Erosion and Role Underload. Inclusion of item 1b in SRD is, therefore, a cause for non-emergence of SRD as a clear factor in validation of NORS. Similarly, inclusion of item 18 in ORS is a cause for non-emergence of SRD as a clear factor in revalidation of ORS. It is also a cause for merger of Role Stagnation with Role Erosion in ORS framework.

The role occupant judges the role from the point of view of opportunity to utilize own expertise. When own expertise is not utilized, the role occupant may perceive that he/she is working against own judgement. The spirit of item 1b, is therefore, included in item 1a. Deletion of item 1b from SRD-1, therefore, will not jeopardise the theoretical construct of SRD.

Deletion of Item 1d

Item 1d (Work in my role is related to my interests), a reverse scoring item, represents a person-role conflict from doing uninteresting work in the role. This item was refined from a similar item (item 28) used in ORS framework (The work I do in the organization is not related to my interests). Coming across uninteresting work in the role may create a perception of being deprived of some important parts of the role, which would have been more interesting. Item 1d, therefore, overlaps with Role Erosion. Looking at it in another way, when the role

occupant cannot find interesting work in the current role, he/she aspires for a higher role, in which work would be more interesting. Thus, item 1d also overlaps with Role Stagnation. In their revalidation study of ORS, Srivastav and Pareek (2008) have reported clustering of item 28 on Role Stagnation instead of SRD. Further, while coming across uninteresting work in the current role, it is likely that the role occupant craves for higher responsibility or challenges in the current role, which would make the current role more interesting. In this way, item 1d overlaps with Role Underload. Inclusion of item 1d, therefore, promotes overlapping of SRD with Role Stagnation, Role Erosion and Role Underload. Inclusion of item 1d in SRD is therefore, a cause for non-emergence of SRD as a clear factor in validation of NORS. Similarly, inclusion of item 28 in ORS is a cause for non-emergence of SRD as a clear factor in revalidation of ORS. It is also a cause for merger of Role Stagnation with Role Erosion in ORS framework.

The role occupant finds work in the role interesting or uninteresting on the basis of his/her own judgement. The spirit of item 1d is, therefore, included in item 1a. Deletion of item 1d from SRD-1, therefore, will not jeopardise the theoretical construct of SRD.

Realization of SRD-2

Items 1b and 1d were deleted to realize SRD-2, the enhanced version of SRD-1. To distinguish the second version from the first version, items 1a, 1c, 1e, 1f, 1g, were relabelled as 2a, 2c, 2e, 2f, 2g, respectively in SRD-2. To recapitulate, SRD-2 comprised five items as listed below.

(2a) My role demands me to do what is against my judgment;

(2c) I would like to do things for the organization which are quite different from what I am doing in my role;

(2e) Work in my role conflicts with my values;

(2f)   Work in my role conflicts with my needs;

(2g) Work in my role conflicts with my beliefs.

Reliability Assessment of SRD-2

Reliability assessment of SRD-2 was carried out as done for SRD-1. Result of SRD-2 reliability assessment is furnished in Table-2.

Table-2. Reliability Assessment of SRD 2 (N = 222; Scale CA = 0.778)

Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation (CITC)	Item Deleted Cronbach's Alpha (IDCA)
2a	0.520	0.747
2c	0.392	0.797
2e	0.629	0.713
2f	0.619	0.712
2g	0.634	0.710

SRD-2 has acceptable reliability with scale CA being 0.778. CITC values for items 2a, 2c, 2e, 2f, and 2g are in the acceptable range. IDCA values for items 2a, 2e, 2f, and 2g are lower than scale CA but, the IDCA value for item 2c is higher than scale CA.

Enhancement of SRD-2

It is clear from Table-2 that deletion of item 2c would lead to enhancing the CA of SRD-2 scale from 0.778 to 0.797.

Deletion of Item 2c

Item 2c (I would like to do things for the organization which are quite different from what I am doing in my role) represents a person-role conflict from desire to do things differently. This item was refined from a similar item (item 38) used in ORS framework (If I had full freedom to define my role, I would be doing some things differently from the way I do them now). When there is a lack of interaction between roles, the role occupant has lesser prospects of understanding the rationale of expectations from other role senders. Hence, there is a difference between what the role occupant wants to do and what the role expects him/her to do. It can be seen how item 2c overlaps with Role Isolation. Further, conflict and ambiguity in role expectations may also be perceived by the role occupant when the role occupant wants to do things in one way and the role expects him/her

to do things the other way. Item 2c, therefore, overlaps with Role Expectation Conflict and Role Isolation in addition to overlapping with Role Ambiguity. In their revalidation study of ORS, Srivastav and Pareek (2008) have reported clustering of item 38 on Role Ambiguity and Role Isolation (instead of SRD). Inclusion of item 2c in SRD is a cause for non-emergence of SRD as a clear factor in validation of NORS. Similarly, inclusion of item 38 in ORS is a cause for non-emergence of SRD as a clear factor in revalidation of ORS.

The role occupant's desires to do things differently, originates only from role occupant's judgement about what needs to be done in the role. The spirit of item 2c is, therefore, included in item 2a in SRD-2. Deletion of item 2c from SRD-2, therefore, will not jeopardise the theoretical construct of SRD.

Realization of SRD-3

Item 2c was deleted to realize SRD-3, the enhanced version of SRD-2. To distinguish the third version from the second version, items 2a, 2e, 2f, and 2g were relabelled as 3a, 3e, 3f, and 3g, respectively in SRD-3. To recapitulate, SRD-3 comprised four items as listed below.

(3a) My role demands me to do what is against my judgment;

(3e) Work in my role conflicts with my values;

(3f) Work in my role conflicts with my needs;

(3g) Work in my role conflicts with my beliefs.

Reliability Assessment of SRD-3

Reliability assessment of SRD-3 was carried out as done for SRD-1 and SRD-2. Result of SRD-3 reliability assessment is furnished in Table-3.

SRD-3 has acceptable reliability as the scale CA is 0.797. This is the highest scale CA among different versions of SRD scale. CITC values for items 3a, 3e, 3f, and 3g are in the acceptable range. The IDCA values for items 3a, 3e, 3f, and 3g are lower than scale CA. Hence, there is no scope for enhancing the reliability of SRD-3 by item deletion.

Table-3. Reliability Assessment of SRD-3 (N = 222; Scale CA = 0.797)

Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation (CITC)	Item Deleted Cronbach's Alpha (IDCA)
3a	0.513	0.792
3e	0.650	0.726
3f	0.617	0.742
3g	0.660	0.721

Validity Assessment of SRD-3

Validity assessment was done for SRD-3 in the same way as done earlier for SRD-1 and SRD-2. Table-4 furnishes the result of validity assessment for SRD-3.

Table-4. Validity Assessment of SRD-3 (N = 222)

Item	Factor Loadings
3a	0.708
3e	0.820
3f	0.799
3g	0.828
Eigen Value	2.497
Variance	62.415%

A single factor was obtained with Eigen value of 2.497 explaining variance of 62.415%. Unidimensional nature of SRD and construct validity of SRD was thus proved. Validity assessment of SRD-3 also did not offer any cue for further improvement.

Conclusion

This study on enhancement of framework for measurement of SRD throws light on why SRD did not emerge as a clear factor in revalidation/ validation of ORS and NORS frameworks and what caused the merger of Role Stagnation and Role Erosion.

In the light of results obtained from reliability and validity assessment of SRD-3, it can be finalised as The Enhanced SRD Scale. The enhanced scale is unidimensional, while the original scale (SRD-1) is two-dimensional. The validity of the enhanced scale is acceptable, while the validity of the original scale is unacceptable.

The reliability of the enhanced scale is higher and acceptable (CA = 0.797), while the reliability of the original scale is far lower and unacceptable (CA = 0.323).

To recapitulate, The Enhanced SRD Scale comprises the following direct scoring items, which are scored as 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5, depending on how strongly the item is applicable for respondent's role (1 for never applicable and 5 for always applicable). SRD score for the respondent (in the range of 0-10) is obtained by computing respondent's average for item score, subtracting 1 from the item average, and multiplying the remainder by 2.5.

1. My role demands me to do what is against my judgment;
2. Work in my role conflicts with my values;
3. Work in my role conflicts with my needs;
4. Work in my role conflicts with my beliefs.

Recommendations

1. Enhanced self-role distance scale with higher reliability and validity presented in this study can be used for identifying roles that poorly integrate with their occupants. Such roles can be redesigned for higher role effectiveness possibly through the use of Process Based Role Analysis and Design (Srivastav, 2012).

2. Further research may be conducted on SRD, its determinants, and correlates in different types of organizations across age groups, hierarchical levels, qualification levels, functional groups, and genders. Individual and organizational strategies for dealing with SRD may be emphasized for wellbeing and effectiveness at both levels.

3. All the constituent scales of NORS may be re-examined for possible improvements on the lines of SRD. Improved NORS framework with improved constituent scales may be revalidated.

References

Bowling, A. (1997). *Research Methods in Health.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bryman, A., & Cramer, D. (1997). *Quantitative Data Analysis with SPSS for Windows.* London: Routledge.

Driver, M. (2003). Using Brechtian ideas and theatrical practices to reconceptualise role distance and facilitate learning in organizations. Tamara *Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science, 2*(4), 82-93.

Ferketich, S. (1991). Focus on psychometrics: Aspects of item analysis. *Research in Nursing and Health, 14* (2), 165–168.

Ferguson, E., & Cox, T. (1993). Exploratory factor analysis: A user's guide. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 1*(2), 84–94.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Encounters: Two Studies in Sociology of Interaction.* Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merill.

Gordon, J. (2004). *Pfeiffer Classic Inventories, Questionnaires, and Surveys for Training and Development.* San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Jack, B., & Clarke, A. (1998). The purpose and use of questionnaires in research. *Professional Nurse, 14,* 176-179.

Kahn, R.L, Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R.P., Snoek, J.D., & Rosenthal, R.A. (1964). *Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Kline, P. (1993). *The Handbook of Psychological Testing.* London: Routledge.

Oppenheim, A.N. (1992). *Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement.* London: Pinter.

Pareek, U. (1982). *Organizational Role Stress Scales: Manual.* Ahmedabad, India: Navin Publications.

Pareek, U. (1983). *Organizational Role Stress.* In L.D. Goldstein, & J.W. Pfeiffer (Eds.). The 1983 annual (115-123), San Diego, CA: University Associates.

Pareek, U. (1993). *Making Organizational Roles Effective.* New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited.

Pareek, U. (2002). *Training Instruments in HRD and OD* (2nd Ed. pp. 477-487). New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited.

Pestonjee, D.M. (1999). *Stress and Coping: The Indian Experience.* New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Priest J., McColl, B.A., Thomas, L., & Bond, S. (1995). Developing and refining a new measurement tool. *Nurse Researcher, 2,* 69–81.

Rattray, J., & Jones, M.C. (2007). Essential elements of questionnaire design and development. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 16*(2), 234–243. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2702.2006.01573.x

Santos, J.R.A. (1999). Cronbach's alpha: A tool for assessing the reliability of scales. *The Journal of Extension, 37*(2), 1-5. http://www.joe.org/joe/1999april/tt3.php/. Accessed December 14, 2014.

Srivastav, A.K. (2007). Stress in organizational roles - Individual and organizational implications. *Icfaian Journal of Management Research, 6*(12), 64-72.

Srivastav, A.K., & Pareek, U. (2008). Measurement of stress in organizational roles: Revalidating the framework. In E. Biech (Ed.). *The 2008 Pfeiffer Annual: Training* (187-208). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Srivastav, A.K. (2009). New organizational role stress (NORS) scale. In E. Biech (Ed.). *The 2009 Pfeiffer Annual: Training* (157-170). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Srivastav, A. K. (2012). Process based role analysis and design. In E. Biech (Ed.). *The 2012 Pfeiffer annual: Consulting* (233-250). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Srivastav, A.K. (2015). Underload in organizational roles – Development and validation of framework for measurement. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 41*(3), 34-42.

Stryker, A., & Statham, A. (1985). Symbolic interaction and role theory. In G. Lindsey & L. Aronsen (Eds.). *Handbook of Social Psychology* (3rd Ed., pp. 311-378). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Avinash Kumar Srivastav, Organization Development Researcher & Consultant, Bengaluru, India. Email: drkumarioc@hotmail.com