

Level Of Role Stress Among Nationalized Bank Employees: A Case Study Of Tiruchirappalli District

K. Saravanan¹ and K. MuthuLakshmi²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Bishop Heber College (Autonomous), Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli-620017, Tamil Nadu, India

²Associate Professor, Department of Commerce, Bishop Heber College (Autonomous), Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli-620017, Tamil Nadu, India

Email Id: saravanakarnan@yahoo.in

ABSTRACT: This paper examines the level of role stress among nationalized bank employees, Tiruchirappalli District. The Main aim of the study is to find out various reasons for the role stress level of bank employees. This study analysed that the bank employees faced stress in their working area due to their work pressure and inter personal conflicts. The results of the study it is clear that the nationalized bank employees as a whole are found to be more than half high level of role stress and less than half of the bank employees the low level of role stress. Role Stress scale was developed by Agarwal and Ramaswami (1993). Sample bank employees were selected by using simple random sampling method because of easy accessibility and affordability analysed by using statistical package of social sciences.

Keywords: Stress, Role stress, Workplace stress, Bank employees, Nationalized bank;

INTRODUCTION

Meaning of stress

The word, —stress| has been derived from the Latin Word, —Stringere| which means to draw tight. The term is used to refer to hardship, strain, adversity or affliction. Various expressions have been synonymous used by way of stress such as anxiety, frustration, conflict, pressure, and so on. Every human being has his/her own understanding of stress. Because all require of adaptability do evoke the stress experience.

Stress is simply the body's non – specific response to any demand made on it. Stress is not by definition synonymous with nervous tension or anxiety. Stress provides the means to express talents and pursue happiness. It can also cause exhaustion and illness, either physical or psychological, heart attack or accidents. The important thing to remember about stress it that certain forms are normal and essential. The result of continuing stress may because disruption is one or more of the following areas of health, physical, emotional, spiritual and social.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Davis and Newstrom (1985): Stress is a condition of strain on one's emotion's thinking process, and Physical condition. When it is excessive, it can threaten one's ability to cope with the environment, _stress' is the general term applied to the pressures people feel in life. As a result of these pressures, employees develop various symptoms of stress that can harm their job performance. People who are stressed may become nervous and develop chronic worry. They are easily provoked to anger and are unable to relax. They may be uncooperative or use alcohol or drugs excessively. These conditions occur from other causes also, but they are common symptoms of stress.

Mathew (1993): Stress has a variety of meaning to people in the workplace. To the production manager in a chemical plant, it may be the tension of missing the shipping date of a large order for a major customer. To the business executive, it may be frustration associated with the inability to acquire sufficient short-term loans from banks to cover the operating needs, and so on.

In the words of Szilagyi and Wallace, stress is an internal experience that creates a psychological or physiological imbalance within an individual and results from factors in the external environment, the organisation or the individual.

D'Souza (1993): Today's leaders not only live and work at a faster pace but also must also deal with uncertainty and change. They need effective methods for coping with the kind of stress that affects anyone in leadership positions. People popularly identify managing directors or chief executive officers as those most susceptible to stress and disease. However, people at all levels of management find themselves exposed to comparable pressures.

Robbins (2005): Most of us are aware that employee stress is an increasing problem in organisations. Friends tells us they're stressed out from greater workloads and having to work longer hours because of downsizing at their company. Parents talk about the lack of job stability in today's world and reminisce about a time when a job with a large company implied lifetime security. We read surveys in which employees complain about the stress created in trying to balance work and family responsibilities. In this section, we'll look at the causes and consequences of stress, and then consider what individuals and organisations can do to reduce it.

Jha (1988) in his study on Jobs Stress and Employee Strain in India Executives' explains the pattern of stress and strain in three work groups, namely production, personnel and data-processing divisions in an organisation. Results indicated that job future ambiguity had negative effect on job satisfaction in all the three groups. The patter of stress in the three groups was different among different levels of management. Among different levels of managers, the diddle level managers had more role ambiguity than others did.

Reddy and Ramamurthi (1991) in their study on The Relation between Stress Experience on the Job-Age, Personality and General ability' analysed the influence of age, personality and general ability of the individual in the perception of stress. It was found that only age influenced the perception of stress. There was only very limited contribution of personality and general ability of the individual to the intensity of stress experience of the individual.

Singh and Sehgal (1995) in their study on Men and Women in Transition: Patterns of Stress, Strain and Social Relations' highlight the patterns of stress and strain among men and women as well as single- and dual-career couples. They found that male and female managers did not differ significantly on various stress dimensions. Difference in gender was however found in strains. Women were characterised by anxiety, whereas men exhibited more symptoms of somatic problems comparing the single and dual couples. It was found that male managers with working spouses experienced higher workload than managers whose spouses were not working. In strains also single career male managers had less irritability that dual career male managers, and overall single career male managers had better psychological well-being than others. Working women managers had better physical well-being that their working husband did but had poorer psychological well-being.

Shah (2003) in his study on Role Stress in the Indian Industry: A Study of Banking Organisations' describes adequate explanation of stress, and its nature, dimensions, causes, manifestations and coping up strategies. It was observed that most of the employees experience medium to high level of stress at work. Role stagnation, inadequacy of role authority and role

erosion is comparatively high-rated dimensions of job stress. The study further reveals that employees belonging to the clerical cadre relatively experience more stress on most of the dimensions.

Berhem *et al* (2004) in their study on ‘A New Model for Work Stress Patterns’ describe that the role of ambiguity is the main source of work stress and self-knowledge as the main coping strategy to overcome work stress. Work stress is believed to be one of the most important factors affecting productivity.

Kang (2005) in his study on ‘Stressors among Medical Representatives: An Empirical investigations’ tries to investigate the various stressors related with the job of a medical representative. A sample of 140 medical representatives was taken for the purpose of the present study. The results showed interference of job in personal life, unsupportive colleagues, work load and continuous pressure for improved performance have been found to be causing stress among the medical representatives.

Anitha Devi (2006-2007) in her study on ‘Occupational Stress: A comparative Study of Worker in different Occupations’ describes identifying the degree of life stress and role stress experienced by professional women. It also studies the effect of life stress and role stress on various demographic variables like age, experience and income. For the purpose of study, 180 women professionals (six different occupations) were chose. It was found that science and technology professionals and doctors experienced significantly greater life stress and role stress.

Dhanalakshmi (2008) in her study on ‘Actors Predicting Stress of Employees in a Public Transport Corporation’ measures the level of stress of the transport corporation employees and also studies the factors that could predict stress. It is found that the employees experience moderate level of stress. Further, stress is predicted by working environment and safety and security.

Sankpal, Negi, and Vashishtha (2010) the sector to which their organization belongs can also be one of the elements of role stress for employees. Postulating the difference in the organizational role stress across public and private sector bank employees discovered that private bank employees experience higher organizational role stress than their counterparts in the public sector. These findings make studying the impact of occupational role stress in the banking sector in Johannesburg imperative because this research could reveal factors leading to stress in the local South African context and inform current and future policy formulation.

OBJECTIVES

1. To understand the level of role stress of the nationalized bank employees.
2. To analyze the factors influencing job stress among the nationalized bank employees.

HYPOTHESES

1. There is a significant difference between type of family of the respondents and role stress.
2. There is a significant difference between nativity of the respondents and role stress.
3. There is a significant relationship between the age of the respondents and role stress.
4. There is a significant relationship between years of work experience of the respondents and role stress.
5. There is a significant relationship between monthly income of the respondents and role stress.
6. There is a significant association between sex of the respondents and role stress.
7. There is a significant association between marital status of the respondents and role stress.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The Study on Role Stress among Employees in Nationalized Bank at Tiruchirappalli District. Hence the researcher adopted the descriptive research design for the study. The present study is based on both primary and secondary data. Primary data have been collected by conducting from employees of nationalized bank in Tiruchirappalli district in the state of Tamil Nadu. Secondary data have been collected from books, journals, newspapers, periodicals, reports and internet. Administering Role Stress scale was constructed and standardized by Agarwal and Ramaswamy (1993). The first part of the questionnaire was related to personal details of bank employees, second part relates with measuring of role stress among the bank employees with the help of Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS). Role stress scale was developed on the lines of the 5 point Likert summated rating scale in order to recognize the common strategies used to overcome stress. The item responses are to be elicited on a Likert scale that range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

SAMPLING DESIGN

A sample of 100 bank employees was taken to meet the sample adequacy, for conducting factor analysis number of sample nationalized bank employees for the study were selected by using simple random sampling method because of easy accessibility and affordability.

ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATION

Table: 1 Level of Various Dimensions of Role Stress

Sl. No.	Dimensions	Number of Respondent n=100	Percentage
1.	Role Ambiguity		
	Low	41	41
	High	59	59
2.	Role Conflict		
	Low	31	31
	High	69	69
3.	Overall level of Role Stress		
	Low	36	36
	High	64	64

The above table represents that more than half (59%) of the respondents perceived levels of role stress in the dimension of role ambiguity is high followed by more than half (69%) of the respondents perceived levels of role stress in the dimension of role conflict is also high. While summing up more than half (64%) of the respondents perceived levels of overall role stress is high and (36%) of the respondents level of overall role stress is low.

H1: There is a significant difference between type of family of the respondents and role stress.

Table: 2 Z Test between Types of Family of the Respondents and Role Stress

Sl. No.	Various dimension of Role Stress	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Statistical Inference
1.	Role Ambiguity Joint Family Nuclear Family	45 55	17.800 16.709	5.383 5.849	$z=0.970$ $P>0.05$ Not significant
2.	Role Conflict Joint Family Nuclear Family	45 55	29.511 27.109	8.409 8.234	$z=1.437$ $P>0.05$ Not significant
3.	Overall level of Role Stress Joint Family Nuclear Family	45 55	47.311 43.818	13.141 13.480	$z=1.304$ $P>0.05$ Not significant

From the above table it is evident that there is no significant difference between type of family of the respondents and with regard to various dimensions and overall level of role stress of the respondents. It explains that the type of the family has no influence on the role stress among the bank employees.

H2: There is a significant difference between nativity of the respondents and role stress.

Table: 3 'F' Test: One Way Analysis of Variance among the Respondents with different nativity of Role Stress

Sl. No.	Various dimension of Role Stress	Sum of Squares	Mean	Mean Square	Statistical Inference
1.	Role ambiguity Between Groups Within Groups Total	11.714 3140.286 3152.000	G1= 17.000 G2=17.714 G3=18.000	5.857 32.374	F=0.181 $P>0.05$ Not Significant
2.	Role Conflict Between Groups Within Groups Total	85.587 6829.803 6915.390	G1= 28.149 G2=29.191 G3=24.600	42.794 70.410	F=0.608 $P>0.05$ Not Significant
3.	Overall level of Role Stress Between Groups Within Groups Total	91.416 17620.374 17711.790	G1= 45.149 G2=46.905 G3=42.600	45.708 181.653	F=0.252 $P>0.05$ Not Significant

G1= Urban G2= Semi Urban G3= Rural

The above table states that there is no significant difference among the respondents of difference nativity background and with regard to various dimensions and overall level of role stress of the respondents. It explains that the various areas of living of the respondents have no influence on the role stress among the bank employees.

H3: There is a significant relationship between the age of the respondents and role stress.

Table:4 Karl Pearson' Co-Efficient of Correlation between Age of the Respondents and Role Stress.

Sl. No	Various dimension of Role Stress	Correlation Value	Statistical Inference
1.	Role Ambiguity Age	-0.096	P>0.05 Not Significant
2.	Role Conflict Age	-0.103	P>0.05 Not Significant
3.	Overall level of Role Stress Age	-0.074	P>0.05 Not Significant

The above table illustrates that there is no significant relationship between age of the respondents and with regard to various dimensions and overall level of role stress. The correlation value shows that there is negative relationship between the age of the respondent and the role stress level among the bank employees. It explains that age of the respondents has no influence on the role stress level among the bank employees.

H4: There is a significant relationship between years of work experience of the respondents and role stress.

Table: 5 Karl Pearson's Co-Efficient of Correction between Years of work Experience of the Respondents and Role Stress

Sl. No	Various dimension of Role Stress	Correlation Value	Statistical Inference
1.	Role Ambiguity Experience	-0.041	P>0.05 Not Significant
2.	Role Conflict Experience	-0.075	P>0.05 Not Significant
3.	Overall level of Role Stress Experience	-0.064	P>0.05 Not Significant

The above table shows that there is no significant relationship between years of experience of the respondents and with regard to various dimensions and overall level of role stress. It explains that working experience of the respondents has no influence on the role stress level among the bank employees. The correlation value shows that there is negative relationship between the work experience of the respondent and the role stress level among the bank employees.

H5: There is a significant relationship between monthly income of the respondents and role stress.

Table: 6 Karl Pearson's co-efficient of correction between monthly income of the respondents and Role Stress

Sl. No	Various dimension of Role Stress	Correlation Value	Statistical Inference
1.	Role Ambiguity Monthly Income	0.008	P>0.05 Not Significant
2.	Role Conflict Monthly Income	-0.058	P>0.05 Not Significant
3.	Overall level of Role Stress Monthly Income	-0.033	P>0.05 Not Significant

The above table interprets that there is no significant relationship between monthly income of the respondent and with regard to various dimensions and overall level of role stress. Hence null hypothesis accepted. It explains that the monthly income of the respondents has no influence on the role stress level among the bank employees. The correlation value shows that there is negative relationship between the monthly income of the respondent and the overall level of role stress among the bank employees.

H6: There is a significant association between sex of the respondents and role stress.

Table: 7 Association between sex of the respondents and Role stress

Sl. No.	Various dimension of Role Stress	Sex		Statistical Inference
		Male n=57	Female n=43	
1.	Role Ambiguity Low High	24 33	17 26	$\chi^2 = 0.067$ dt = 1 P>0.05 Not Significant
2.	Role Conflict Low High	18 39	13 30	$\chi^2 = 0.021$ dt = 1 P>0.05 Not Significant
3.	Overall level of Role Stress Low High	21 36	15 28	$\chi^2 = 0.041$ dt = 1 P>0.05 Not Significant

The above table construes that there is no significant association between sex of the respondents and with regard to various dimensions and overall level of role stress. Hence null hypothesis is accepted. It explains that the gender of the respondents has no influence on the role stress level among the bank employees.

H7: There is a significant association between marital status of the respondents and role stress.

Table: 8 Association between the respondents by marital status of role stress

Sl. No.	Various dimension of Role Stress	Marital Status		Statistical Inference
		Married n=82	Single n=18	
1.	Role Ambiguity Low High	33 49	8 10	$\chi^2 = 0.108$ dt = 1 P>0.05 Not Significant
2.	Role Conflict Low High	25 57	6 12	$\chi^2 = 0.056$ dt = 1 P>0.05 Not Significant
3.	Overall level of Role Stress Low High	29 53	7 11	$\chi^2 = 0.080$ dt = 1 P>0.05 Not Significant

The above table indicates that there is no significant association between marital status of the respondents and with regard to various dimensions and overall level of role stress. Hence null hypothesis is accepted. This given an explanation that marital status of the respondents does not contribute to the role stress in this study.

CONCLUSION

This study was conducted at Nationalized Bank employees in Tiruchirappalli district. The Main aim of the study is to find out various reasons for the role stress level of bank employees. This study analysed that the bank employees faced stress in their working area due to their work pressure and inter personal conflicts. The results of the study it is clear that the nationalized bank employees as a whole are found to be more than half high level of role stress and less than half of the bank employees the low level of role stress. The next finding of this study revealed that there is no significant difference among the various areas of living of the bank employees with regard to the level of role stress. Further, from the result it is clear that there is no significant relationship between the age of the respondents and role stress. Further, from the result it is clear that there is no significant relationship between Years of Work Experience of the respondents with regard to overall level of role stress. Further, from the result it is clear that there is no significant relationship between monthly income of the respondent and level of role stress. It explains that the monthly income of the respondents has no influence on the role stress level among the bank employees. Stress in the work place has become the black plague of the present century.

REFERENCES

- 1) Beehr, t., & newman, j. (1978). Job Stress, employee health, and organizational effectiveness: a facet analysis, model, and literature review. *Personnel Psychology*, 31(4), 665-699. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1978.tb02118.x>
- 2) Borg, M., Riding, R., & Falzon, J. (1991). Stress in Teaching: a study of occupational stress and its determinants, job satisfaction and career commitment among primary schoolteachers. *Educational Psychology*, 11(1), 59-75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0144341910110104>
- 3) D'Souza, A. (1993). *Leadership Book*. Mumbai City: J.N.Jarakkatt.
- 4) Davis, K., & Newstrom, J. (1985). *Human behavior at work: organizational behavior*. New Delhi: McGraw-Hill.
- 5) Devi,A. (2007). Occupational stress: a comparative study of women in different occupations. *Trajan*, 35(1), 61-73.
- 6) Dhanalakshmi, R. (2008). Factors predicting stress of employees in a public transport corporation. *SMART Journal Of Business Management Studies*, 4(1), 59—62.
- 7) Jha, S. (1988). Job stress and employee strain in Indian executives. *Work & Stress*, 2(3), 233-237. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02678378808259171>.
- 8) Kang, L. (2005). Stressors among medical representatives: an empirical investigation. *Indian Journal Of Industrial Relations*, 40(3), 336—356.
- 9) Mathew, M. (1993). *Organization theory and behavior book*. Jaipur City: S.K. Parnami.
- 10) Reddy, V. S., & Ramamurti, P. V. (1991). The relation between stress experience on the job-age, personality and general ability. *Psychological Studies*, 36(2), 87-95.
- 11) Robbins, S. (2005). *Organizational behavior*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.

- 12) Sargent, T., & Hannum, E. (2005). Keeping Teachers Happy: Job Satisfaction among Primary School Teachers in Rural Northwest China. *Comparative Education Review*, 49(2), 173-204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/428100>
- 13) Selye, H. (1974). *Stress without distress*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- 14) Selye, H. (1984). *The stress of life*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 15) Shah, A. (2003). Role stress in the Indian industry: A study of banking organizations. *Indian Journal Of Industrial Relations*, 38(3), 381—396.
- 16) Sidin, M., & S, K. (2004). A new model for work stress patterns. *Asian Academy Of Management Journal*, 9(1), 53—77.
- 17) Singh, A., & Sahgal, P. (1995). Men and Women in Transition : Patterns of Stress, Strain, and Social Relations. *Vikalpa*, 20(1), 13-24.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0256090919950102>
- 18) Sorenson, H. (1964). *Psychology in education*. New York [u.a.]: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
