



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS, MANAGEMENT AND ALLIED SCIENCES (IJBMAS)

A Peer Reviewed International Research Journal

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE WORK STRESS AMONG THE MANAGERIAL EXECUTIVES IN SERVICE SECTOR

Dr. V.RAMANUJAM¹, M.RANI²

¹Assistant Professor & ²Research Scholar

Bharathiar School of Management and Entrepreneur Development
Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India



ABSTRACT

Stress refers to adaptive response to a situation that is perceived as challenging or threatening to the person's well being. The service sectors had undergone rapid and striking changes like policy changes due to globalization and liberalization, increased competition due to the entry of more private and foreign players, downsizing, introduction of new technologies etc. Due to these changes, the employees in the service sectors are experiencing high levels of stress. The article attempts to find the factors influencing work stress and its differences among the managers executives in three service sectors namely hospital, hotel and bank in Nilgiri district. A sample of 490 respondents was taken across the three service sector. The analysis revealed that individuals in three sectors namely hospital, bank and tourism consider organizational climate factors, interpersonal relationship, work autonomy, work load work feedback and role conflict are the important factor that causes stress (mean value 3.53 to 3.9). Hence organization needs to focus on these stress creating factors and try to minimize or overcome the same.

Key words - Work Stress, Organizational Climate, Interpersonal Climate and Role Conflict

INTRODUCTION

Work stress can be defined as a mismatch between an individual and their environment. In general, the higher the imbalance between external demands and an individual's abilities, the higher the level of stress that will be experienced.. Some of this research revealed that high work stress lead to low job performance. However, a few studies found an inverted U-shaped relationship or a positive relationship between work stress and job performance. Wu et al. asserted that a possible explanation for these inconsistent results might be existing variables to moderate the effect of stress on performance. A broad range of variables have been considered as potential moderators such as emotional intelligence, organizational commitment, and supportive leadership. In recent years, more attention has been drawn to stress and its effects on organizations. Although in medical science, the causes of stress and its impacts have long been investigated; however, it is a recent debate on organizational performance. Despite the idea that stress is somewhat beneficial and some stress is essential to activate people, however, when stress is discussed, the focus is more on its side effects

and consequences. Therefore, stress has great impact on organization members' performance and activities. Managers, staff, and clients, under the influence of certain mental states, behave in such a way that its reflection on organization's efficiency is tangible. Stress has physical effects and thereby damages the organization. Acute stress destroys the organization's human resources and defeats the purposes of the organization. Stress is one of the essential features of mental health of the ever changing and dynamic world. Stress has been viewed as a complex and dynamic transaction between individuals and their environments (Evans William and Kelly Billy, 2004). It is a situation which will force a person to deviate from normal functioning due to the change (i.e., disrupt or enhance) in his or her psychological and/or physiological condition (Beehr and Newman, 1978). It is also a factor which potentially hinders organizational effectiveness by contributing to lower employee performance (McGrath, 1976) and to employee withdrawal behaviour such as absenteeism and turnover (Lyons, 1971; Hrebaniak and Alutto, 1972).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Velayutham and Chandru, 2012 identified six stressor, management relationship with others, workload pressure, homework interface, role ambiguity, performance pressure in a study among the private hospital employees of south india. Kareem et al, 2011 in a study across the Female nurses of public sector hospitals, Peshawar found that excessive work load, unhealthy and dangerous working environment, insufficient resources, role conflict, lack of professional respect, lack of promotional chances, inadequate pay and benefits, domestic and marital problems are the various source of stressors. Ahmed et al, 2013, studied that continuous poor performance, unfair friend treatment, heavy workload uncertain about job after graduation, high competition among students are the major stress causing factors among the graduate in management students in Pakistan.

Shankar and keerthi 2010 found that technological changes, changes in family life no hygienic safe working environment group cohesiveness, too many bosses no appreciation from managers are the stress causing factors in the low level employees of hotel saveraChennai. Ashfaq et al, 2011 in a study conducted among the R& D Audit and account officers in Pakistan identified that lack of control over work, defective evaluation system, lack of support at work, no promotion, low remuneration work conflict are the important stressors effecting the officers. Suri and Arora, 2009 studied that the sources of stress are work and peer pressure, competitive working environment. Demanding for high quality of task work deadline among the Middle level managers of KrishakBharthi Cooperative Limited (KRIBHCO), a public sector organization and DABAR India Ltd, a private sector organization, India. Anantharaman et al, 2013 studied that the factors contributing to stress among the Inspectors, Sub-inspectors, Head constables are inadequate salary and facilities pressure from inside and outside department providing security to VIPs and public meetings.

2.1.1 WORK STRESS

Workers who suffer from higher level of work stress are more probable of being less motivated, less safe at job, physically unhealthy, and less productive. Their organizations likewise are more averse to succeed in competitive market. There are different sources of job stress and its mode of affecting people is also different. According to the findings of Pawar and Rathod (2007) there is adverse association between stress at job and job satisfaction amongst naval force trainees. They further found that the key determinants of job stress are less autonomy and more insecurity of job. A study was conducted by Jamal (1984) to inspect the connection amongst stress at job and job performance among blue-collar workers and managers. Stress was defined as the outcome of an employee resulted from workplace environment that employee perceives as unsecured.

Vivian and Thompson (1996) found the sources of stress through psychometric properties of the Occupational Stress Indicator (OSI). These sources can be classified under six dimensions: factors intrinsic to the job, managerial role, inter-personal relationships with employees, career and achievement, home-work interface and organizational structure and climate. Behestifar and Nazarian

(2013) worked on stress in the health sector and showed that occupational stress can be both at individual and organizational levels. Individual level stress can lead to unwanted feelings and behavior like job dissatisfaction or low motivation, physiological diseases like high blood pressure or cholesterol and psychological diseases like depression or aggressiveness; and at the organizational level, consequences of occupational stress can be categorized under organizational symptoms like poor morale of workers, low quality products, poor relationships with clients, etc.) and organizational costs (like cost of reduced productivity, replacement cost, sick pay, etc). Westman and Eden (1992) dealt with stress and performance at the individual level. They considered objective performance measures in occupational stress research. Janice (2000) proved that organizational health, as a composite factor, contributed significantly to job satisfaction, which is an indicator of job performance

Job performance can be viewed as an activity in which an individual is able to accomplish the task assigned to him/ her successfully, subject to the normal constraints of reasonable utilization of the available resources. There are four types of relationships between the measures of job stress and job performance (Jamal M. 2007). One is a negative linear relationship, when productivity decreases with stress (distress). Productivity can also increase as a consequence of stress, thereby implying a positive relationship between the two. Thirdly, there could be a U shaped or a curvilinear relationship wherein, mild stress could increase the productivity initially up to a peak and then it declines as the person descends into a state of distress. The Yerkes and Dodson (1908) suggest that a higher stress leads to a higher job performance for simple jobs, whereas lower stress is active in affecting highly complicated jobs. This means that a moderate stress, and not an extraordinary stress, could be good to improve an individual's job performance.

2.1.2 ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

The vast majority of occupational stress research and theory building over the years has been focused at the individual level of analysis. Researchers and theorists have been interested in whether individuals who experience job-related stressors also tend to experience physical or psychological detriments as a result. It is just as important, however, to examine whether the experience of occupational stress results in decreased organizational effectiveness. One reason that may explain the paucity of research in this area is the difficulty associated with defining and measuring organizational effectiveness (Jex&Crossley, 2005). Begley and Czajka (1993) who distributed questionnaires comprised of items measuring organizational commitment, stress, job satisfaction, intention to quit, and depression at two points in time to 155 mental health professionals in a large Midwestern city. The authors found that organizational commitment moderated the relationship between occupational stress and job displeasure (comprised of job dissatisfaction, intention to quit, and work-related irritation) during periods of organizational turmoil.

More recently, Leong, Furnham, and Cooper (1996) investigated organizational commitment as a moderator of stress outcomes in a sample of 106 professional and administrative personnel in a public-sector organization. Responses to four measures (Occupational Stress Indicator, Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, intention to quit, demographic questionnaire) showed that stress was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, poor mental health, poor physical health, and intention to quit.

Nevertheless, there was no significant correlation between the participants' commitment to the job and any of these four outcome variables. Thus, Leong et al. concluded that their study "failed to show any substantial moderating effects of organizational commitment on the stress-outcome relationships"

Ekundayo (2014) showed that organizational stress should be dealt at the management level and not at individual level as this will lead to increased productivity. Some of the suggested ways are providing work with some personal choice, including employees in the decision-making processes which might affect them, giving rewards for achieving targets, etc. Pretus and Kleiner (2003) found a threefold approach to managing workplace stress. This includes assessing the workplace to identify

factors which could cause damaging stress, implementation of measures to lessen the amount of stress, and eventual monitoring of the process Donovan and Kleiner (1994) studied effective stress management in which the ways of stress management are analyzed through a thorough planning process such as estimating employee stress level, assessing employees' adaptive coping abilities, identifying causes of stress, etc. Bradley and Sutherland (1994) found that an organization would benefit from counselling within social services in comparison with counseling independent of social services, when it comes to stress management counselling. They also emphasized the significance of recognizing and dealing with some of the barriers in reducing stress in an organization.

2.1.3 ROLE CONFLICT

Role conflict, role overload and role ambiguity are three major components of role stress (Cooper and Marshall, 1976; Singh and Dubey, 2011), and they have been abundantly investigated in the extant literature (Brown and Peterson, 1994; Jackson and Schuler, 1985). Role ambiguity occurs when there is an ambiguity in the role of a person in the organization or when the person does not know what to do or how to perform his or her role. Role conflict occurs when employees are confronted with expectations for different roles, such as when two roles should be performed simultaneously or when performing one role prevents performing the other one. Role overload increases when the fulfillment of a role becomes impossible for the individual because of time, energy or resources. All these three elements, role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload, are significant variables influencing the functions of organizations. This may cause discontent, a lack of confidence in the organization, tense interpersonal relations, low productivity, low performance, low achievement and fewer interpersonal relationships (Widmer, 1993).

Role Space Conflict

It refers to conflicts between the self, a person's role and other roles occupied by him. Role stress may take various forms namely self- role distance, role stagnation and inter-role distance

Role Set Conflict

While role space conflicts arise from the incompatibility between the self and the roles played by the person, role set conflicts denote in-compatibilities amongst the varying expectations that 'significant others' have from the role incumbent. Among the important role set conflicts are the role ambiguity, role expectation conflict, role overload, role erosion, role inadequacy, personal inadequacy and role isolation

2.1.4. STRESS AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

Self-reported work stress is also been connected to positive outcomes. Stress can create a competitiveness that requires positive change to get results (Marino, 1997; Merelman, 1997). In addition, certain stressors, like time constraints, can bring positive results and can be worth any hardship for the employee (McCall, Lombardo, & Morrison, 1988). Scheck, Kinicki, and Davy (1995) cite that these positive stressors are events that "produce state of challenge, coupled with disruptive pleasure" (Bhagat, McQuaid, Lindholm, and Segovis, 1985). Jamal (1985), in a study of 227 middle managers and 283 blue collar workers in a large Canadian manufacturing firm, found negative effects of role overload. In contrast, in a study of 181 female secretaries from the University of South Florida, no relationship between the secretaries' reports of workload and their supervisors' performance ratings was found, but the secretaries' reports of constraints and role ambiguity were negatively related to performance (Spector, Dwyer, & Jex, 1988).

2.2 RESEARCH GAP

Adverse individual outcomes that have been reported include poor psychological and mental health outcomes, physical disease and detrimental behavioral outcomes. While the stress literature has grown in recent decades, most of the research investigating outcomes has been limited to the individual level of analysis that focuses mainly on their behavioral aspects that are indirectly detrimental to their job performance. Only few study were focused to identify the factors in the service sector . Jyothsna & Adinarayana (2014) explored the probable differences between public and

private employees and also between three service sectors. The current study will address this gap in the literature by examining the differences and/or similarities of employees stress among the selected service sectors in Nilgiri District and important factors influencing stress among the managerial executives .

2.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The rapid technological changes .increased competition due to globalization ,the rise of the consumerism , government policies internal competition developed to maintain quality and price , social change taking at faster pace, structural change in employment changes in sector distribution has brought a great challenge to the employees . The alienation and dehumanization effect of repetitive and monotonous task in wake of technological phenomenon ,effective utilization of human resource under this technological environment is the prime challenge for the organization .The ability to create positive effect for the customers from stake holders perspective has become a critical success factor for any business. .The employees suffer due to increase in work load, responsibilities and also non-fulfillment of existing vacancies They are facing working hour stress, organizational stress, family related stress etc. This condition lead to extreme anxiety/distress, physical and mental diseases, leading to the deterioration in quality of life and service provision.

Each and every industry ,experience stress according to the market demand and changing environment .But there exists a common phenomenon that stress affect the service quality and reputation of the organization . Hence this study is undertaken to explore the differences and/or similarities of employee stress among the selected service sectors .

2.4. SCOPE AND NEED OF THE STUDY

The study has focused the administrative executives and managers working in general type of private hospitals, banks and Tourism (Hotel and Travel Agencies) in Nilgiris District, Tamilnadu. The study focused the variables namely organizational climate, interpersonal relations and work related stressors and work conflict . This research is need of the hour because of the nature of employment in the selected study area, Nilgiris district. The individuals who got employment in this hilly area are not staying back for a long time due to various external factors that create stress. Hence, the organizations need to focus on developing a good climate, conducive place to work and try to minimize stress. The present research identifies the stress factors which the management need to focus for retention of people.

2.5. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The present research attempt to answer the following questions;

- What are the important factors that affect stress of managers and administrative executives working in select service sectors (hospital, bank and tourism) in Nilgiris district?
- Whether there exists difference in stress and job performance based on gender, marital status, of individuals in these sectors?

2.6. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To identify the factors that influence work stress in service sector.
2. To compare the perception of individuals working in various sectors towards source of stress.
3. To examine the differences based on demographic variables and level of stress.

2.7. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The following were the hypotheses of the study:

H₀₁: There is no relation between stress and the group of respondents based on gender and marital status .

H₀₂:There is no relation between stress and the group of respondents based on qualification .H₀₃ : There is a no relationship among the factors of Work stress .

2.8. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. The survey was limited to the three select sectors in Nilgiris district and that means the results might not be applicable to all elsewhere.
2. The study is focused on a specific set of causes of work stress on select category of employees and hence the study does not necessarily apply to all workers.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Sampling Design: The target population for this research was managers and administrative executives associated with three sectors; hospitals, bank and tourism of Nilgiris district. The general types of hospitals were randomly selected for study from the list of hospitals obtained from District Statistical Handbook of Nilgiris District (22 Hospitals - 10 in Udthagamandalam, 5 in Coonoor, 3 in Kothagiri and 4 in other places). Similarly, from the list of 10 private banks, 200 executives were targeted. The individuals in tourism sector were drawn from 28 hotels registered under The Nilgiri Hotel and Restaurant Association and the registered tour operators of the district. Accordingly about 600 respondents were targeted by proportionate random sampling method out of which, 490 valid responses were received (Hospital - 165, Bank - 174 and Tourism - 151) with an overall strike rate of 81.67 percent.

3.2. Questionnaire Development and Reliability:

For the purpose of the research, a 60 item questionnaire was developed that contains questions on stress related factors were assessed based on 6 factors namely Organizational Climate (5 items), Interpersonal Relationships (8 items), Work Autonomy (6 items), Workload (6 items), Work Feedback (6 items) and Role Conflict (8 items). The employee job performance was assessed based on task performance (8 items), conditional performance (13 items) and job avoidance (3 items). The respondents are asked to rate all the statements on a 5 point scale (5 - Strongly Agree).

3.3. Sampling Techniques and Sampling Procedure

Three prominent service sectors of Nilgiris district were chosen for the research. The individuals associated with these sectors who are in and involved in the managerial role were chosen as the population of the research. Accordingly, in the hospital sector, doctors working in private hospitals who is in-charge of the respective departments playing the administrative/managerial role were selected. Similarly, the branch managers, officers/ executive in-charge of operations, loan and credit services of private banks were selected. The managers and assistant managers of hotels and restaurants were chosen from the tourism sector. The proportionate type of simple random sampling technique was adopted and accordingly 600 sample was targeted across three sectors; hospitals, bank and tourism. The hospitals which are of general type were randomly selected for the study based on the list of hospitals obtained from District Statistical Handbook of Nilgiris District. In order to obtain sample of the respondents the researcher contacted doctors working on duty from 22 Hospitals - 10 in Udthagamandalam, 5 in Coonoor, 3 in Kothagiri and 4 in other places. Similarly, from the list of 10 private banks, 200 executives of various cadre including managers of branch, operations and loan section officers were targeted. The respondents in tourism sector were drawn from 28 hotels registered under The Nilgiri Hotel and Restaurant Association and the registered tour operators of the district. From the 600 individuals targeted, the incomplete and non-responsive samples were excluded. This resulted in 490 valid responses with an overall strike rate of 81.67 percent. The response rate was good across all the three sectors. Out of 200 individuals targeted in each sector, 165 questionnaires were received from hospital sector with a response rate of 82.5 percent. Similarly, 174 and 151 valid responses were received from banking and tourism sector with 87 and 75.5 percent of response rate respectively.

4. ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATIONS

4.1. Descriptive Statistics Of Work Stress Factors For Gender & marital status

In order to analyze the difference in the perception of individual stress factors based on demographic variables, independent sample t test and one way ANOVA was carried out.

H_{01} : There is no significant difference among the group of respondents based on gender and marital status with respect to the work stressors under the study.

Table1. Mean value of work Stress on Gender and marital status

Factor	Stress factor	N	Mean	SD
Gender	Male	267	3.61	4.12
	Female	223	4.15	3.45
Marital status	Married	269	4.20	2.16
	Unmarried	221	3.67	3.12

Independent sample t-test conducted based on stress factors and gender identified that female experience more stress. The significance value of stress 0.996 is greater than 0.05, therefore equal variances assumed row is considered. Stress is significantly different based on gender, as the significance value 0.007 is lesser than 0.05 (Table 1). Females faced more stress. Female respondents showed slightly higher mean (4.15) than male. The hypothesis H_{01} is rejected

The significant difference between stress factors and marital status was identified using independent t-test. The significance value of stress is 0.642 which is greater than 0.05, so consider equal variances assumed row. Stress level is different as the significance value 0.000 is lesser than 0.05 (Table 1). Married respondents faced more stress than unmarried (Table 1). Married respondents showed marginally higher mean (4.20) for stress. The hypothesis H_{01} is rejected.

4.2 Difference in work Stress based On Qualification

One-way ANOVA test was carried out to find if there exist any difference in stress and performance based on qualification of the individuals.

Table 2 Difference in Stress and Performance based on Qualification

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
OC	Between Groups	4.304	3	1.435	2.169	.101
	Within Groups	40.336	61	.661		
	Total	44.639	64			
IR	Between Groups	.797	3	.266	.171	.915
	Within Groups	94.663	61	1.552		
	Total	95.460	64			
WA	Between Groups	.878	3	.293	.371	.775
	Within Groups	48.172	61	.790		
	Total	49.050	64			
WL	Between Groups	7.023	3	2.341	2.024	.120
	Within Groups	70.540	61	1.156		
	Total	77.562	64			
WF	Between Groups	1.377	3	.459	.337	.798
	Within Groups	83.016	61	1.361		
	Total	84.393	64			
RC	Between Groups	1.689	3	.563	.746	.529
	Within Groups	46.065	61	.755		
	Total	47.754	64			
TP	Between Groups	2.404	3	.801	1.316	.278
	Within Groups	37.158	61	.609		

	Total	39.562	64			
CP	Between Groups	1.362	3	.454	.642	.591
	Within Groups	43.144	61	.707		
	Total	44.506	64			
JA	Between Groups	.878	3	.293	.402	.752
	Within Groups	44.431	61	.728		
	Total	45.309	64			

H_{02} : There is no significant difference among the group of respondents based on Qualification with respect to the work stressors under the study .

From the table 4.2 among the various stress factors it is inferred that there was no significant difference among the respondents in the dimensions of stress based on qualification of the individuals as all the values are $p > 0.05$. All the respondents irrespective of their qualification experience the same level of stress. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted .

4.3 Descriptive Statistics Of work Stress Factors For 3 Service Sectors

In order to understand the overall level of stress faced by the individual, overall mean scores of various factors/ dimensions of work stress were computed. Table.3.1 provides the descriptive statistic mean scores of all the factors considered and the work stress level across three different sectors chosen for the research.

Table 3.1 Descriptive statistics of stress factors for all three select sectors. N=490

Stress Factors	Mean	Median	SD	Population Mean*	't' value	Level of significance
Organizational Climate	7.94	8.08	2.60	12.00	-11.90	0.01
Interpersonal Relationships	27.46	25.57	17.56	16.00	-23.98	0.01
Work Autonomy	8.77	8.01	6.90	12.00	-18.76	0.01
Work Load	13.16	14.50	5.46	12.00	-13.89	0.01
Work Feedback	9.77	10.09	4.67	12.00	-8.12	0.01
Role Conflict	12.86	11.76	9.88	16.00	-6.50	0.01
Overall	79.96	78.01	28.61	80.00	-21.44	0.01

Classification of

Level of stress	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	OVERALL
Low Level	<6	<8	<6	<6	<6	<8	<40
Moderate level	6to 12	8to 16	6to 12	6to 12	6 to 12	8to 16	40 to 80
Low level	>12	>16	>12	>12	>12	>16	>80

The table 3.1 explains the descriptive analysis of various factors of stress considered for research . The mean score of stress is almost the same level for all the respondent in the three sectors . However the various factors of stress did not have the same level of existence . interpersonal relationship is identified as one the highest stress contributing factor for all the three sectors followed by role conflict and work load .work autonomy and work feedback has less impact considering the other . Organizational climate has the lowest mean as it shows that it is of less concern .

Table3.2 Descriptive Statistics Of Stress Factors For hospital**N=165**

Stress Factors	Mean	Median	SD	Population Mean*	't' value	Level of significance
Organizational Climate	9.73	10.00	3.78	12.00	-6.89	0.01
Interpersonal Relationships	28.87	27.00	17.89	16.00	-11.98	0.01
Work Autonomy	10.03	8.00	8.76	12.00	-10.98	0.01
Work Load	13.38	15.00	10.40	12.00	-6.49	0.01
Work Feedback	11.68	11.95	8.51	12.00	-2.76	0.01
Role Conflict	23.98	23.50	9.02	16.00	-10.37	0.01
Overall	97.67	95.09	42.04	80.00	-8.38	0.01

Classification of

Level of stress	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	OVERALL
Low Level	<6	<8	<6	<6	<6	<8	<40
Moderate level	6 to 12	8 to 16	6 to 12	6 to 12	6 to 12	8 to 16	40 to 80
Low level	>12	>16	>12	>12	>12	>16	>80

Table3.3 Descriptive Statistics Of Stress Factors for tourism**N=151**

Stress Factors	Mean	Median	SD	Population Mean*	't' value	Level of significance
Organizational Climate	9.73	10.00	3.78	12.00	-6.89	0.01
Interpersonal Relationships	28.87	27.00	17.89	16.00	-11.98	0.01
Work Autonomy	10.03	8.00	8.76	12.00	-10.98	0.01
Work Load	13.38	14.00	10.40	12.00	-6.49	0.01
Work Feedback	11.68	11.59	8.51	12.00	-2.76	0.01
Role Conflict	19.98	21.50	9.02	16.00	-10.37	0.01
Overall	93.67	92.09	42.56	80.00	-8.38	0.01

Classification of

Level of stress	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	OVERALL
Low Level	<6	<8	<6	<6	<6	<8	<40
Moderate level	6 to 12	8 to 16	6 to 12	6 to 12	6 to 12	8 to 16	40 to 80
Low level	>12	>16	>12	>12	>12	>16	>80

Table 3.4 Descriptive Statistics Of Stress Factors For bank**N=174**

Stress Factors	Mean	Median	SD	Population Mean*	't' value	Level of significance
Organizational Climate	9.75	9.61	4.60	12.00	-11.48	0.01
Interpersonal Relationships	21.35	19.56	19.00	16.00	-17.51	0.01
Work Autonomy	10.87	8.51	8.50	12.00	-15.74	0.01
Work Load	14.11	13.51	5.46	12.00	-15.42	0.01
Work Feedback	12.64	11.54	5.87	12.00	-10.95	0.01
Role Conflict	18.38	19.55	10.49	16.00	-17.19	0.01
Overall	87.10	82.28	32.69	80.00	-12.38	0.01

Classification of

Level of stress	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	OVERALL
Low Level	<6	<6	<6	<6	<8	<40	
Moderate level	6 to 12	8 to 16	6 to 12	6 to 12	6 to 12	8 to 16	40 to 80
Low level	>12	>16	>12	>12	>12	>16	>80

The analysis for individual sector (3.2 to 3.4) states that hospital and tourism are in line with the total scores of level but in banking there exists a different pattern of stress from the total scores. Work load and role conflict seems to have higher mean. With regard to organizational climate the individual score and the overall score are similar. Interpersonal relationship work load and role conflict are similar and this indicates that stress creating factors are almost the same in all the select service sectors. In hospitals role is usually difficult to define and to make out the significance of role played by others this leads to role conflict. In tourism industry, too the role conflict is high as the mismatch between the position and the skill set or expectation. In banking sector work load is the highest stress contributing as the employees are overload with information as the demand from the customers are increasing for instant and reliable data at all times. At the other extreme work feedback stress has a low mean value in all the three industries so it is of less concern among the respondent.

Table 4. Pearson's correlation co-efficient Analysis Between Work Stress Factors

		OC	IR	WA	WL	WF	RC
OC	Pearson Correlation	1	.627** (.000)	.618** (.001)	.651** (.009)	.510** (.000)	.765** (.005)
IR	Pearson Correlation		1	.608** (.000)	.632** (.094)	.572** (.069)	.527** (.000)
WA	Pearson Correlation			1	.649** (.000)	.728** (.005)	.717** (.010)
WL	Pearson Correlation				1	.649** (.000)	.751** (.084)
WF	Pearson Correlation					1	.618** (.001)
RC	Pearson Correlation						1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
OC- Organizational culture , IR- Interpersonal relations , WL-Work Load ,
WF-work feedback, , WA- work autonomy ,RC- role conflict,

Hypothesis 3

H₀₃: There is no relationship among the factors of Work stress.

To identify the relationship between independent variable organizational culture interpersonal relationship , work feedback , work load ,work autonomy and role conflict Pearson's correlation was applied and the intercorrelation shows that there is a strong positive significant correlation between the dimensions of stress at 0.01 significant level. This clearly indicates that the increase in one of the stress factor will also lead to increase in the other factor. Also the stress level is less in one of the factor this will lead to decrease in the other factors. so the organization should try to reduce the stress for the overall healthy work environment. Hence the null hypothesis is H₀₃ is rejected.

5.1. SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

In this competitive service industry certain amount of pressure is required from the management perspective for its success. So optimum stress is necessary but care should be taken to create an environment of positive stress. To sum up there exists two types of stress eustress

that is positive and Distress that has a negative effect.(Le Fevre, Mathney , &Kolt ,2003). The limit of stress should not exceeds the limit as is harmful for the organization and the employees. So the present study is undertaken identify the stress factor among the managerial level executives in three sectors .

The major findings and conclusion has made up suggestion to reduce the stress at the executive level in service sectors.

The findings of independent sample t-test and one way ANOVA towards the perception of individual stress factors based on gender stated that the significance value of stress 0.996 is greater than 0.05, therefore equal variances assumed row is considered. Stress is significantly different based on gender, as the significance value 0.007 is lesser than 0.05 (Table 4.1) ,Female respondents showed slightly higher(mean 4.1) than male. This is related to the findings of (Rubab, Sabnam&Saha, 2008).women executives are subjected to under pressure by male counterparts that produce higher level of stress among women.The significance value of stress is 0.642 which is greater than 0.05, so consider equal variances assumed row. Stress level is different as the significance value 0.000 is lesser than 0.05 (Table 4.1). So ,Married respondents showed marginally higher (mean 4.20) for stress. From the analysis it is also found that there is no relation between stress based on qualification all the employees irrespective of their qualification face the same level of stress.

From the Pearson's correlation test , it was found that the individual dimensions on organization a culture , interpersonal relationship, work autonomy , work load , work feedback and role conflict of stress have an association within at 1% of significance level.An increase or decrease in any one of the will also les to the same in the other factors too.

This is related to the findings of factor analysis done by Tat-wing, Siu and Paul, (2000) identified six stressors: perceived organizational practices at work interface were the best predictors of psychological distress. So the organization need to focus on intervention strategies to reduce stress for the organization success. To sum up there exists two types of stress eustress that is positive and Distress that has a negative effect.(Le Fevre, Mathney , &Kolt ,2003).Work environments produce stress and reduce job satisfaction (Della and Robert, 1983).Hence organization needs to focus on distress and try to minimize or overcome the same.

5.2 SUGGESTIONS: The management of these organizations should take necessary actions to bridge the gap between the employees of same cadre to avoid stress factors. They need to focus on internal communication and should bring about transparency in their activities. The organization should devise a mechanism whereby the employees shall receive instant feedback from the customers about their service rendered. The policies are to be revisited in consultation with the key employees of the organization that make the effective functioning of executives. The organization should devise a mechanism whereby the executives shall receive instant feedback from the co-workers and customers about their service rendered. The training needs of the executives are to be ascertained periodically and need based training should be given to lower the stress.

5.3 CONCLUSION

The wellbeing at managerial level is very important as they play an crucial role in the administrative and hold higher responsibilities concerned with the organization growth and development .In this high competitive scenario the managers are exposed to all kind of stressors that effect their physical and mental health .This research reveals that managerial level stress is caused by organization culture , interpersonal relation and work related activities .The researcher found that there exists a positive relation between the work stress factors . The stress beyond certain level will lead to hypertension , acidity ,headache and psychological disorders ending up in burn out. where the recovery is of long duration . To overcome this situation the organization should develop stress coping or stress management techniques for their employees. The organization should also identify the positive stress that result in feeling of challenge , higher satisfaction, motivation and effectiveness for better performance and work life balance. so further studies can be undertaken to identify the other stress variables such as role stress ,

organizational stress and its impact on job satisfaction and employees performance. Further the research can be extended to other sectors, or regional wise with the same select service sector.

References

- [1]. Alam .Z, Gouhar , S.& Shafiqur,R.(2015). The impact of Job stress on Employees performance : Investigating the Moderating effect of employees motivation . City University , research, Journal5(1) 120-129.
- [2]. Birdseye.M.G. and J.S. Hill (19195). Individual , Organisation work and Environmental Influences on Expatriate turnover Tendencies :An Empirical Study . Journal of international Studies . 26/94): 787-813.
- [3]. Borman, W,c& Motowildo , S.J.(1993). Expanding the Criterion Doain to Include Elements of Contextual Performance , San Francisco : Jossey -Bass , 71-98.
- [4]. Campbell , J.P.(1990) Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and Organisation Psychology . In M.D. Dunnette, & L.M. Hough(Eds.)handbook of Industrial and Organisation Psychology (2nd ed.) .PaloAlto, CA: consulting Psychologist Press,687-732.
- [5]. Cox, T., Griffiths, a.,Barlowe, C. randall, K.Thomson , L.and rial Gonzale, E(2000).
- [6]. Organizations interventions for stress: A risk mamangement approach , Sudbury: HSEbooks.
- [7]. Della.A.P., and Rober E.S(1983)Enviromental satisfiers in academic higher education 12(1) 35-47.
- [8]. Dr.M. Jyothsna Dr. U.V. A .Dinarayana A. Study on stress Among Public & Private Sector Employees in Select service Sectors , Intercontinental Journal Of Human Resource Research Review,Volume 2, Issue 12, Dec 2014
- [9]. Flaherty Theresa B, Dahltrom , Robert; and Steven J. Skinner(1999).Organisational values and role stress as determinants of customer - orient selling performance . Journal of personal Selling and Sales Management .19(2) 1-18.
- [10]. Fry, Louis ; Futrell, Charles M.; Parasuraman ,A.; Margaret A. Chmielewski.(1986). An analysis of casual models of sales person role perceptions and work-related attitudes . Journal of Marketing research. 33(May); 153-163.
- [11]. Michie.S.(2002) Causes and management of stress at work. Occupation Environment Med. 59, 67-72.
- [12]. Hoel, H., Sparks, K.Cooper, C.L(2002). The cost of violence /stress at worl and the benefits of a violence /stress free working environment (vol.81).Geneva, The International Labour Organisation .
- [13]. Imtiaz, S., & Ahmad , S. (2009). Impact of stress on employee productivity , performance and turnover; An important managerial issue . International Review of Business Research papers, 5(4) , 468-477.
- [14]. Kumar (2008) . occupational Stress of bank employee of Nationalized and Non-Nationalized Banks in Kerala. Research and Practice in Human resource management , 9(2). 109-118.
- [15]. Mattesson , M.T. , and Ivancevich , J.M.(1999). Organizational behaviour and Management . 5th Ed. New york:McGraw Hill.
- [16]. Niharika , U.V. Kiran, Occupational Stress among bank Employees, European Academic Research, Vol.II Issue 4/ July 2014.
- [17]. Okeke, M.n: OjanEcho, Oboreh. J.C(2016), Effects of stress on employee productivity , International Journal of accounting Research Vol, 2No,11.
- [18]. Parker D.F., & DeCotiis, T.A.(1983). Organisational Determinants of job stress Organizational Behaviuor and human performance , 32(2). 160-177.

- [19]. Rod, M., Ashill, N.J., Carruthers, J. (2008). The relationship between job demand stressors . service recovery performance and job outcomes in a stste owned enterprise . journal of Retailing and consumer Service , 15(1) , 22-31.
- [20]. Rubab A, Sabnam.J., Sampa.S(2008). Occupational family difficulties and job contentment of working Womwn: BAngladech Perspective , Daffodil International University , Journal of Business and economics .3(1)
- [21]. Sharma, N.R, Yadava, A,S., & Yadava A.M.(2001) . Mental health of women in relation to job stress . Journal of personality & Clinical studies , 17, (1),41-44.
- [22]. Parkington , J.J., & Schneider ,B.(1979). Some correlates of experienced job stress: a Boundary role study . Academy of management Journal ,22(2) , 270-281.
- [23]. Usamn , A., Ahmed, Z., I., & Akbar ,Z.(2011). Work stress experienced by the teaching Staff of University of Punjab,International Journal of Business and Social Science ,2(8).
- [24]. Taskina Alii, Mohammad Khaleq (2010) factors Contributing To Job stress of Private Bank Employee in Bangladesh. Journal of Business and Social Studies , Vol.1., Page 89-104
-