

A Study of Organizational Role Stress of Executives and Non-Executives of Nationalized Low Experienced Employees

Dr. Triza Janifer Toppo^{1*}

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine and quantify Organizational Role Stress (ORS) among executives and non-executives of nationalized low-experience banking sector employees. The study also ranks the ten components of ORS and measures their level of ORS among employees. Using convenience sampling, the research was conducted on 100 banking employees. The information was tabulated and organized. The hypothesis about the influence of various variables was tested using the T-test. When compared to non-executives of nationalized low experienced bank employees, executives of nationalized low experienced bank employees have significantly higher levels of Organizational Role Stress. Different themes, such as role stagnation, role expectation conflict, role erosion, and role isolation, are also discovered to have a significant impact.

Keywords: *Organizational Role Stress, Nationalized Bank, Experience*

The modern world, which is said to be a world of achievements, is also a world of stress. One finds stress everywhere, whether it be within the family, business, organization/enterprise or any other social or economic activity. Right from the time of birth till the last breath drawn, an individual is inevitably exposed to various stressful situations. Thus, it is not surprising that interest in the issue has been rising with the advancement of the present century which has been called the 'Age of Anxiety and Stress'.

Stress is a subject which is hard to avoid. The term is discussed not only in our everyday conversations but has become enough of a public issue to attract widespread media attention whether it be radio, television, newspaper or magazines, the issue of stress figures everywhere. Different people have different views about it as stress can be experienced from a variety of sources. Ask the opinions of five different people and you are likely to get at least five different definitions. The businessperson views stress as frustration or emotional tension; the air traffic controller sees it as a problem of alertness and concentration; the biochemist thinks of it as a purely chemical event.

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Santal Pargana College, Sido Kanhu Murmu University, Dumka

*Corresponding Author

Received: November 12, 2021; Revision Received: December 23, 2021; Accepted: December 28, 2021

© 2021, Toppo T J; licensee IJIP. This is an Open Access Research distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any Medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

A Study of Organizational Role Stress of Executives and Non-Executives of Nationalized Low Experienced Employees

The concept of stress was first introduced in the life sciences by Hans Selye in 1936. It is a concept borrowed from the natural sciences. Derived from the Latin word 'Stringere', stress was popularly used in the seventeenth century to mean hardship, strain, adversity or affliction. It was used in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to denote force, pressure, strain or strong effort with reference to an object or person. In engineering and physics, the term implies an external force or pressure exerted on something with the intention to distort and being resisted by the person or object on which it is exerted. In psycho-physiology, stress refers to some stimulus resulting in a detectable strain that cannot be accommodated by the organism and which ultimately results in impaired health or behaviour. In common parlance, however, the terms 'stress' and 'strain' are used synonymously in a non-scientific manner. The popularity of this concept has dwindled in the physiological field where it was first introduced but the use of stress terminology continues to flourish in psychology and social sciences.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Mason (1975) reviewed literature on stress and concluded that there was confusion and a lack of consensus regarding its definition. The term stress has been approached in at least four different ways. First, as the stimulus of external force acting on the organism; second, as the response or changes in the physiological functions; third, as the interaction between an external force and the resistance opposed to it, as in biology, and finally, as a comprehensive phenomenon encompassing all the three.

Agarwala et al. (1979) believed that the confusion in definition is primarily due to the fact that the same term is used variously by scholars of different disciplines. Thus, in physics, stress is a force which acts on a body to produce strain. In physiology, the various changes in the physiological functions in response to evocative agents denote stress (rather than strain). In psychology, stress refers to a particular kind of state of the organism resulting from some interaction between him/her and the environment. One way of unravelling this confusion is to identify the following parameters of stress:

1. The context in which the term is used: When the term stress is used in the psychological context, it is not necessarily equivalent to systemic stress. Psychological stress is, in general, a broader term encompassing both systemic stress as also the conditions preceding systemic stress (Cofer and Appley, 1964).
2. The discipline of the researcher and the nature of the stimuli considered as stressors: Physical and humoral stimuli are primarily studied in physiology and psycho-biology (systemic stress) and psycho-social stimuli in psychology (psychological stress).
3. The response relevant to the scientist: Physiologists are primarily concerned with physiological changes; psycho-physiologists with health and behaviour; and psychologists with deviations at the psychological (e.g., anxiety, depression) and behavioural (e.g., withdrawal) levels. Organizational researchers focus on work related psychological and behavioural symptoms.

A number of studies are included here. These studies deal with the effect of different organizational variables on role stress. Madhu (1976) studied the nature and resolution of role conflict. While evaluating Kahn et al.'s (1964) model, he observed that neither did the model emphasize the role of the focal person nor did the scales consider the focal person's perceptions of the sanctions. In the light of literature reviewed, the author observed that 'conflict is more a function of the focal person's perception – especially regarding the relevant aspects of a role conflict situation, namely, the role senders, the expectations, the

A Study of Organizational Role Stress of Executives and Non-Executives of Nationalized Low Experienced Employees

sanctions they allot to the focal person's perception of himself'. These perceptions, following Kelly's (1955) theory, have been termed constructs and were included in a construct model of role conflict. This model explains role conflict as arising out of inappropriate constructs.

To test the construct model of role conflict, the semantic differential technique was adopted to measure role constructs in a sample of 300 middle management personnel of two public sector organizations. Factor analysis of the construct scale yielded five 'role sender' constructs, two 'role expectation' constructs, two 'sanctions' constructs and three 'self' constructs. Role conflict and job satisfaction were measured by administering standardized psychometric instruments whereas conflict resolution was studied on the basis of the focal person's response to a case study.

The findings supported the construct model of role conflict. Differential or moderating effects of constructs on role conflict experience were observed. Conflict was more when the focal person had ill-defined constructs regarding the role sender (particularly personality constructs and supervision constructs). The moderating effects of role constructs on the outcomes of role conflict were studied by dividing the sample into high, medium and low groups on the basis of construct scores and observing the relationships between role conflict and job satisfaction for the three groups. Role constructs which moderated the experience of role conflict also moderated the relationship between role conflict and job satisfaction.

The result of conflict resolution indicated that the high and low role conflict groups differed significantly in their choice of a resolution strategy. It was found that the high role conflict group adopted a unilateral strategy (their own expectations), while the low role conflict group used bilateral (a compromise between their own and the supervisor's expectations) strategies. It was also observed that the low role conflict group had a more consistent and congruent role construct pattern – they perceived the superior as being accommodating, experimenting, having high initiation and consideration, conveying legitimate, expectations while providing more positive and immediate sanctions, and they perceived themselves as experimenting, group dependent and confident.

The construct model developed by the author can be seen as extension of the Kahn et al.'s (1964) model. However, the phenomenological approach gives a better understanding of role conflict.

Like Madhu, T. V. Rao (1987) studied the differential influences of contextual determinants pertaining to managerial role ambiguity. While reviewing the literature, he observed a number of inconsistent findings regarding the influence of antecedents of role ambiguity. Further, it seems that contextual antecedents have differential influences on role ambiguity and hence, multivariate analysis of these variables will account for the differential levels of role ambiguity variance.

For the purpose of the present study, the author developed a scale to measure five categories of contextual determinants – organizational, job, leadership, communication and personal determinants – and tested it on a sample of 100 managerial employees. Three types of role ambiguity, namely, role ambiguity, task ambiguity and feedback ambiguity were measured by using items from the Rizzo et al. (1970) and House et al. (1983) scales. The instruments

A Study of Organizational Role Stress of Executives and Non-Executives of Nationalized Low Experienced Employees

were administered to two groups of 173 and 76 managers of two public sector organizations. One was a relatively new organization whereas the other was an older organization.

A comparative analysis of the data revealed significant differences in the managers' description of their organization, job and leader behaviour. Managers of the older organization tended to experience lesser role ambiguity. Multiple regression analysis showed that contextual determinants have a significant influence on managerial role ambiguity. Other major findings of this study are as follows:

1. Managerial role ambiguity and its dimensions were basically a function of contextual factors.
2. The nature and determinants of managerial role ambiguity were specific to particular organization.
3. Employees of older organizations experienced ambiguity due to the influence of several factors, but they did not necessarily experience more ambiguity.
4. Organizational factors became more influential, and leadership factors less influential in older organizations as compared to new organizations.

METHODOLOGY

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are:

- To compare the level of Organizational Role Stress between Executives and Non - Executives of Nationalized bank low experienced employees.
- To find out the impact of types of employees on Organizational Role Stress (ORS).

Hypotheses

- The level of Organizational Role Stress may vary among Executives and Non-Executives of Nationalized bank low experienced employees.
- There is no significant difference in Organizational Role Stress among Executives and Non-Executives of Nationalized bank low experienced employees.

Sample Design

Employees	Nationalized Bank	
	Executives of Nationalized Bank Low Experienced Employees	Non-Executives of Nationalized Bank Low Experienced Employees
N	50	50
Total	50+50=100	

Sample

The employees selected in the present sample belong to the nationalized banks located in Ranchi, Ramgarh, Bokaro, Dhanbad, Jharia and Jamshedpur.

Tools

The following tools have been used for the selection of the respondents and collection of information from respondents.

- **Personal Data Questionnaire:** The questionnaire has been used to seek information concerning the criteria for being selected as a sample question such as name, gender, age, nature of Bank, nature of job and the duration of working period. For the consideration of an experience have been used in questionnaire.

A Study of Organizational Role Stress of Executives and Non-Executives of Nationalized Low Experienced Employees

- Organizational Role Stress Scale:** The test has been developed and standardized by Pareek (1981). There are 10 items in the scale and each theme is measured by 5 items. Thus, the scale consists of 50 items in total. Each item has 5 response alternatives, namely; rarely, occasionally, sometimes, frequently, very frequently. Scored as 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 respectively. Thus, the score range of the organizational role stress scale is 0 – 200. The high score indicated performance of high organizational role stress. The themes of the scale are listed below.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Inter-role Distance – (IRD) | 6. Role Isolation – (RI) |
| 2. Role Stagnation – (RS) | 7. Personal Inadequacy – (PI) |
| 3. Role Expectation Conflict – (REC) | 8. Self-role Distance – (SRD) |
| 4. Role Erosion – (RE) | 9. Role Ambiguity – (RA) |
| 5. Role Overload – (OR) | 10. Resource Inadequacy – (RIn) |

Reliability of the scale: The scale was used on 500 employees from three different banks and the Test re-test (after 8 weeks) reliability co-efficient in 7 sub-scale were reputed between 0.37 to .65. It was 0.73 in the case of total role stress. Thus, it is reliable test.

Validity of the test: The items have been selected on the basis of item, total score, correlations which were very high. Sen (1981) reported construct validity of the scale on the basis of factor analysis. Further Srivastav (1993) has also reported similar result for factor analysis.

Analysis

Table 1 Mean scores and SDs of Executives and Non - Executives of Nationalized bank low experienced employees in Organizational Role Stress and its themes

Sub groups ⇒	Executives of Nationalized Bank Low Experienced Employees		Non-Executives of Nationalized Bank Low Experienced Employees	
↓ Scale	N= 50		N = 50	
	M	SD	M	SD
IRD	4.46	4.49	3.8	2.5
RS	5.8	2.21	3.92	1.62
REC	3.96	3.82	2.16	1.96
RE	9.44	4.04	5.88	2.96
OR	3.9	2.9	3.6	2.33
RI	6.3	3.37	4.16	2.33
PI	10.58	4.07	8.48	6.28
SRD	3.24	3.71	2.3	5.01
RA	2.98	3.33	2.48	3.98
RIn	5.08	2.86	3.1	2.83
Total	53.52	34.8	39.88	31.03

Abbreviation Used:

Inter-Role Distance – (IRD), Role Stagnation – (RS), Role Expectation Conflict – (REC), Role Erosion – (RE), Role Overload – (OR), Role Isolation – (RI), Personal Inadequacy – (PI), Self-Role Distance – (SRD), Role Ambiguity – (RA), Resource Inadequacy – (RIn).

A Study of Organizational Role Stress of Executives and Non-Executives of Nationalized Low Experienced Employees

Figure 1 Mean score of Executives of Nationalized Bank Low Experienced Employees



Figure 2 Mean score of Non-Executives of Nationalized Bank Low Experienced Employees



A Study of Organizational Role Stress of Executives and Non-Executives of Nationalized Low Experienced Employees

Figure 3 Mean score of Executive and Non-Executives of Nationalized Bank Low Experienced Employees



As per the table 1 and figure 3, it is found that executives of nationalized bank low experienced employees subgroup having higher level of organizational role stress (M = 53.52) than non-executives of nationalized bank low experienced employees sub-group (M = 39.88).

Table 2 t-values of Executives of Nationalized bank low experienced employees and Non - executives of Nationalized bank low experienced employees in Organizational Role Stress and its themes

Scale ⇔ Sub Groups ⇓	IRD	RS	REC	RE	OR	RI	PI	SRD	RA	RIn	Total
Executives of Nationalized Bank Low Experienced Employees Vs Non-Executives of Nationalized Bank Low Experienced Employees	0.90 ^{NS}	4.82 ^{**}	2.95 ^{**}	5.24 ^{**}	0.57 ^{NS}	3.69 ^{**}	1.98 ^{NS}	1.07 ^{NS}	0.68 ^{NS}	3.81 ^{**}	9.44 ^{**}

*Significant at 0.05

**Significant at 0.01

NS:- Not Significant

A Study of Organizational Role Stress of Executives and Non-Executives of Nationalized Low Experienced Employees

Abbreviation Used:

Inter-role Distance – (IRD), Role Stagnation – (RS), Role Expectation Conflict – (REC), Role Erosion – (RE), Role Overload – (OR), Role Isolation – (RI), Personal Inadequacy – (PI), Self-role Distance – (SRD), Role Ambiguity – (RA), Resource Inadequacy – (RIIn).

As per the table 2, it has been found that a significant difference was observed between executives and non-executives of nationalized low experienced bank employees subgroup on organizational role stress dimensions namely role stagnation ($t=4.82$; $P<0.01$), role expectation conflict ($t=2.95$; $P<0.01$), role erosion ($t=5.24$; $P<0.01$), role isolation ($t=3.69$; $P<0.01$). However, no significant difference was found among them on inter-role distance, role overload, personal inadequacy, self-role distance and role ambiguity dimensions.

CONCLUSION

The executives of nationalized low experienced bank employees have substantially higher levels of Organizational Role Stress as compared to their counterparts non-executives of nationalized low experienced bank employees. It is also found that there is a significant impact of different themes namely role stagnation, role expectation conflict, role erosion, role isolation. On the other hand, there is no significant impact of some themes which are, on inter-role distance, role overload, personal inadequacy, self-role distance and role ambiguity dimensions observed.

REFERENCES

- Agarwala, U. N., Malhan, N. K. & Singh, B. (1979). Some classifications of stress and its applications at work. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 15(1), 41-50.
- Cofer, C. N. & Appley, M. H. (1964). *Motivation theory and research*. New York: Wiley.
- House, J. S., Schuler, R. S. & Levanari, E. (1983). Role conflict and ambiguity scales: Reality or artifacts? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 334-337.
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D. & Rosenhal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational Stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.
- Kelly, G. A. (1955). *The psychology of personal constructs*. New York: Norton.
- Madhu, K. R. (1976). *Role conflict: A study of its nature and resolution*, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Andhra University, Waltair.
- Mason, J. W. (1975). A historical view of stress field. *Journal of Human Stress*, March, 6-12.
- Rao, T. V. (1987). *Managerial role ambiguity: Differential influence of contextual determinants*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Andhra University, Waltair.
- Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J. & Litzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 150-163.

Acknowledgement

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

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Toppo T J (2021). A Study of Organizational Role Stress of Executives and Non-Executives of Nationalized Low Experienced Employees. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(4), 2006-2013. DIP:18.01.191.20210904, DOI:10.25215/0904.191