A Study on Organisational Role Stress among Women Working In Private Colleges in Mangalore using ORS scale

Ms Sneha S Kairanna, Mrs Rajani Suresh

[1,2]*Assistant Professor St Aloysius Institute of Management and Information Technology St Aloysius College (Autonomous)*

Abstract: *Organizations face many challenges and managing role stress has assumed great importance due to its debilitating effects on employees and organizations. Organisation role stress is due to the problems within the organisation probably due to roles being not properly allocated, role expectation being higher, inadequate resources, lack of personal inadequacy, role erosions and role stagnation due to lack of modern and technical facilities. Work plays a central role in the lives of many people, and thus the impact of occupational stress is an important issue both for individual employees and the organizations in which they work. Stress experienced at work can have adverse outcomes for the well-being of individual employees and organization as whole. The mush room growths of technical educational institutions in educational sector change the organizational climate at the institutions. Because of the entry of private institutions and foreign universities, the staff working in the educational institute is expected to play many roles other than their major role. This affects their performance and also leads to a stressful life. The present study has made an attempt to analyze the role stress among the staff working in private educational institutions.*

Keywords: *organisation role stress, role stressors, role ambiguity,*

I.   Introduction:

An organization can be defined as a system of roles. The concept of 'role' is key to understanding how an individual functions in any system. This is through his/her role that an individual interacts and is integrated into a system. Occupational stress is no longer considered an occasional, personal problem that can be taken lightly. It is a global phenomenon affecting all occupations and countries alike. Role stress refers to the conflict and tension due to the roles being enacted by a person at any given point of time. Stress is not a new issue. However, in recent years it has become more apparent. It can be defined as 'environmental factors which exert undue strain or pressure on a person' and can be caused by numerous factors either at home or in the workplace. Stress from any source may affect an employee's health and their performance at work. Many employees experience stress because they are unable to partake in any decision making in relation to their own job, thus feeling that they have no control at all over their destiny at work. The working environment may contain a minefield of potential stressors; badly designed workstations; inadequate or inappropriate heating, ventilation or lighting; inadequate holidays; long hours, even performance-related pay can be major sources of stress. Each individual responds differently to the varying levels of pressure to which they are exposed, but when the pressure becomes excessive for the individual, it can result in physical symptoms. Stress is defined as an adaptive response, to an external situation that results in physical, psychological and behavioural deviations (Luthans 1995). Stress is not simply anxiety but usually accompanied by anxiety. Stress is not always dangerous. Sometimes, mild stress stimulates performance. Stress has become an indispensable phenomenon for an individual both in the organisational and personal life.

II.   Objective:

To study the influence of various role stressors on age, qualification, year of experience and marital status of women working in private colleges

III.   Literature Review

Stress in the workplace is increasingly a critical problem for employees, employers and the society. Researchers who study stress have demonstrated the direct and indirect costs of stress. (Matteson and Ivancevich, (1987). A number of aspects of working life have been linked to stress. Aspects of work itself can be stressful, namely work overload (Defrank and Ivancevich, 1998; Sparks and Cooper, 1999, Taylor et al., 2005) and role-based factors such as lack of power role ambiguity, and role conflict (Burke, 1988; Nelson and Burke, 2000). Robbins (2001) defines stress as a dynamic condition in which the individual is confronted with an opportunity, constraint, or demand related to what he or she desires and for which the outcome is perceived

to be both uncertain and important. Stress can be caused by environmental, organisational, and individual variables (Matteson and Ivancevich, 1999; Cook and Hunsaker, 2001).

Studies in India have also attempted to establish the degree of association or find out casual relationships of stress with other variables such as organisational, job, leadership, communication and personal factors (Pestonjee et al., 1992). Most studies with managerial stress used the general category "managers" as a unit for their analysis. A few studies look at different managerial levels in terms of junior, middle and top level managers with the aim of identifying or understanding the different causes of stress that act on them (Gemmill and Heisler, 1972; Singh, 1990. Ahmad, Bharadwaj, and Narula (1985) assess stress levels among 30 executives from both the public and private sector, using an ORS scale to measure ten dimensions of role stress. Their study reveals significant differences between public and private sector employees in three dimensions of role stress—role isolation, role ambiguity, and self-role distance. The authors also establish the insignificant effect of several background factors, such as age, level of education, income, marital status, and work experience. Jha and Bhardwaj's (1989) empirical study of job stress and motivation among 120 frontline managers from both the public and private sector finds that the latter score more than the former in factors such as the need for achievement and total motivation. Chaudhary (1990) probes the relationship between role stress and job satisfaction among bank officers. The author's results indicate that role erosion and resource inadequacy act as dominant stressors while role ambiguity and role expectation conflict are remote contributors to role stress in the sample population.

IV. Methodology

The research paper titled **"A study on Organizational Role Stress among Women working in private colleges in Mangalore using ORS scale "** adopts a descriptive research design with its hypothesis concentrating on understanding the presence of role stress among women and the various stressors that are having a high impact at their workplace. The study mainly involves convenient sampling method for the selection of respondents. 10 working women from 10 different private colleges from in and around Mangalore were selected for the study. The aim of the study is to investigate the type of Organisational Role Stress faced by women working in private colleges. The data was collected from 100 women working in private colleges (out of which 25 were rejected) through Organisational Role Stress Scale framed by   Udai Pareek. In total 75 responses were collected for the study. Correlation analysis was the method followed to identify the relationship between the various stressors found by Udai Pareek with age, qualification, marital status and experience. The ten stressors used in the study are as follows: Inter Role Distance, Role-Stagnation, Role-Expectation Conflict, Role-Erosion, Role-Overload, Role-Isolation, Personal-Inadequacy, Self Role Distance, Role-Ambiguity and Role-Inadequacy. The ORS is a widely used instrument to measure these role stressors. This scale contains five items for each role stress hence a total of 50 statements, and uses a five-point scale, from 0 to 4.
1.   Inter Role Distance (IRD): conflict between the organisational and non-organisational roles.
2.   Role Stagnation (RS): feeling of being stuck in the same role. It results in the perception that there is no opportunity for one's

    for one's career progression.
3.   Role Expectation Conflict (REC): conflicting expectations or demands by the different role senders i.e. the significant others

    who have expectations from the role.
4. Role Erosion (RE): feeling that functions that should belong to incumbent's role are being transferred performed or shared by

    other roles. It is a feeling of responsibility without power.
5.   Role Overload (RO): feeling that too much is expected from the role than what the occupant can cope with. It has two aspects

    quantitative and qualitative.
6. Role Isolation (RI): lack of linkages of one's role with other roles in the organisation.
7. Personal Inadequacy (PI): lack of knowledge, skills or adequate preparation to effective in a particular role.
8.   Self-Role Distance (SRD): conflicts of one's values and self-concepts with the requirements of the organisational role.
9.   Role Ambiguity (RA): lack of clarity about expectations of others from the role, or lack of feedback on how performance

    is regarded by others. It may be in relation to the activities   priorities, norms or general expectations.
10. Resource Inadequacy (RIn): non-availability of resources needed for effective role performance.

Reliability analysis:
Table 1.1: Cronbach's alpha coefficient confirms the internal consistency of the set of items of a given scale. Generally, a   value greater than 0.50 is desirable. The present study shows Cronbach alpha for ORS scale equal to 0.754, shown below

Table 1.1

Cronbach's Alpha	No of Items
.754	8

Table 1.2: shows the details of Mean and Standard Deviation values of all ten role stressors used in the study. The study below shows that among the ten stressors Inter Role Distance followed by Role Expectation and Role Erosion are the major stressors that women feel, they face at regular intervals at the workplace.

Table 1.2

SL No	Role-Stressors	Number of sample	Mean	Std deviation	Rank
1	Inter Role Distance	75	2.96	0.38	1
2	Role Stagnation	75	2.12	0.63	7
3	Role Expectation	75	2.41	0.59	2
4	Role Erosion	75	2.29	0.76	3
5	Role Overload	75	2.26	0.72	4
6	Role Isolation	75	2.18	0.60	6
7	Personal Inadequacy	75	2.22	0.78	5
8	Role Ambiguity	75	2.10	0.50	8

Table 1.3 . In order to investigate further, the ORS scores on various stressors have been classified in four categories; namely, Low stress group (0-5), medium stress group (6-10), medium high stress group (11-15), and the very high stress group (16-20). The following table shows that 85.3% of people respond to Inter Role Distance as High Stress,64% of respondents specified Role Expectation to be Medium Stress and 57.3% of people responded Role Erosion as Medium Stress

Table 1.3

Stress Level /Role Stressors	Low Stress		Medium Stress		High Stress		Very High Stress	
	(f)	%	(f)	%	(f)	%	(f)	%
Inter Role Distance	-	-	7	9.3	64	85.3	4	5.3
Role Stagnation	11	14.7	44	58.7	20	26.7	-	-
Role Expectation	-	-	48	64	23	30.7	4	5.3
Role Erosion	8	10.7	43	57.3	18	24	6	8
Role Overload	9	12	40	53.3	23	30.7	3	4
Role Isolation	8	10.7	45	60	22	29.3	-	-
Personal Inadequacy	14	18.7	32	42.7	27	36	2	2.7
Role Ambiguity	6	8	55	73.3	14	18.7	-	-

Table 1.4 The study below shows the correlation between the variables like Age, Year of experience, Marital Status, Qualification and the various Role Stressors. This study mainly helps to identify the relationship between the ten stressors and the variables selected for study.

Table 1.4

Variables/ Stressors	Inter Role Distance	Role Stagnation	Role Expectation	Role Overload	Role Isolation	Personal Inadequacy	Role Ambiguity	Role Erosion
Age	0.030	0.451*	0.862**	0.065	- 0.021	- 0.034	- 0.161	0.432**
Years of Experience	0.120*	0.026	0.769**	0.511**	0.011	- 0.026	- 0.123	0.657**
Marital Status	0.762**	0.126*	0.031	0.561**	- 0.017	0.412*	0.013**	0.028
Qualification	0.215*	0.612**	0.727**	0.624**	0.046	- 0.069	0.021*	0.178**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The correlation values are as follows:
0 to 0.5 = Weak Positive Correlation (WPC)
0.5 to 1= Strong Positive Correlation (SPC)
0 to -0.5= Weak Negative Correlation (WNC)
-0.5 to -1= Strong Negative Correlation (SNC)

Table 1.4 (a) Summary of Correlation Matrix

Stressors /Variables	IRD	RS	RE	RO	RI	PI	RA	REr
Age	WPC	WPC	SPC	WPC	WNC	WNC	WNC	WPC
Years of Experience	WPC	WPC	SPC	SPC	WPC	WNC	WNC	SPC
Marital Status	SPC	WPC	WPC	SPC	WNC	WPC	WPC	WPC
Qualification	WPC	SPC	SPC	SPC	WPC	WNC	WPC	WPC

V.   Conclusion:

The study has mainly helped in identifying the various stressors which women think are actually reasons for their organisational stress. Some stressors have definitely a correlation with the variables selected like age, year of experience, marital status and qualification. As women are entering into the corporate world to earn their living, the organisation needs to take care of basic stress causing agents which might lead to increase in rate of attrition among women working in the organisation.

References

[1].   Scheuler 1980, Stress makes you sick', The Hindu, Apr. 25, Pg.6.
[2].   Luthans 1995,'The Prettiest addiction you might have', personnel Today, Vol. XXIV, No.2.
[3].   Robbins, S., P. (2001). Organizational Behavior .Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall
[4].   Selye H. 1976. The Stress of Life, New York: McGraw-Hill
[5].   Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1991) "Tripartite model of anxiety and depression: Psychometric evidence and taxonomic implications", Journal of Abnormal Psychology, pp100, 316-336.
[6].   Robert James A., Richard S. Lapidus and Lawrence B. Chanko (1997) "Salesperson and Stress:The moderating Role of Locus of Control and Work Stressors & Felt Stressors", Journal of Marketing Theory & Research,5,3(summer),pp93 – 108.
[7].   Ivancevich, J., and Matteson, M., (1980), Stress at Work, Scott, Foresnian, Glenview, Illinois.
[8].   Ahmad, S., Bharadwaj, A., & Narula, S. (1985). A study of stress among executives. Journal of Personality and Clinical Studies, 1(1–2), 47–50.
[9].   Jha, P. K., & Bhardwaj, G. (1989). Stress and motivation: An empirical study on front line managers. Unpublished manuscript.
[10].   Srivastava, A. K. (1991). A study of the role stress-mental health relationship as a moderator by adopting coping strategies. Psychological Studies, 3, 192–197.
[11].   Dwivedi, R. K. (1997). Trust and role stress. In D. M. Pestonjee & U. Pareek (Eds.), Studies in organizational role stress and coping. New Delhi: Rawat.
[12].   Pestonjee, D.M. A study of role stress in top and middle management. RePEc:iim:iimawp:749, 1988.
[13].   Pestonjee, D.M. A study of role stress in relationship to Type-A and anger RePEc:iim:iimawp:670, 1987.
[14].   Pflanz, S.E., Steven. Work stress in the military: Prevalence, causes, and relationship to emotional health. Military Medicine, 2002, pp.12-17.
[15].   Jinky, L.L. Organizational role stress indices affecting burnout among nurses. Journal of International Women's Studies 2008, vol. 9, pp. 3.
[16].   Cherniss, C. (1980). Staff Burnout - Job stress in the human services, Beverly Hills:Sage Publications
[17].   Daniels, K. & Guppy, A. (1994). An Exploratory Study of Stress in a British University, Higher Education Quarterly, 48 (2): 135-144
[18].   Dua, J. K. (1994). Job stressors and their effects on physical health, emotional health and job satisfaction in a university. Journal of Educational Administration, 32:59-78.
[19].   Evrard, Y., Pras B. & Roux, E. (2003). Market : Etudes et recherches en Marketing,Dunod
[20].   Ministerial Decree No. 401 of 1997 regarding the Arrangement of Part-time Work in Private Sector Establishments in Relation to Federal Law No. 1 of 1972 and Federal Law No. 8 of 1980 (English translation).
[21].   Gmelch, W. G. & Burns, J. S. (1994). Sources of stress for academic department chairpersons, Journal of Educational Administration, 32: 79-94
[22].   Griffith, J., Steptoe, A. & Cropley, M. (1999). An investigation of coping strategies associated with job stress in teachers, British Journal of Educational Psychology,69: 517-531
[23].   Vandenberghe, R. & Huberman A. M. (1999). Understanding and preventing teacher burnout: A Source Book of International Research and Practice. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
[24].   Vijayashree, L. & Mund, P. (2011). Role stress and coping: A case in ITES company,Mustang Journal of Business & Ethics: 107-119
[25].   Winefield, A. H., Gillespie, N., Stough, C., Dua, J., Hapuarachchi, J. Boyd, C. (2003). Occupational stress in Australian university staff: Results from a national survey.International Journal of Stress Management, 10: 51-63