



## OCCUPATIONAL STRESS AND ITS EFFECT ON JOB PERFORMANCE OF BANK EMPLOYEES: A STUDY ON COMMERCIAL BANKS IN TAMIL NADU

S. Theerthamalai\*      Dr. K. R. Rajendiran\*\*

\*Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Annamalai University.

\*\*Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce wing - DDE, Annamalai University.

### Introduction

Stress has become a pervading feature of people's life in modern world. The modern world which is said to be a world of achievements is also a world of stress. Stress is everywhere, whether it is in the family, business organization, enterprise, institute or any other social or economic activity. Right from birth till death, an individual is invariably exposed to various stressful situations.

Despite tremendous advancements in science and technology, and remarkable growth of economy and sources of luxury, people all over the world seem to experience stress in various spheres of their lives. Consistently psychosomatic and psychological disorders are increasing; the feelings of frustration and dissatisfaction with life in general reflect the stress being experienced by people. In the past also, the societies were not entirely free from stress. However the causes of stress in those societies were episodic in nature, low in severity and frequency. But during the last two decades the span of psychosocial stress has drastically increased. The basic reasons were being the changed physical and socio-cultural environment of the contemporary societies and life style of the people. People's life has become more demanding, complicated, mechanical and dependent running by the clock. Ever increasing needs and aspirations, high competition, pressures of meeting deadlines, uncertainty of future and weak social support system have made the life of people stressful in modern societies.

The term 'Stress' is discussed not only in everyday conversations but has also become an issue to attract widespread media attention. Different people have different views about it as stress can be experienced from a variety of Sources. Dr. Selye Hans said **"Without stress, there would be no life"** Olpin, Micheal and Helson Margie (2010, 2007).

### Objective

The effect of occupational stress dimensions on job performance of the bank employees.

### Occupational stress instrument

Working people undergo much stress while they are in the work. Such occupational stresses vary from person to person. Occupation to occupation and time to time, occupational stress is defined as any adjective demand, which occurs in the workplace by physical, mental or emotional factors that require coping behavior. A well developed and widely used Occupational Stress Index (OSI) in the Indian context (Srivastava and Singh, 1981) was chosen to assess the occupational stress of the sample. The Occupational Stress have 12 dimensions consists of 46 statements. The dimensions are role overload, Role ambiguity, Role conflict, group pressure, Responsibility for persons, under participation, Powerlessness, Poor peer relations, Intrinsic Impoverishment, Low Status, Working condition and Low profitability. Respondents indicates their level of agreement for each statement in the dimensions by using a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

### Job performance

Performance measurement is the process of quantifying the efficiency and effectiveness of past action. More concrete performance measurement is the process of measuring how well organizations are managed against their targets and the value they generate for their stakeholders. The employee's past knowledge is helpful to perform the present tasks effectively and thereby he attains feeling of fulfillment. Thus satisfied workers contribute to their organization by the way of giving training and sharing their past experiences to the new employees and giving suggestions for innovations and development of their skills. Williams and Andersons (1991) proposed in-role and extra-role performance measuring rating scale for employees of the organisation. The present study adopted in-role performance rating scale is used, which consists of five statements. Respondents indicates their level of agreement for each statement by using a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

### Collection of Data

In the present study, four districts of Tamilnadu i.e. Chennai, Coimbatore, Kancheepuram and Madurai districts have been selected for the current study on the criteria of highest number of bank branches prevails in these districts. The target



respondents of the study are branch heads, assistant managers and the senior staff (more than 5 years of service) of banks in the Tamilnadu state. The researcher approaches 51 bank branches for the survey of occupational stress of the bank employee. Manager of 36 bank branches have permitted to conduct the survey in their branches. Totally 721 questionnaires were distributed by having face to face interaction with the respondents of the banks. After a gap of 10 working days, 389 questionnaires were collected back and giving a response rate of around 54 percent. Unfortunately, out of these 389, 25 questionnaires were incomplete which has been eliminated in the final data analysis. Therefore, the final data analysis was operated on 368 respondents.

### Study Period

The time period for data collection was four months from October 2015 to January -2016.

### Refinement of Occupational Stress Scale

**Table -1, KMO and Bartlett's Test over all Occupational Stress Scale**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.772
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	16767.922
	Df	861
	Sig.	.000

Table 1 represents the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity of service quality of internet banking scale. The KMO test provides an index ranging from zero to one and it reaches one, each variable is perfectly predicted without error by other variable. The value of KMO sample adequacy index is 0.772 and it should be above 0.5 (under 0.5 is unacceptable) and above 0.8 is considered as meritorious (Hair, Blake, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). The chi-square value of Bartlett's test of sphericity is 16767.922, which is statistically significant at 1 percent level. It provides that the items are correlated highly enough to provide a reasonable basis for factor analysis. It is evident that KMO test indicates the occupation stress scale fulfill the criteria to develop a sound scale.

**Table 2, Factor 1: Role over load**

S.No.	Variables	Factor loading	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	Lot of work in this job	0.725	0.902
2.	Work load I have to manage an inadequate employees and resource.	0.817	
3.	I have to dispense off my work hurriedly owing to excessive work load.	0.842	
4.	Busy schedule I couldn't take of care my domestic and personal problems.	0.831	
5.	I have to do such work as ought all of a sudden the new dealing	0.756	
6.	I am unable to carry out my assignments to my satisfaction	0.765	
	<b>Eigen value</b>	9.982	
	<b>% of Variance explained</b>	23.767	
	<b>Cumulative % variance</b>	23.767	

**Factor 2: Role ambiguity**

S.No.	Variables	Factor loading	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	Vague and insufficient	0.828	0.853
2.	Objectives of my work role are quite clear and adequately planned.	0.733	
3.	Ambiguity of jurisdiction and authorities	0.720	
4.	Higher authorities and colleagues expect from me	0.754	
	<b>Eigen value</b>	6.004	
	<b>% of Variance explained</b>	14.296	
	<b>Cumulative % variance</b>	38.062	



**Factor 3: Role conflict**

S.No.	Variables	Factor loading	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	Conflicted instructions about my works.	0.646	0.927
2.	Officials are not interfering with my jurisdiction and working methods	0.870	
3.	Clear instruction and facilities discharge the newly assigned job.	0.881	
4.	Due importance to the official instructions and formal working procedures	0.898	
5.	The new procedures and policies in work place already in practice.	0.888	
	<b>Eigen value</b>	3.932	
	<b>% of Variance explained</b>	9.362	
	<b>Cumulative % variance</b>	47.424	

**Factor 4: Unreasonable group and political pressure**

S.No.	Variables	Factor loading	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	Political /group pressures and formal rules and instructions.	0.835	0.949
2.	Work unwillingly by the force of the group/ political pressures.	0.867	
3.	In order to maintain group-conformity sometimes	0.855	
4.	I am compelled to violate the format and administrative political	0.861	
	<b>Eigen value</b>	3.169	
	<b>% of Variance explained</b>	7.545	
	<b>Cumulative % variance</b>	54.969	

**Factor 5: Under participation**

S.No.	Variables	Factor loading	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	Productivity of employees is thrust upon me.	0.877	0.921
2.	I am responsible for the employees in better future.	0.850	
3.	I have great responsibility for the progress and prosperity	0.904	
	<b>Eigen value</b>	2.776	
	<b>% of Variance explained</b>	6.609	
	<b>Cumulative % variance</b>	61.578	

**Factor 6: Responsibility for person**

S.No.	Variables	Factor loading	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	Most of my suggestions should be implemented here	0.891	0.954
2.	Solving an administrative or industrial problem at higher level.	0.932	
3.	My opinions are needed in training and important policies	0.909	
4.	Changing or modifying the working system instruments and conditions.	0.882	
	<b>Eigen value</b>	2.383	
	<b>% of Variance explained</b>	5.674	
	<b>Cumulative % variance</b>	67.253	

**Factor 7: Powerless**

S.NO.	Variables	Factor loading	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	My decisions and instructions regarding distribution	0.843	0.945
2.	Training programmers of the employees.	0.856	
3.	Our interests and opinion or considered in making appointment	0.864	
	<b>Eigen value</b>	1.844	
	<b>% of Variance explained</b>	4.390	
	<b>Cumulative % variance</b>	71.643	



**Factor 8: Poor relations**

S.NO.	Variables	Factor loading	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	Have to work with persons whom I like.	.906	.964
2.	My colleagues try to defame and malign me as unsuccessful.	.910	
3.	My colleagues co-operate with me in solving administration problem	.907	
4.	Exists sufficient mutual co-operation and team-spirit among employees	.917	
	<b>Eigen value</b>	1.532	
	<b>% of Variance explained</b>	3.648	
	<b>Cumulative % variance</b>	75.291	

**Factor 9: Low status**

S.NO.	Variables	Factor loading	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	Higher authorities do care for my self- respect	0.894	0.903
2.	This job has enhanced my social status.	0.864	
3.	Authorities do not give due significance to my post and work.	0.884	
	<b>Eigen value</b>	1.366	
	<b>% of Variance explained</b>	3.253	
	<b>Cumulative % variance</b>	78.544	

**Factor 10: Strenuous working condition (quick working condition)**

S.NO.	Variables	Factor loading	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	I do my work under tense circumstance	0.801	0.934
2.	Some of my assignments are risky and complicated.	0.842	
3.	Often feel that this job has made my life difficult	0.860	
4.	Working conditions are satisfactory here from the point	0.846	
	<b>Eigen value</b>	1.287	
	<b>% of Variance explained</b>	3.064	
	<b>Cumulative % variance</b>	81.607	

**Factor 11: Unprofitability**

S.NO.	Variables	Factor loading	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	I get low salary with comparison to quantum	0.814	0.798
2.	I am rarely rewarded for my hard work and efficient performance.	0.836	
	<b>Eigen value</b>	1.102	
	<b>% of Variance explained</b>	2.623	
	<b>Cumulative % variance</b>	84.230	

Table 4.2 represents the result of exploratory factor analysis of the occupational stress scale. Finally, the scale shows up with eleven dimensions and 42 items. The factor 1 consists of six items with factor loading ranges from 0.725 to 0.842. The Eigen value and percentage of variance explained are 9.982 and 23.767 respectively. According to Nunnally (1978), the value of Cronbach alpha coefficient more than 0.70 is always considered as a sound measure of reliability. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.902 and it has been labeled as "Role Overload".

The factor 2 consists of four items with factor loading ranges from 0.720 to 0.828. The Eigen value and percentage of variance explained are 6.004 and 14.296 respectively. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.853, which is above the criteria mention by Nunnally (1978) and it has been labeled as "Role Ambiguity". The factor 3 consists of five items with factor



loading ranges from 0.646 to 0.898. The Eigen value and percentage of variance explained are 3.932 and 9.362 respectively. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.927, which is above the criteria mention by Nunnally (1978) and it has been labeled as “Role Conflict”.

The factor 4 consists of four items with factor loading ranges from 0.835 to 0.867. The Eigen value and percentage of variance explained are 3.169 and 7.545 respectively. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.949, which is above the criteria mention by Nunnally (1978) and it has been labeled as “Unreasonable group and political pressure”. The factor 5 consists of three items with factor loading ranges from 0.850 to 0.904. The Eigen value and percentage of variance explained are 2.776 and 6.609 respectively. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.921, which is above the criteria mention by Nunnally (1978) and it has been labeled as “Under Participation”.

The factor 6 consists of four items with factor loading ranges from 0.882 to 0.932. The Eigen value and percentage of variance explained are 2.383 and 5.674 respectively. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.954, which is above the criteria mention by Nunnally (1978) and it has been labeled as “Responsibility for person”. The factor 7 consists of three items with factor loading ranges from 0.843 to 0.864. The Eigen value and percentage of variance explained are 1.844 and 4.390 respectively. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.945, which is above the criteria mention by Nunnally (1978) and it has been labeled as “Powerless”.

The factor 8 consists of four items with factor loading ranges from 0.907 to 0.917. The Eigen value and percentage of variance explained are 1.532 and 3.648 respectively. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.964, which is above the criteria mention by Nunnally (1978) and it has been labeled as “Poor relations”. The factor 9 consists of three items with factor loading ranges from 0.884 to 0.894. The Eigen value and percentage of variance explained are 1.366 and 3.253 respectively. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.903, which is above the criteria mention by Nunnally (1978) and it has been labeled as “Low Status”.

The factor 10 consists of four items with factor loading ranges from 0.801 to 0.860. The Eigen value and percentage of variance explained are 1.287 and 3.064 respectively. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.934, which is above the criteria mention by Nunnally (1978) and it has been labeled as “Strenuous Working Condition”. The factor 11 consists of two items with factor loading of 0.814 and 0.836. The Eigen value and percentage of variance explained are 1.102 and 2.623 respectively. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.798, which is above the criteria mention by Nunnally (1978) and it has been labeled as “Unprofitability”. Due to low reliability, Intrinsic Impoverishment factor has been dropped and finally 11 factors have been considered for the present study.

**Table 4.3,Regression Analysis: Effect of Occupational stress Dimension on Job performance**

Variables	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
				Tolerance	VIF
Role overload	-.142	-3.360	.001	.720	1.389
Role ambiguity	.072	1.552	.122	.591	1.693
Role conflict	-.163	-3.911	.000	.732	1.365
Unreasonable group and political pressure	-.333	-7.132	.000	.586	1.706
Under participation	-.113	-2.657	.008	.711	1.407
Responsibility for person	-.072	-1.741	.083	.740	1.352
Powerless	.018	.393	.694	.591	1.691
Poor relations	-.330	-7.444	.000	.649	1.540
Low status	-.069	-1.738	.083	.816	1.225
Strenuous working condition	-.102	-2.210	.028	.599	1.669
Unprofitability	-.068	-1.613	.108	.712	1.405

Table 4.101 describes the regression analysis results between occupational stress dimension and job performance. The independent variable are role overload, role ambiguity, role conflict, unreasonable group and political pressure, under participation, responsibility for person, powerless, poor relations, low status, strenuous working condition, unprofitability and the dependent variable is job performance. The standardized coefficient of role overload, role ambiguity, role conflict, unreasonable group and political pressure, under participation, responsibility for person, poor relations, low status, strenuous working condition, unprofitability are -0.142, 0.072, -0.163, -0.333, -0.113, -0.072, 0.018, -0.330, -0.069, -0.102 and -0.068 respectively. The role overload, role conflict, unreasonable group and political pressure, under participation, poor relations



and strenuous working condition are negative significantly influencing job performance, whereas the standardized coefficient of responsibility for person, low status and unprofitability are negative, but not significantly influence the job performance. The standardized coefficient of role ambiguity and powerless is positive, but not significantly influencing the job performances. The results suggests that role overload, role conflict, unreasonable group and political pressure, under participation, poor relation and strenuous working condition are the key dimension that cause the occupation stress of the employee in the bank.

Multicollinearity create unstable coefficient and lead the regression results biased. When correlation exists among the independent variable, it denotes the presence of multicollinearity. The variance inflation factor (VIF) is employed to observe the presence of multicollinearity among the independent variables. When the independent variable are correlated among them, VIF will be more than 1 and its shows the presence of correlation among independent variables and VIF is equal to 1 indicates no relation. The larger the VIF shows the severe multicollinearity. Montgomery and Peck (1982) suggest that when VIF is greater than 5, then the regression co-efficient are poorly estimated. The results indicate the VIF is less than 5, so there is no severe multicollinearity.

### Conclusion

The study had mainly focused on the effect of occupational stress dimensions on the job performances of the bank employees in Tamilnadu. The occupational stress scale consists of 12 dimensions namely like Role overload, Role ambiguity, Role conflict, group pressure, Responsibility for persons, under participation, Powerlessness, Poor peer relations, Intrinsic Impoverishment, Low Status, Working condition and Low profitability. Due to low reliability, Intrinsic Impoverishment factor has been dropped and finally 11 factors have been considered for the present study. The study result found that role overload, role conflict, unreasonable group and political pressure, under participation, poor relation and strenuous working condition are the key dimension that causes occupy the occupation stress of the employee in the bank.

### References

1. Akbari JA.(2012) Life satisfaction and stress among working and non-working women. Indian Journal of Research Paripex. 2012; 9(1):174-178.
2. Aziz M.(2004) Role stress among women in the Indian information technology sector. Women in Management Review. 2004; 17(7):322-333.
3. Best JW et al.,(1995) Research in education (7th ed.). New Delhi: Prentice Hall, 1995.
4. Karmokar et al., (2016) "Relationship between stress and cardio vascular endurance among college men." (2016).
5. Tine Curtis and Siv Kvernmo (2005) "Changing Living Conditions, Life Style And Health" International Journal of Circumpolar Health 64:5 2005
6. Sadhvi Pandey (2013) "A Study on Work Stress, Causes, Symptoms and Impact on Health" intentional journal of innovative research & studies 2013 Vol-2 Issue-5 ISSN 2319-9725
7. Anderson et al., (1977) "Managerial response to environmentally induced stress." *Academy of Management Journal* 20: 260-272.
8. Bhagat, R. S. (1983) "Effects of stressful life events on individual performance effectiveness and work adjustment processes within organizational settings: A research model." *Academy of Management Review*. 8(4): 660-671.
9. Srivastava, A.K., & Sinha, M.M.(1983) "Perceived Role Stress as a Function of Ego Strength and Job Involvement of Managerial Personnel." *Psychological Studies* 28 (1983): 8-12.
10. Srivastava, A.K., & Pandey, A.K. (2000) "The University Employees' Role Conflict and Their Tension". *Social Science International* 16(1-2) (2000): 94-98.
11. Srivastava, A.K., & Singh, A.P.(1981) "Construction and Standardization of an Occupational Stress Index: A Pilot Study". *Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology* 8 (1981): 133-136.
12. Srivastava, A.K., & Singh, H.S.(1988) "Modifying Effects of Coping Strategies on the Relation of Organizational Role Stress and Mental Health". *Psychological Reports* 62 (1988): 1007-1009.
13. Anderson, C.R.(1976) "Coping Behaviours as Intervening Mechanisms in the Inverted 'U' Stress-Performance Relationship." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 61 (1976):30-34.
14. Aminabhavi, V.A & Triveni.(2000) "Variables Causing Occupational Stress in Nationalized and Non-Nationalised Bank Employees." *Journal of Community Guidance and Research* 17(1) : 20-29.
15. Rajeshwari, T.R.(1992) "Employee Stress: A Study With Reference to Bank Employees". *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations* 27(4) : 419- 429.
16. Tewari, A.K.(1995) "Burnout and Total Amount of Control in Two Types of Banks". *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations* 30(4) : 454-460.