A Comparative Study of ORS among The Age Group of Women's Working in Selective Services

Priya Makhija
Research Scholar
Pacific University,

Dr Gajendra Naidu
Research Guide
Pacific University

Rakesh TN
Lecturer Indo
Asian Academy and PG Center

Abstract

Introduction:

Stress as we all know, has become an important feature of our day to day lives. For the last few decades, research around stress has produced a large number of conferences, books, and articles, however despite the popularity of "stress" as a research topic, experts still do not agree on a common definition of this simple and at the same time controversial concept (Rees and Redfern, 2000).

Statement of the Problem:

Stress is an ordinary segment of life. The work lives of working women in service sector are not easy; in fact, they are in the eye of the storm. This study has focused on evaluating the difference between the two groups of employees. Eight stress factors were identified by Pareek (1983) among working women. These factors, namely Inter Role Distance (IRD), Role Stagnation (RS), Role Expectation Conflict (REC), Role Erosion (RE), Role Overload (RO), Personal Inadequacy (PI), Self-Role Distance (SRD) and Role Ambiguity (RA) were used in this study to distinguish the opinion of academicians and corporate employees.

Research Objectives:

- To find out the ORS among working women of academic & corporate sector.
- To make a comparative analysis and its impact of ORS among corporate & academic sector.

Findings:

A significant difference between the different age group was found for Self-role distance,Inter-role distance, Role stagnation, Role expectation conflict, Role ambiguity, Role overload, Role Erosion, Role (personal) inadequacy factors of organisational stress.

Keywords: ORS, Working women, Stress.

Introduction

Stress as we all know, has become an important feature of our day to day lives. For the last few decades, research around stress has produced a large number of conferences, books, and articles, however despite the popularity of "stress" as a research topic, experts still do not agree on a common definition of this simple and at the same time controversial

concept (Rees and Redfern, 2000). Stress is now usually defined as a feeling of physical or emotional tension and a feeling of being unable to cope with anxiety and discomfort, particularly in response to change (Vijayashree and Mund, 2011). It can be due to personal professional (occupational) reasons. It has been found that it is not only a problem for developed information societies but also for developing countries and is omnipresent in all professions. Each profession causes a specific level of stress. Researchers suggest that with rapid advancements and changes today, there is hardly any occupation left, the members of which do not suffer from occupational stress and burnout.

Stress experienced at workplaces due to various factors such as job insecurity, annual appraisals, competition, technological advances, globalization and terrorism is termed as organizational stress. Organizational stress, also known as work stress or job stress is found to have penetrated all occupations affecting the well-being of people. Employees are required to undergo training procedures, be punctual in their daily routines, meet specified sales targets and maintain working relations with everyone concerned. Further, new skills and methodologies have to be constantly acquired by employees to keep pace with the modern industrial requirements. All such demanding situations can cause high levels of stress that can be further aggravated by lack of decision making, improper managerial skills and long working hours. Job insecurity and work pressure also contribute to the build-up of stress among employees. Organizational stress must be considered as a serious issue and adequate measures must be taken up by the employers in order to care for the well-being of their employees, even if it affects the organizational productivity and costs (Vijayadurai and Venkatesh, 2012).

The work demands cause stress on employees resulting in negative outcomes such as work-related tension, conflicts, job dissatisfaction and poor performance. Such negative outcomes affect the organizational objectives and the stressors causing such stress are termed as organizational stress factors. Employees who are required to follow the stipulated rules and regulations may experience stress as they are not given the free will to organize their workflow. The rigid organizational procedures may prove to be a hindrance in the productive intentions of employees (Rani and Bhuvaneswari, 2014).

Organizational and Role Stress

Role is defined as the functions one performs in an organization for the position that one occupies. Role can thus be a set of functions to be performed by an employee in accordance with other people's and his/her own expectations about the role (Pareek, 1976).

Organizational stress and role stress was first described by Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek and Rosenthal (1964). Katz and Kahn (1966) continued the research on these topics of stress and suggested that an organization can be defined as a mechanism of roles and three categories can be used to define role stress namely role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload.

Occupational stress is considered as a harmful factor of the work environment. It arises due to lack of person-environment fit and human potential is affected by mismanaged organizational stress. It further leads to reduced quality, productivity, health, well-being and morale. Stress is the outcome of the assigned work role that causes harmful effects for individuals (Kahn and Quinn, 1970).

Brook (1973) reported that qualitative changes in jobs create adaptation problems among employees. Cobb (1975) posits that multiple responsibilities create severe stress and employees' failure to cope with them may lead to several physical and psychological disorders.

Various studies have proved that role incumbents with high levels of role ambiguity respond to situations with anxiety, depression, physical symptoms, lower levels of job involvement and organizational commitment, a sense of futility or lower self-esteem, and perceptions of lower performance on the part of organizations and supervisors (Greene, 1972; Brief and Aldag, 1976).

Review of Literature on Organizational and Role Stress

Role is defined as the functions one performs in an organization for the position that one occupies. Role can thus be a set of functions to be performed by an employee in accordance with other people's and his/her own expectations about the role (Pareek, 1976).

Organizational stress and role stress was first described by Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek and Rosenthal (1964). Katz and Kahn (1966) continued the research on these topics of stress and suggested that an organization can be defined as a mechanism of roles and three categories can be used to define role stress namely role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload.

Occupational stress is considered as a harmful factor of the work environment. It arises due to lack of person-environment fit and human potential is affected by mismanaged organizational stress. It further leads to reduced quality, productivity, health, well-being and morale. Stress is the outcome of the assigned work role that causes harmful effects for individuals (Kahn and Quinn, 1970).

Brook (1973) reported that qualitative changes in jobs create adaptation problems among employees. Cobb (1975) posits that multiple responsibilities create severe stress and employees' failure to cope with them may lead to several physical and psychological disorders.

Various studies have proved that role incumbents with high levels of role ambiguity respond to situations with anxiety, depression, physical symptoms, lower levels of job involvement and organizational commitment, a sense of futility or lower self-esteem, and perceptions of lower performance on the part of organizations and supervisors (Greene, 1972; Brief and Aldag, 1976).

Occupational Stress and Professional Women

Negative factors severely affect the personal outlook and its impact is more in working women. These negative stressors could relate to personal life experiences such as low self-esteem, low morale and constant urge of maintaining social status (Goodman, 1980; Schnacke, 1982; Schwanke, 1981).

According to a study conducted by Farber (1984), factors such as failed administrative meetings, excessive paperwork, and lack of career advancement caused among suburban teachers in the United States of America.

In a study conducted by Smilansky (1984), it was found that administrative matters and working relations did not really affect elementary school teachers as their occupational stress was related to their interactive experiences with pupils and the subsequent behavior of pupils.

Van Fleet (1988) states that unusual situations coupled with extreme demands and pressures causes stress to a person. However stress may not be necessarily bad as it turns to be a motivating factor in certain cases. According to ILO (1986), stress is recognized as a major challenge to mental, physical and organizational health.

The role orientation and role performance of professional women depends upon the perceptions of their colleagues and peers. Professional women's work and career potential is jeopardized by the domestic role and social expectations (Taylorson, 1984). Work performance, health and psychological status of teachers is determined by the work related stress (Cooper, 1986; Capel, 1987; Pierce and Molly, 1990). Studies on teachers have revealed that teaching performance, job satisfaction, and decision making are affected by health and psychological issues (Quick and Quick, 1984; Eckles, 1987).

Traditionally university teaching has been perceived as a stress-free profession, particularly by those who are not related to this profession (Fischer, 1994). Conventionally thought to be a less stressful occupation (French et al., 1982), teaching profession is getting transformed to being more stressful over the last two decades (Olivier and Venter, 2003). Factors such as bureaucracy, paperwork and pupil unruliness have rendered more challenges to the profession of teaching. Teachers' sense of well-being and willingness to stay in the teaching profession is determined by the stressors. When generally compared, teachers stand to experience low levels of job satisfaction and high levels of psychological distress (Schonfield, 1990). According to Borg (1990), a sizeable quantity of teachers deems their profession as highly stressful as they stand to being exposed to many stressors.

According to Willmott (1995), the commodification of academic knowledge production which is increasingly judged in terms of its exchange value, represented in research funding and position in university league tables, rather than in terms of its intrinsic value as an original contribution to knowledge. It is argued that this results into the potential deprofessionalization of academic work and the proletarianization of the academic worker (Dearlove, 1997; Halsey, 1992). These changes are well-advanced and documented in the case of Britain, Australia, Canada, and the United States (Miller, 1995; Smyth, 1995; Harley et al 2004). However, such kind of studies, with reference to university faculty members, has not been conducted very extensively in India, though much of research has been done.

Two third of the university faculty reported that they perceived job stress at least half of the scheduled time. Faculty also expressed burnout, health problems caused by job stress, decreased work output, low capacity to manage the work stress and basis of job change. Over workload is one of the most frequently quoted reasons for considering job change, Blix et al. (1994).

Review of Literature on Factors of Organisational Stress

It is important to study the factors that affect the well-being of employees at workplaces and cause stress. Such stressors can interrupt the normal work-life balance and pose serious health hazards. Both organizational and non-organizational factors cause stress among employees who are subject to work in accordance with the organizational framework. Managers are generally expected to perform without any role definitions and are responsible for execution of multiple events. Such extraordinary work demands cause stress among such employees (Michie, 2002).

Eight stress factors have been identified among working women namely Inter Role Distance (IRD), Role Stagnation (RS), Role Expectation Conflict (REC), Role Erosion (RE), Role Overload (RO), Personal Inadequacy (PI), Self-Role Distance (SRD) and Role Ambiguity (RA) (Pareek, 1983).

Inter Role Distance (IRD)

Inter Role Distance (IRD) is the stressor caused by the struggle and conflict between the organizational and the non-organizational roles (Aravindha&Kanthi, 2012).

Role Stagnation (RS)

Role Stagnation (RS) is a stressor faced by employees where they are not promoted and required to continue in their present capacities. Employees suffer stagnation and feel

oppressed being in the same role. Such individuals tend to think that there are no bright chances for them to see their career graphs grow and they eventually feel depressed. The employees' commitment to their work and sense of well-being is adversely affected by this stressor (Pareek, 1983).

Role Expectation Conflict (REC)

Role Expectation Conflict (REC) is a stressor that is caused by when an employee is not certain about how to continue his/her work due to the huge differences in work procedures suggested by different seniors collaborating on a common project. In such instances, employees' superiors and colleagues may not suit to each other's needs and not correspond to each other's requirements. Role conflict also occurs when an employee is asked to perform a function that is not part of his/her job (Pareek, 1983).

Role Erosion (RE)

Role Erosion (RE) is a situation where employees feel that certain work need to be under their purview but is reassigned to and executed by their colleagues and that such work originally belonged to them (Bano&Jha, 2012).

Role Overload (RO)

Role Overload (RO) is a stressor that occurs when employees are expected to perform certain functions that are not mentioned in their role and such over expectations can cause stress. Role overload requires an employee to perform several roles simultaneously consuming much of his/her time and resources. Such overburdened individuals may unknowingly commit errors in their work execution thereby affecting the job quality (Pareek, 1983).

Personal Inadequacy (PI)

Personal Inadequacy (PI) is caused when employees are expected to deliver more than their abilities in order to meet certain organizational requirements. In such cases, employees may be lacking in some of the vital skills required for executing the functions that are entrusted to them (Bano&Jha, 2012).

Self-Role Distance (SRD)

Self-Role Distance (SRD) is a stress factor that causes individuals to feel that the role which they are supposed to play does not match their expectations and that their role was far from what they had originally thought and conceived (Srivastav, 2006).

Role Ambiguity (RA)

Role Ambiguity (RA) is a stressor in which employees are either not well-informed about their roles or the employees themselves have not understood the intricacies of their roles. It is a situation where there is no clarity about the work role of employees who have not been adequately informed (Schmidt, Roesler, Kusserow, & Rau, 2014).

Occupational Stress and Demographic Variables (age, gender, rank and marital status)

Demographic variables such as age, gender, rank and marital status play an important role in formation of stress among teachers. With regards to creating professional identity, young women faculty members face more stress than their seniors. Academicians in higher ranks face lower levels of stress than those in lower ranks (Gmelch, Wike, and Lovrich, 1986). In a similar study, Witt and Lovrich (1988) report that women experience high levels of stress when they are asked to perform within time constraints amid high expectations.

According to Vadra and Akhtar (1989), university male teachers faced more social and family role stress than female teachers and the authors further stated that married teachers were more stressful than unmarried teachers. Various studies have confirmed the widespread perception of teachers who believed that their professions were highly stressful (Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1978; Boriles, 1982; Soloman and Feld, 1989; Borg and Falzon, 1989; Pithers and Soden, 1998; OConnor and Guglielmi and Tatrow, 1998).

Cluskey (1994) carried out a survey on management accountants and examined the relation between stress and job strains. He found main causes of stress to be as reporting to more than one boss; heavy workload under time constraints, work relations in the organization and perceived lack of career progress. He also reported an additional source of stress, a mismatch between personality and the task demands of the job.

Sehgal (1997) assessed the effect of role stress on the level of involvement a person has in the job and alienation and the coping mechanism used to deal with stress. It was found that role erosion, resource inadequacy and inter-role distance were dominating contributors of role stress. Avoidance style of coping was used more frequently than approach styles of coping.

Chand and Sethi (1997) conducted a study to examine the organizational factors as predictors of job related strain among 150 junior officers working in various banking institutions in the state of Himachal Pradesh. Role conflict, strenuous working conditions and role overload were found to be the dearest and most significant predictors of job related strain. In their seminal paper, Spector and Goh (2001) examined the role of emotion in occupational stress. They employed a narrow definition of job stress as "any condition or situation that elicits a negative emotional response, such as anger / frustration or anxiety / tension" in an attempt to overcome the broadness of previous definitions and focus on negative emotional responses. The authors suggested that emotions influence how the work environment is perceived, that is, whether a particular

condition is appraised as a job stressor or not. They further suggested that these appraising emotions may lead to psychological and physical strains. Psychological strain might result from continual negative emotional experiences and may lead to decreases in job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Physical strains (for example, suppression of the immune system, heart disease) may result from the physiological components of experienced emotions that can adversely affect health. It was concluded that an individual's ability to manage and control their emotions (particularly negative emotions) in the workplace will influence the outcome of stress.

Compared to male counterparts, female managers experienced stress caused by external discriminatory factors as discovered by the empirical studies of Davidson and Cooper, 1987. Even though men find the decline in career prospects as one of the major stressors (Ibid), this stressor is particularly demanding for women as they are mostly designated in the lower organizational levels (Nelson and Hitt, 1992). Moreover, studies have found that in addition to professional demands, domestic obligations to take a heavy toll on working women (Greeglass, 1985; Nelson and Hitt, 1992).

Stressors in the Workplace

Several researchers have categorized types of job stressors. For example, Cartwright and Cooper (1997) suggested six major sources of pressure at work: stress in the job itself, role based stress, relationships, career development factors, organizational structure and climate, and the work-family interface. Five categories were suggested by Ivancevich and Matteson (1980), three of which focused on social psychological stressors in the workplace. They employed the frequently used organizational psychology categorization by level of thought and inquiry; individual level, group level, and organizational level

While these approaches have taken a fairly broad view, trying to develop categories into which many specific stressors could be placed, Thomson, Murphy and Stradling (1994) have settled for a much narrower set of categories: role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary (role conflict) and responsibility

Atindanbila (2011) conducted a study to examine the perceived stressors that lecturers at the University of Ghana encounter in their work. Four hundred and thirty two lecturers were drawn from the University of Ghana for the study. The data was collected using the Teacher Stress Inventory. MANOVA, ANOVA and Independent Sample t tests were used to analyze the data. Analyses of the data revealed that lecturers had moderate stress levels and their major stressors were related to the school environment whilst the least was the administrative role. The Junior Lecturers perceive more stressors than the senior ones and the Professors. However; it was found that all the faculties experience similar levels of stressors. The recommendations centered mainly on expanding on existing infrastructural facilities in the University and improving on the working conditions of lecturers

In an analysis of psychological research on occupational stress related to gender, Deaux (1996) concluded that in most research little variance is accounted for by gender difference. Martocchio and 0'Leary (1992) conducted a meta-analysis of fifteen studies that had examined gender differences in work stress, and they concluded that there are no gender differences in occupational stress. They pointed out that the studies used in the analysis had several limitations including lack of information on reliability and validity of the stress measures. They observed that these methodological shortcomings could have influenced the results of the analysis. Despite the methodological limitations, they asserted that the burden of proof lies with those researchers who suggest that sex differences exist in occupational stress.

Stresses among Academics

Stress is recognized as an inherent feature of the work life of academic staff, and growing evidence suggest that it may be increasing in severity. Numerous studies have indicated that job stress is significant in academic staff. High job stress of academic staff is well documented. Heavy workload, poor staffing, dealing with students and colleagues, career progression, and lack of resources and organizational support have been identified as the major sources of job stress according to (Lee, 2003; Archibong&Effiom, 2010; Abousierie, 1996; Adeyemo, & Ogunyemi,2005;Ahmdy, Changiz, Masiello& Brommels,2007; Akinboye, Akinboye, &Adeyemo, 2002; Blix, Cruise, Mitchell, & Blix, 1994; Liu, & Zhu, 2009).

Stress according to D'Arcy (2007) isthe body's way of rising to a challenge and preparing to meet tough situation with focus, strength, stamina and heightened alertness. Ofoegbu and Nwandiani (2006) see it as a process in whichenvironmental events or forces threaten the wellbeing of the individuals in the society. Adeyemo and Ogunyemi (2005) see it as an unavoidable characteristic of life and work. Thus, in relationship to occupation, it is the physical, mental and emotional wear and tear brought about by incongruence between the requirements of the job and capabilities, resources and needs of the employee to cope with job demands according to (Akinboye&Adeyemo, 2002).

D'Arcy (2007) emphasizes that everyone experiences stress a little differently, it can be a good thing, but overload ofit is a different story. He explains that stress overload is caused by the overreaction or failure of the stress response to turn off and reset itself properly. Health and Safety Executive (HSE) (2001) define stress as the adverse reaction a person has to excessive pressure or other types of demand placed upon

them. They maintain that stress affects us in different ways at different times and is often the result of a combination of factors in our personal and working lives, and that stress is not a weakness but if unnoticed it can lead progressively to a decrease in performance, poor health and long term absence from work. Winfield (2000) indicates that there is prevalence of occupational stress among academic and general staff of universities. Studies by Awopegba (2001), Lam and Punch (2001) and Boyd and Wylie (1994) are in support of stress among academic staff of universities.

Indeed, in the clamour for university education and with each university determined to achieve its goal, the academic staff are bound to be stressed. Ahsan, Abdullah, Fie and Alam (2009) identified stress inducing factors in academic staff to include: work overload, homework interface, and role ambiguity and performance pressure. In support of stress on academic staff, Abouserie (1996) found workload and conducting research as factors of stress. Listing the most related stressors on academic staff, Ahmdy, Changiz, Masiello and Brommels (2007), included workload, conflict, demands from colleagues and supervisors, incompatible demands from different personal and organization roles, inadequate resources for appropriate performance, insufficient competency to the demands of their role, inadequate autonomy to make decision on different tasks and feeling of underutilization.

Madhuet al. (1990) conducted a study on role stress: differential influences of some antecedent factors. 173 managerial personnel from steel organization and 76 from petroleum organization participated in the study. The present study attempted to compare the influence of the antecedent factors namely, personal, organizational, job, superior, leadership styles and communication factors on role conflict and role ambiguity. It was found that role conflict and role ambiguity experienced by the employees were most significant in the petroleum organization.

Tharakan (1992) studied on occupational stress and job satisfaction among working women. He observed that professional women experienced greater work related stress than non-professional women. The expectation of technocrats was much higher than the no technocrats.

Research Methodology

Rationale of the Study

Maintaining balance between work and personal life in the fast-paced life appears to be a lofty goal for working women. Further, the global economic meltdown in the recent years has created an unstable environment both in the corporate as well as academic sectors. Organizations seek creative ways of achieving its business goals; hence, the employee goals are revised constantly to achieve effectiveness and efficiency of employees. To achieve these goals and be successful in its business ventures on an extremely stringent budget, the organization should maintain an environment that is not highly charged and make it highly productive. Stress in work has serious repercussions on employees not only in work, but also in their personal, social and psychological life. The impact of stress is felt on performance of the employees, as a result of absenteeism, poor productivity, job turnover, and poor behavioral aspects. From the analysis of literature, common areas emerge in quantitative research as sources of stress for service industry employees. Review on researches highlight that only few studies have been conducted on teaching professionals with regard to the effects of stress (Quick and Quick, 1984). Earlier teaching profession was considered to be less stressful (French et al., 1982); however, recent studies show that teaching profession to be transforming in to stressful jobs (Singla, 2014).Drastic social changes in the past few decades have resulted in the teaching profession, due to changes in the corporate and community expectations in terms of implementation of new curriculum and teaching practices. This has forced the teachers to think out of box to deliver effective learning to the students resulting in tremendous stress. Lower job satisfaction among the teachers has been reported by many researchers (Eckles, 1987). In addition to immediate teaching environments, institutional and organizational factors also create stress among teachers. Similarly, several studies have mentioned that employees from different service sector undergo stress that result in reduction in productivity and performance (Usman and Ismail, 2010), as they are unable to link the work demands with their capabilities (Barling et al., 2004).

However, it is not clear if the academicians undergo greater stress than the corporate employees. Therefore, this study has focused on evaluating the difference between the two groups of employees. Eight stress factors were identified by Pareek (1983) among working women. These factors, namely Inter Role Distance (IRD), Role Stagnation (RS), Role Expectation Conflict (REC), Role Erosion (RE), Role Overload (RO), Personal Inadequacy (PI), Self-Role Distance (SRD) and Role Ambiguity (RA) were used in this study to distinguish the opinion of academicians and corporate employees.

Research Objectives:

- To find out the ORS among women of academic & corporate sector.
- To make a comparative analysis and its impact of ORS among corporate & academic sector.

Hypothesis:

- Hypothesis01:There is no difference in mean rating scores among factors of ORS across the age group of working women in selective service sector.

- Hypothesis11:There is significant difference in mean rating scores among factors of ORS.

Sample unit: Banks, IT & education institutes of Bangalore city.

Sample size: 200 employees each from academic & corporate sector.

Analysis

It is seen from one-way ANOVA result (Table – 2), that there is a significant (statistically) difference in overall mean score of Inter-role distance[F (2,386) = 32.28, p=0.005, p<0.05] dimension among three categories age group. Hence, we reject null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. In other words, Influencedimensionmean score does not differ significantly between each pair of age group. Now,it would be interesting to see to which pair of age group significantly among three categories of age group. This is carried out by using post-hoc tests. Accordingly, scheffe's post-hoc test is used in a situation and the result is depicted in Table – 2(a). From the Scheffe's test result seen in Table – 2 (a), we see that there is a significant (statistically) difference in mean score of age group 20 to 30 respondents and 40 to 50 of age group with respect to Inter-Role Distance dimension. The positive mean difference indicate that younger women respondents in the age group 20 to 30 age group seem to have greater tendency of strongly agreeing that Inter-Role Distance score dimension of influencing more organisational stress as compared to employees belonging to middle age of 40 to 50 years group.

It is seen from one-way ANOVA result (Table – 3), that there is a significant (statistically) difference in overall mean score of Inter-role distance[F (2,386) = 39.5, p=0.005, p<0.05] dimension among three categories age group. Hence, we reject null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. In other words, Role Stagnationd-imensionmean score does not differ significantly between each pair of age group. Now,it would be interesting to see to which pair of age group significantly among three categories of age group. Accordingly, scheffe's post-hoc test is used in a situation and the result is depicted in Table – 3(a). From the Scheffe's test result seen in Table – 3 (a), we see that there is a significant (statistically) difference in mean score of age group 20 to 30 respondents and 40 to 50 of age group with respect to Role Stagnation dimension.The positive mean difference indicate that younger women respondents in the age group 20 to 30 age group seem to have greater tendency of strongly agreeing that Role Stagnation dimension of influencing more organisational stress as compared to employees belonging to middle age of 40 to 50 years group.

It is seen from one-way ANOVA result (Table – 4), that there is a significant (statistically) difference in overall mean score of Role Expectation Conflict[F (2,386) = 16.3, p=0.005, p<0.05] dimension among three categories age group. Hence, we reject null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. In other words, Role Expectation Conflictdimensionmean score does not differ significantly between each pair of age group. Now,it would be interesting to see to which pair of age group significantly among three categories of age group. Accordingly, scheffe's post-hoc test is used in a situation and the result is depicted in Table – 4(a). From the Scheffe's test result seen in Table – 4(a), we see that there is a significant (statistically) difference in mean score of age group 20 to 30 respondents and 40 to 50 of age group with respect to Role Expectation Conflict dimension.The positive mean difference indicate that younger women respondents in the age group 20 to 30 age group seem to have greater tendency of strongly agreeing that Role Erosion dimension of influencing more organisational stress as compared to employees belonging to the age group of 40 to 50 years.

It is seen from one-way ANOVA result (Table – 5), that there is a significant (statistically) difference in overall mean score of Role Erosion[F (2,386) = 14.4, p=0.005, p<0.05] dimension among three categories age group. Hence, we reject null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. In other words, Role Erosion dimensionmean score does not differ significantly between each pair of age group. The positive mean difference indicate that younger women respondents in the age group 20 to 30 age group seem to have greater tendency of strongly agreeing that Role Erosion dimension of influencing more occupational stress as compared to employees belonging to the age group of 40 to 50 years.

It is seen from one-way ANOVA result (Table – 6), that there is a significant (statistically) difference in overall mean score of Role Overload[F (2,386) = 15.8, p=0.005, p<0.05] dimension among three categories age group. Hence, we reject null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. In other words, Role Overload dimensionmean score does not differ significantly between each pair of age group. From the Scheffe's test result seen in Table – 6 (a), we see that there is a significant (statistically) difference in mean score of age group 20 to 30 respondents and 40 to 50 of age group with respect to Role Erosion dimension.The positive mean difference indicate that younger women respondents in the age group 20 to 30 age group seem to have greater tendency of strongly agreeing that Role Overload dimension of influencing more organisational stress as compared to employees belonging to the age group of 30 to 40 years.

It is seen from one-way ANOVA result (Table – 7), that there is a significant (statistically) difference in overall mean score of Role Overload[F (2,386) = 55.3, p=0.005, p<0.05] dimension among three categories age group. Hence, we reject null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. In other words, Role (personal) Inadequacy dimensionmean score does not differ significantly between each pair of age

group. From the Scheffe's test result seen in Table – 7 (a), we see that there is a significant (statistically) difference in mean score of age group 20 to 30 respondents and 40 to 50 of age group with respect to Role (personal) Inadequacy dimension.

The negative mean difference indicate that younger women respondents in the age group 30 to 40 age group and also elder age group of 40 50 years seem to have greater tendency of strongly agreeing that Role (personal) Inadequacy dimension of influencing more organisational stress as compared to employees belonging to the younger age group of 20 to 30 years.

It is seen from one-way ANOVA result (Table – 8), that there is a significant (statistically) difference in overall mean score of Self –Role Distance[F (2,386) = 9.5, p=0.005, p<0.05] dimension among three categories age group. Hence, we reject null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. In other words, self –Role Distance dimensionmean score does not differ significantly between each pair of age group. From the Scheffe's test result seen in Table – 8 (a), we see that there is a significant (statistically) difference in mean score of age group 20 to 30 respondents and 40 to 50 of age group with respect to Self –Role Distance dimension.The negative mean difference indicate that women respondents in the age group 40 to 50 age group seem to have greater tendency of strongly agreeing that Self –Role Distance dimension of influencing more organisational stress as compared to employees belonging to the age group of 30 to 40 years.

It is seen from one-way ANOVA result (Table – 9), that there is a significant (statistically) difference in overall mean score of Role Ambiguity [F (2,386) = 14.8, p=0.005, p<0.05] dimension among three categories age group. Hence, we reject null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. In other words, Role Ambiguity dimensionmean score does not differ significantly between each pair of age group. From the Scheffe's test result seen in Table – 9 (a), we see that there is a significant (statistically) difference in mean score of age group 20 to 30 respondents and 40 to 50 of age group with respect to Role Ambiguity dimension.The positive mean difference indicate that younger women respondents in the age group 20 to 30 age group seem to have greater tendency of strongly agreeing that Role Ambiguity dimension of influencing more organisational stress as compared to employees belonging to the age group of 30 to 40 years.

Conclusion

Women in both academia and the corporate world face organisational and occupational stress though not equal stress levels. Handling work pressures and the daily responsibilities of home-life, especially women with children can be immensely daunting. Organizations must recognize these challenges and provide support for working women so that this talent pool can be effectively harnessed.

From this study, it is understood that role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload to have a negative impact, hence, specific effort should be made for alleviating the negative outcomes which are unfavorable to the productivity of the employees as well as the organization and to achieve better quality of work life for the women employees. Due to performance of dual roles by women employees, a few suggestions may be practiced to assuage their problems. As acknowledged by Havighust (1953), the age-linked developmental tasks should emphasize on balance between career and family orientation by both male and females. The sex roles need to be reexamined as reciprocal and overlapping instead of considering is as distinct. From this study it is evidenced that role overload is one of the significant factors that is considered as challenging for women; therefore, this factor should be due consideration by the human resource management practices.

A significant difference between the different age group was found for Self-role distance,Inter-role distance, Role stagnation, Role expectation conflict, Role ambiguity, Role overload, Role Erosion, Role (personal) inadequacy factors of organisational stress.

Suggestions for Further Research

1. The limitations observed in the study have given rise to scope for further studies. The present study had focussed on the various contributors of stress, such as Inter Role Distance, Role Stagnation, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Erosion, Role Overload, Personal Inadequacy,Self-Role Distance and Role Ambiguity among academicians and women working in corporate sector. However, not many studies have been conducted on contract labourers who work in various IT and ITes sectors in relation to the stress level experienced by them. Unlike full time employees, these employees, in addition to juggling between work and family, also live under continuous threat created by job security.
2. As only the age group of respondents working both in academics and corporate sector are explored in future research with special focus on the role of women and impact of women in such conflict resolutions.
3. Perhaps, the coping mechanism applied by the working women may throw light on the developing a model which could be used to boost the mental health of women.

References

Afolabi, O. A., &Omole, E. O. (2011).Personality type and workforce diversity as predictors of ethical behaviour and job satisfaction among Nigerian policemen. Current Research Journal of Social Sciences, 3(5), 381-388.

Aravindan, A., &Kanthi, M. P. (2012). A Study on the Effect of Occupational Stress & Work life Balance Among Women Employees in Mass Media Industry-With Special Reference to Kerala. Circulation in more than 85 countries, 1.

Bano, B., &Jha, R. K. (2012). Organizational role stress among public and private sector employees: a comparative study.

Bakker, A. B., Van Der Zee, K. I., Lewig, K. A., & Dollard, M. F. (2006). The relationship between the big five personality factors and burnout: A study among volunteer counselors. The Journal of Social Psychology, 146(1), 31-50.

Best, R. G., Stapleton, L. M., & Downey, R. G. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job burnout: the test of alternative models. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10(4), 441.

Bickford, M. (2005). Stress in the Workplace: A General Overview of the Causes, the Effects, and the Solutions. Canadian Mental Health Association Newfoundland and Labrador Division, 1-3.

Calvarese, M. (2015). The effect of gender on stress factors: An exploratory study among university students. Social Sciences, 4(4), 1177-1184.

Cassidy, C., O'Connor, R. C., Howe, C., & Warden, D. (2004). Perceived discrimination and psychological distress: The role of personal and ethnic self-esteem. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51(3), 329.

Chang, K., & Taylor, J. (2014). Do your employees use the right stress coping strategies. International Journal of Commerce and Strategy, 5(2), 99-116.

Colligan, T. W., & Higgins, E. M. (2006). Workplace stress: Etiology and consequences. Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health, 21(2), 89-97.

Cooper, C. L. (2005). The future of work: careers, stress and well-being. Career Development International, 10(5), 396-399.

Cooper, C. L., & Cartwright, S. (1994). Healthy mind; healthy organization - A proactive approach to occupational stress.Human Relations, 47(4), 455-471.

Cooper, C. L., Dewe, P. J., &O'Driscoll, M. P. (2001). Organizational stress: A review and critique of theory, research, and applications. Sage.

Cosman, D., 2010. Psihologiemedicala, Ed. Polirom, 14(8), pp. 300-302.

Darshani, R. K. N. D. (2014). A review of personality types and locus of control as moderators of stress and conflict management.International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 4(2), 1-8.

de Jong, G. M., &Emmelkamp, P. M. (2000). Implementing a stress management training: Comparative trainer effectiveness. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5(2), 309.

Dewe, P., &Trenberth, L. (2004). Work stress and coping: Drawing together theory and practice. British Journal of Guidance &Counselling, 32, 143-156.

Dimitriu, M. C., &Mitovski, A. (2009).Organizational stress management.In the Ninth International Conference, Investments and Economic Recovery.

Doherty, E. M., & Nugent, E. (2011). Personality factors and medical training: A review of the literature. Medical Education, 45(2), 132-140.

Dumitru, V. M., &Cozman, D. (2012).The relationship between stress and personality factors. Hum Vet Med, 4, 34-9.

El Shikieri, A. B., & Musa, H. A. (2012). Factors associated with occupational stress and their effects on organizational performance in a Sudanese University. Creative Education, 3(01), 134.

Grimshaw, J. (1999). Employment and health: Psychosocial stress in the workplace. British Library Board.

Hill, R. B. (2003). The strengths of black families.University Press of America.

Hodgson, C. S., Teherani, A., Gough, H. G., Bradley, P., &Papadakis, M. A. (2007).The relationship between measures of unprofessional behavior during medical school and indices on the California Psychological Inventory. Academic Medicine, 82(10), S4-S7.

Jex, S. M. (1998). Stress and job performance: Theory, research, and implications for managerial practice. Sage Publications Ltd.

Jeyaraj, S. S., &Ramamoorthy, K. (2013). Study on individual, interpersonal and organizational factors that influence occupational stress among higher secondary teachers in Madurai district, Tamil Nadu. International Journal of Management and Social Sciences Research, 2(5).

Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., & Newton, T. L. (2001). Marriage and health: his and hers. Psychological Bulletin, 127(4), 472.

Kivimäki, M., Vahtera, J., Elovainio, M., Helenius, H., Singh-Manoux, A., &Pentti, J. (2005).Optimism and pessimism as predictors of change in health after death or onset of severe illness in family. Health Psychology, 24(4), 413.

Krishnan L. (2014). Factors causing stress among working women and strategies to cope up. IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 16(5) 12-17.

Landy, F. J., & Conte, J. M. (2004).Work in 21st Century, An Introduction to Individual & Organizational Psychology. New York: McGraw Hill.

Le Blanc, P., de Jonge, J., &Schaufeli, J. (2000).Job Stress and Health.ÎnChmiel, N.(Ed.) Work and Organizational Psychology. A European Perspective.

Le Fevre, M., Matheny, J., &Kolt, G. S. (2003).Eustress, distress, and interpretation in occupational stress. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 18(7), 726-744.

Mazzetti, A., & Blenkinsopp, J. (2012). Evaluating a visual timeline methodology for appraisal and coping research. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 85(4), 649-665.

McManus, I. C., Keeling, A., &Paice, E. (2004). Stress, burnout and doctors' attitudes to work are determined by personality and learning style: A twelve year longitudinal study of UK medical graduates. BMC Medicine, 2(1), 1.

Michie, S. (2002).Causes and management of stress at work. Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 59(1), 67-72.

Panda, U. K. (2011). Role conflict, stress and dual career couples: An empirical study. The Journal of Family Welfare, 57(2), 72-88.

Pareek, U. (1983). Role stress scale: ORS scale booklet, answer sheet, and manual. Ahmedabad: Navin Publications.

Patil, M. (2016). Stress level of working and non working women. The International Journal of Indian Psychology, 3(2) 4-31.

Rani, R. U., &Bhuvaneswari, K. (2014).An analysis on the main factors of occupational stress among Indian women–A soft computing approach.International Journal of Computational Intelligence and Informatics, 4(2) 155-162.

Schmidt, S., Roesler, U., Kusserow, T., & Rau, R. (2014). Uncertainty in the workplace: Examining role ambiguity and role conflict, and their link to depression—a meta-analysis. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 23(1), 91-106.

Srivastav, A. K. (2006). Organizational climate as a dependent variable: Relationship with role stress, coping strategy and personal variables. Journal of Management Research, 6(3), 125.

Terrill, A. L., Garofalo, J. P., Soliday, E., & Craft, R. (2012). Multiple roles and stress burden in women: a conceptual model of heart disease risk. Journal of Applied Biobehavioral Research, 17(1), 4-22.

Törnroos, M. (2015). Personality and work stress: The role of five-factor model traits and cynicism in perceptions of work characteristics.

Tripathi, P., &Bhattacharjee, S. (2012). A study on psychological stress of working women. Zenith International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 2(2), 434-435.

Tyagi, V. (2014).Impact of role stagnation on employees' sensitivity.International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation, 1(2) 27-35.

Uen, J. F., Wu, T., & Huang, H. Y. (2009). Young managers' interpersonal stress and its relationship to management development practices: An exploratory study. International Journal of Training and Development, 13(1), 38-52.

Vandenberg, R. J., Park, K. O., DeJoy, D. M., Wilson, M. G., & Griffin-Blake, C. S. (2002). The healthy work organization model: Expanding the view of individual health and well being in the workplace. Historical and current perspectives on stress and health, 2, 57-115.

Vijayadurai, D. J., &Venkatesh, S. (2012). Study on stress management among women college teachers in Tamilnadu, India. Pacific Business Review International, 5.

Tables

One way ANOVA for Age group:

Table – 2: One-way ANOVA between age group and Inter -Role Distance score of ORS

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Between Groups	410.69	2	205.34	32.2	0.00*
Within Groups	2455.12	386	6.4	85	
Total	2865.81	388			

[Note: Only three age group categories namely 20 to 30 years, 30 to 40 years and 40 and 50 years are considered for ANOVA. The last age group category namely "greater than 50 years" has only 12 respondents. Hence to balance the sample size, this category is dropped and as a result the total sample size here would be 388 instead of 400]
* Significant at 5 % level.

Table 2(a): Scheffe's post -hoc test result between pair of age group under Inter-Role Distance score dimension of ORS

Age group	Age group	Mean Difference	Std. Error	p-value
20 – 30 yrs	40 – 50 yrs	2.6	0.35	**0.00***

Note: * Significant at 5 % level

Table – 3: One-way ANOVA between age group and Role Stagnation score of ORS

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Between Groups	581.5	2	290.7	39.6	0.00*
Within Groups	2836.1	386	7.4		
Total	3417.6	388			

Note: * Significant at 5 % level.

Table 3(a): Scheffe's post -hoc test result between pair of age group under Role Stagnation dimension of ORS

Age group	Age group	Mean Difference	Std. Error	p-value
20 – 30 yrs	40 – 50 yrs	2.7	0.4	0.00*

Note: * Significant at 5 % level.

Table – 4: One-way ANOVA between age group and Role Expectation Conflict score of ORS

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Between Groups	147.9	2	73.9	16.4	0.00*
Within Groups	1743.9	386	4.52		
Total	1891.8	388			

Note: * Significant at 5 % level

Table 4(a): Scheffe's post -hoc test result between pair of age group under Role Expectation Conflict dimension of ORS

Age group	Age group	Mean Difference	Std. Error	p-value
20 – 30 yrs	30 – 40 yrs	0.9	0.3	0.00*

Note: * Significant at 5 % level

Table – 5: One-way ANOVA between age group and Role Erosion Score of ORS

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Between Groups	278.0	2	139.0	14.4	0.00*
Within Groups	3721.8	386	9.6		
Total	3999.8	388			

Note: * Significant at 5 % level.

Table 5(a): Scheffe's post-hoc test result between pair of age group under Role Erosion dimension of ORS

Age group	Age group	Mean Difference	Std. Error	p-value
20 – 30 yrs	40 – 50 yrs	1.6	0.4	0.00*

Note: * Significant at 5 % level

Table – 6: One-way ANOVA between age group and Role Overload Score of ORS

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Between Groups	130.9	2	65.4	15.8	0.00*
Within Groups	1599.3	386	4.1		
Total	1730.2	388			

Note: * Significant at 5 % level.

Table 6(a): Scheffe's post-hoc test result between pair of age group under Role Overload dimension of ORS

Age group	Age group	Mean Difference	Std. Error	p-value
20 – 30 yrs	30 – 40 yrs	0.9	0.2	0.00*

Note: * Significant at 5 % level.

Table – 7: One-way ANOVA between age group and Role (personal) Inadequacy Score of ORS

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Between Groups	316.6	2	158.3	55.4	0.00*
Within Groups	1103.2	386	2.8		
Total	1419.8	388			

Note: * Significant at 5 % level

Table 7(a): Scheffe's post-hoc test result between pair of age group under Role (personal) Inadequacy dimension of ORS

Age group	Age group	Mean Difference	Std. Error	p-value
20 – 30 yrs	30 – 40 yrs	-1.3	0.19	0.00*
20 – 30 yrs	40 – 50 yrs	-2.4	0.23	0.00*

Note: * Significant at 5 % level

Table – 8: One-way ANOVA between age group and Self –Role Distance Score of ORS

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Between Groups	87.4	2	43.7	9.5	0.00*
Within Groups	1767.5	386	4.5		
Total	1854.9	388			

Note: * Significant at 5 % level.

Table 8(a): Scheffe's post-hoc test result between pair of age group under Self –Role Distance dimension of ORS

Age group	Age group	Mean Difference	Std. Error	p-value
30 – 40 yrs	40 – 50 yrs	-1.2	0.27	0.00*

Note:* Significant at 5 % level

Table – 9: One-way ANOVA between age group and Role Ambiguity Score of ORS

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Between Groups	148.2	2	74.1	14.8	0.00*
Within Groups	1932.9	386	5.0		
Total	2081.1	388			

Note: * Significant at 5 % level

Table 9(a): Scheffe's post-hoc test result between pair of age group under Role Ambiguity dimension of ORS

Age group	Age group	Mean Difference	Std. Error	p-value
20 – 30 yrs	30 – 40 yrs	1.2	0.3	0.00*

Note: * Significant at 5 % level.