CHAPTER TWO
2. REVIEW OF RESEARCH LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

The need for literature review indicates that stress is recognized as a key concern in the business of work today, and there are increasing number of research studies on this topic due to its threat to overhead costs and productivity in business. A lot of studies examine stress and its related variables. Stressors are 'characteristics of the job environment, which pose a threat to the individual' (Caplan, Cobb, French, Van Harrison & Pinneau, 1975). Stress, in another research is defined as 'a perceived dynamic state involving uncertainty about something important' (Schuler, 1975). According to Robbins and Sanghi (2006), stress arises from confronting an opportunity, constraints, or pressure, when the outcome expected is important as well as uncertain.

Research also examines stress as a relationship between the employees and one's contextual environment, as appraised by the person, as taxing or exceeding his or her resources as well as endangering his or her own well-being (Dewe & Guest, 1990; Lazarus, 1966; French, Roger, & Cobb, 1974; McGrath, 1976).

As articulated in Chapter One, stress is often considered transactional in nature, that is, an interaction between the individual and the environment (Lazarus and Launier, 1978). In a way, stress is perceived as the negative effect of the workplace in conjunction with employee characteristics such as health and well-being (Beehr, 1995, Evans & Cohen, 1987).
Interventions introduced to reduce and prevent stress have met with some success (Clarke, 2000; Cox & Cox, 1991, 1996; Cox & Flin, 1998). In similar perspective, management attitudes, cultures and styles have been found to have significant impact on levels of stress (Mikkelsen et al, 2004; Forster & Still, 2002, Ernst et al., 2004; Valle & Witt, 2001)

2.2 Person-Environment Fit Theory

In this present study, stress is viewed as a transactional construct (Lazarus, 1966; McGrath, 1976; Beehr & Newman, 1978). Stress is the outcome of incongruence between the demands of the work environment and the competencies of banking executive. Stress is a variable in the research and development of the Person-Environment Fit Theory, or P-E Fit Theory. The concept of P-E fit is described in the motivational processes and research of Lewin (1951) and Murray (1938). However, Pervin (1968) speaks more specifically. Pervin (1968) who started the development of P-E Fit assumes that for 'each individual there is an environment which more or less matches the characteristics of the individual's personality'. Pervin's (1968) research shows that environment that matches the personality characteristics of the individual, foster positive interaction between the organization and the individual. Conversely, the lack of fit, decreased performance, increased dissatisfaction and stress (Pervin, 1968).

Research review dictates that the P-E fit model of stress is perhaps the most discussed in the literature (Edwards, 1991; Edwards & Cooper, 1988; Eulberg et al., 1999). The difficulty, however, is that there is little empirical evidence to support this model due to problems in clarifying the exact nature of misfit and the appropriate level of measurement of the construct involved (Edwards & Cooper, 1988). Various
researchers who have worked around this model are (Cox & Mc Kay, 1981; Beehr & Franz, 1987; Ivancevich & Matteson, 1980; Payne, Jick & Burke, 1982; and Lazarus 1966).

Bolger and Zuckerman (1995) suggested that personality may play an important role in the stress process by influencing individual's exposure to stressful events, by affecting their reactivity to these events or both of these processes. Though there is transactional evidence, at the empirical level the tendency is still to research the relationship between the specific constructs of the transaction rather than to explore the nature of the transaction itself and the processes that link the individual to the environment (Dewe, 1991).

2.3 Bird's Eye View of Stress Research

Stress research has largely remained confined to:


**Social support and stress** (Murphy, 1995; Netemeyer et al., 1996; Valle & Witt, 2001; Spielberger et al., 2003; Frone, 2000; Grzywacz & Marks 2000; Grant-Vallone & Donaldson, 2001; Schabracq & Cooper, 2000; Dobreva-Martinova et al., 2002; Nigam et al., 2003; O'Driscoll et al., 2003; Semmer,2003; Hammer et al., 2004; Mikkelsen & Burke, 2004; de Croon et al., 2004; Haslam & Reicher, 2006; Spielberger et al., 2003; Thompson & Prottas , 2006) and

2.3.1 Stress - The Indian Experience

Within the Indian context, various researchers have attempted to explore the relationship of organizational role stress with:

Personality variables (Sen, 1981; Surti, 1982);


Job satisfaction (Shrivastava & Parmar, 1977; Pestonjee & Singh, 1982; Jagdish, 1983; Jagdish & Srivastava, 1983 b; Mishra, 1986);

Job involvement (Madhu & Harigopal, 1980; Singh & Singh, 1982; Srivastava & Sinha, 1983; Mishra, 1986, 1987);

Role efficacy (Sen, 1981; Surti, 1982; Das, 1985; Sayed, 1985);

Role satisfaction (Sen, 1981);

Type A behavior (Pestonjee, 1987; Pestonjee & Singh, G.P., 1988);

Anger (Pestonjee & Singh, 1988; Sharma et al., 1998) and

Organizational climate and organizational effectiveness (Khanna, 1985; Srivastav, 2007).
The subsequent section, therefore, will only concentrate on the review of literature in the areas of Role stress.

2.4 Review on Role Theory

Role theory is concerned with the study of behaviors that are characteristics of person within context (i.e. roles) and with various processes that presumably produce, explain, or are affected by those behaviors (Biddle, 1979).

The history on role theory can be traced to the late 1920's and early 1930 are when various behavioral researchers (psychology, sociology and anthropology) began to consider pattern of human conduct and individual human responses to those patterns in terms of roles.

Talcott Parson a social scientist noted that roles belonged to a social system and were explained through role expectation that were held in check through norms and sanctions (Parsons, 1951). It was G.H. Mead who explored how role-taking impacted socialization and influenced the psychology of individuals and their self-perception. However a major contribution of role theory depends in the variety of pioneering perspectives from which it derived (Biddle, 1979).

Various behavioral researchers of different disciplines have conceptualized employee stress in terms of role related factors (Singh, 1993; House & Rizzo, 1972; Schwab, Jackson & Schuler, 1986). It was through the work of Kahn, 1964 and colleagues which marked as the beginning of the application of role theory to understand employee behavior (Lyonski, 1985). In order to examine and integrate the research on role the Kahn et al. (1964) role episode model is useful.
The model depicts the interpersonal process between the person being sent expectations (the focal person) and those sending the expectations (role senders). In addition, the model incorporates organizational, personal, and inter-personal factors. These factors affect the expectations of individuals about the role behavior of others. These expectations determine the nature and content of communication 'sent' to the focal person by the role sender. The expectations are transmitted to a 'focal' person as norms, or pressures, to act in certain ways. Pressures received by the focal person when interpreted leads to the level of organizational stress and role stress in particular.

The main focus in predicting role stress has been organizational variables (Moth, Bartunek, and Brass, 1979; Morris, Street, & Koch, 1979; Rogers & Molnar, 1976). Limited studies have investigated interpersonal predictors (Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, & Pinneau, 1980; Nicholson & Goh, 1983; Randolph & Posner 1981). Some researchers report data relating to personality predictors (Beehr, Walsh, & Taber, 1976).

Another study by Newton and Keenan (1987) investigated the relationship between three different types of predictors on role stress; personal, interpersonal and organizational and four forms of role stress; role conflict, role ambiguity, quantitative role overload, and qualitative role overload. The result supports the relevance of personal, interpersonal, and organizational predictors to role stress.

According to Pareek (1993, 2002), role is a position assigned in a social system or an organization, composite of obligations and responsibilities. It represents a position occupied by a person, which is characterized by the expectation of significant others as well as those of a role occupant. Owning to the very nature of the role, there are
inherent problems in the performance of a role. Hence, role stress is inevitable. However in the pioneering work of Pareek (1983) the ten dimensions of role stress have been widely used and researched and has largely contributed to the breadth of role stress research.

Earlier frameworks in the area of role stress dealt with only three types of role stress (Kahn et al., 1964; Rizzo et al., 1970, and Beehr et al., 1976). It was in the work of Pareek (1983) that the ten dimensions of role stress have been widely researched. However, as a new development to the above scale Srivastav and Pareek (2008) have reported the existence of another type of role stress, called Role Underload.
2.5 Review on the Types of Role Stress

All ten dimensions of role stress that have been developed by Prof. Udai Pareek have been extensively researched. The various research findings and contributions made by various researchers are placed here as under:

2.5.1 Inter-Role Distance (IRD)

An individual occupies more than one role at a time. His organizational role may often come into conflict with his family role or with other organizations or groups. The distance or conflict amongst these various roles represents inter-role distance.

A manager's life inside the organization and outside the organization might put pressure on the manager's family problems (Paul & Paul, 1971). Marshall and Cooper (1978) have mentioned two main problems regarding manager's relationship with his family.

The first is that of time and commitment-management. Not only does his busy schedule leave him fewer resources to cope with other people's needs but in order to do this job well the manager usually also needs support from others to cope with background details of home management etc., to relieve stress when possible and to maintain contact with the outside world, and

The second, often a result of the first, is the spillover of crises or stresses in one system to affect the other. Beattie, Darlington and Cripps (1974) highlight the difficult situation of the young executive who in order to build up his career must devote a great deal of time and energy to his job just when his young house-bound wife with small children are also making pressing demands. They suggested that the executive fights to maintain the distance between his wife and the organization.
Bhatnagar and Bose (1985) found that stress-related problems of branch managers (bank employees) appear to be their inability to combine the demands of their organizational life with those of their family life. As a result, they feel that their role as a branch manager leaves them little time for their other important roles in their personal life. They further suggested that people with a high task appear to experience low inter-role distance in their jobs.

Gupta, Navin (1988), found higher inter-role distance among executives with service length of more than 10 years. After 10 years of service, executives become more career-oriented and their excessive involvement in the organization creates conflicts between their career and family demands, resulting in more stress, that is, inter-role distance. Kedar Nath (1988) stated that subjects who experience high role stress pertaining to inter-role distance showed less job involvement.

Satyanarayana (1995) revealed that the two groups, namely executives and supervisors differed significantly in respect of inter-role distance dimension. Pandey (1997) found experience to be positively and significantly associated with inter-role distance. Srivastava (1997) examined the dynamics of role stress and found that inter-role distance was associated negatively and significantly with intro-persistent and extra-persistent coping styles. In yet another study, Sehgal (1997) revealed that inter-role distance was a dominant contributor of role stress for the total sample. Since job factors influence the human factors and the human factors influence the job factors, the executives may find themselves boxed in a home and job conflict situation. High level of education is helpful to deal with the stressful situation in a better way resulting in less stress, that is, inter-role distance among women having education up to SSC level as compared to women having education up to postgraduate level and above. Similarly, Sen (1981) also found high inter-role
distance among bank employees having intermediate qualification only. An educationally handicapped employee takes his duties lightly and devotes more time for other activities than office work.

2.5.2 Role Stagnation (RS)

This kind of stress is the result of a gap between demand to outgrow his previous role and to occupy a new role effectively. Such a type of stress results into perception that there is no opportunity for one's career progression. The perception may be more intense when the role occupant holds a role for a longer period and enters in a new role in which he feels less secure.

Marshall and Cooper (1979) identified two major clusters of potential stressors: Lack of job security, fear of redundancy, obsolescence or early retirement, and status incongruity, for example, under or over promotion, frustrations at having reached one's career ceiling. For many managers, their career progression is of overriding importance. By promotion, they earn not only money but enhanced status and the new job challenges for which they strive. The fear of demotion or obsolescence can be strong for those who know they have reached their career ceiling. Role stagnation decreases as people advance in age.

Sen (1981) found that people above 50 years of age had the lowest role stagnation. At this level of age, people are generally at the top and senior management cadres, where they carry more responsibilities, greater authority, status and esteem and their prospects of career advancement also increases.

Gupta (1988) found that the feeling of role stagnation were high in the executives with the service length of 5 to 10 years. Kedar Nath (1988) stated that subjects who
experience high role stress pertaining to Role stagnation, showed less job involvement. Kumar (1989) identified role stagnation to be significantly higher among lower level executives. Whereas, Satyanarayana's (1995) analysis showed data to the effect that role stagnation was experienced as a dominant contributor of role stress in executives and supervisors. Srivastava (1997) examined the dynamics of role stress and found that role stagnation was associated negatively and significantly with intro-persistive and extra-persistive coping styles. Pandey (1997) found experience to be positively and significantly associated with Role Stagnation. Sehgal (1997) revealed that middle level executives reported higher role stagnation and senior level executives scored higher on total ORS as compared to junior and middle levels.

2.5.3 Role Expectation Conflict (REC)

This type of stress is generated by different expectations of different significant persons about the same role. It is possible that the significant persons differ in their expectations about the same role and the role occupant is ambivalent as to whom to please. Harigopal (1984) suggested that receiving contradictory instructions from two or more superiors is found to be the most frequently occurring conflict when the immediate superior's instructions contradict the focal person's own job expectations.

Gupta (1988) found that role expectation conflict increases as the length of service increases. It might be possible that as the responsibilities increase gradually, the executive is not able to cope with and understand the expectations of the role made by other authorities and colleagues and concerned people. Kedar Nath (1988) stated that subjects who experience high role stress pertaining to role-expectation conflict show less job involvement. Ahmad et al. (1991) stated that only one dimension of
ORS (role expectation conflict) had a significantly negative relationship with extraversion — introversion. Raju and Madhu (1994) revealed that higher level employees experienced lesser role conflict than middle and lower level counterparts who obtained comparable scores.

Pandey (1997) found experience to be positively and significantly associated with Role Expectation Conflict. Chand and Sethi (1997) found that role conflict, strenuous working conditions were found to be the clearest and most significant predictors of job-related strain. Sehgal (1997) reported that senior level executives experienced more role expectation conflict and scored higher on total ORS as compared to junior and middle levels. Mishra (1987) in the analysis of the data revealed that public relation officers of public sector experienced significantly higher occupational stress on the dimension of role conflict.

According to Edwards and Rothbard (2000), strain-based conflict occurs when participation in one role produces strain that hampers role performance in another role. Yousef (2000) reported that role conflict independently and negatively affects job satisfaction.

2.5.4 Role Erosion (RE)

This type of role stress is the function of the role occupant's feeling that some functions, which should properly be belonging to his role, are transferred to, or performed by some other role. This can also happen when the role occupant performs the functions but the credit for those goes to someone else. Role erosion is high& in the initial years of service length and significantly decreases after 10 years of service length (Gupta, 1988). Sen (1981) also reported a negative
relationship between role erosion and length of service. Family size is negatively related with role erosion because a person with a larger family may not want higher responsibilities (Sen, 1981). But, Surti (1982) reported no significant relationship between family size and role erosion among women employees.

Bhatnagar and Bose (1985) indicated the existence of an alienation syndrome in branch managers because they felt powerless in the face of gradual circumventing of their authority and power in the branches. Erosion of their role leaves many of their capabilities and talents underutilized which is a source of dissatisfaction and stress. In the Indian context, research surfaced, that executives from Public sector banks have accounted for role erosion as a prime source of stress in the organization (Pestonjee, 1991; Sehgal, 1997; Sen, 1982). Further, Luhadia (1991) stated that role erosion caused maximum stress for middle and junior level officers. Whereas, Satyanarayana’s (1995) analysis showed data that role erosion was experienced as a dominant contributor of role stress in executives and supervisors.

Joshi and Singhvi (1997) indicated that maximum role stress was experienced on the dimension of role erosion. Pandey (1997) found experience to be positively and significantly associated with role erosion. In yet another study, Sehgal (1997) revealed that role erosion was a dominant contributor of role stress for the total sample.
2.5.5 Role Overload (RO)

When the role occupant feels that there are too many expectations from the significant roles in his role set, he experiences role overload (Pareek, 1983). There are two aspects of this stress, quantitative and qualitative. The former refers to having 'too much to do', while the latter, refers to 'too difficult' (Marshall & Cooper, 1979).

When there is more work to be done than there is time available, the individual experiences quantitative overload. Qualitative role overload occurs when tasks to be accomplished are too difficult, given the individual's abilities, skills and experiences (French & Caplan, 1970).

French and Caplan (1970) summarize the various research findings by suggesting that both qualitative and quantitative overload produces different symptoms of psychological and physical strain: job dissatisfaction, (Beehr, 1976; Beehr, 1981; Keenan & Newton — 1984), job tension, lower self-esteem (Margolis, Kroes & Quinn, 1974), threats, embarrassments, high cholesterol levels, increased heart rate, and more smoking.

Surti (1981) found that persons with high incomes experience low role overload because persons with higher incomes hold correspondingly higher assignments with better status, esteem and more scope for self actualization. Srilatha (1986) found that people in the age group of 47-58 experienced low role overload. She also reported that executives of about 20 years of service length experience less role overload.
But, Gupta (1988) reported that role overload increases as the length of service increases. As length of service of the executive grows, responsibilities also grow and they feel overloaded. Srilatha (1986) found that executives with a span of more than nine years, experience high role overload. Kedar Nath (1988) stated that subjects who experience high role stress pertaining to role overload, showed less job involvement.

Dhadda (1990) stated that role overload caused maximum stress among railway officials and Mittal (1992) found that the major stress experienced by private doctors was role overload. Satyanarayana (1995) revealed that the two groups, namely executives and supervisors differed significantly in respect of role overload.

Chand and Sethi (1997) found that role overload, strenuous working conditions were found to be the clearest and most significant predictors of job-related strain.

Mishra (1987), in the analysis of the data, revealed that Public Relations Officers of private sector experienced significantly higher occupational stress on the dimension of role overload than the Public Relation Officers of public sector.

**2.5.6 Role Isolation (RI)**

This type of role stress refers to psychological distance between the occupant's role and other roles in the same role set. It is also defined as role distance, which is different than inter-role distance in the sense that, IRD refers to the distance among various roles occupied by same individual. The frequency and cause of interaction among the roles is a measure of the strength of the linkage among the roles.
Marshall and Cooper (1979) have suggested that the nature of the relationship with the boss, subordinates and colleagues is a major source of stress at work. French and Caplan (1972) define poor relations as those, which include low trust, low supportiveness and low interest in listening to and trying to deal with problems that confront the organizational member. The most notable studies in this area are by Kahn, et al. (1964). French and Caplan studies came to roughly the same conclusion that mistrust of persons one worked with, was positively related to high role ambiguity which lead to inadequate communication between people and to psychological strain in the form of low job satisfaction and to feelings of job-related threat to one's well-being. It was interesting to note, however, in the study by Kahn, et al. (1964) that poor relations with one's subordinates were significantly related to feelings of threat with colleagues and superiors but not in relationship to threat with subordinates.

Gupta (1988) found that after 10 years of service, executives constantly feel isolated from other roles. People begin to trust him more but they also begin to be more suspicious of him. On the other hand, Sen (1981) found that role isolation has negative correlation with length of service.

Sen (1981) found that family size is positively related with role isolation because growing family and more responsibilities lead to a feeling of exclusion and loss of linkage.

Bhatnagar and Bose (1985) found that bank branch managers felt their role as a branch manager leaves them little time for their other important roles in their personal life. And though the branch operations are the key aspect of a bank's functioning, the manager did not feel involved in organizational affairs which are
indicated by their role isolation. According to Sehgal (1997), junior level executives experienced relatively higher role isolation, while senior level executives scored higher on total ORS as compared to junior and middle levels.

2.5.7 Personal Inadequacy (PI)

This type of stress arises when the role occupant feels that he does not have the necessary skills and training for effectively performing the functions expected from his role. This is found to happen when the organizations do not impart periodic training to enable the employees to cope with the fast changes both within and outside the organization. Kedar Nath (1988) stated that subjects who experience high role stress pertaining to Personal Inadequacy, showed less job involvement. Kumar (1989) identified personal inadequacy to be significantly higher among lower level executives.

Whereas, Satyanarayana's (1995) analysis, emerged data that Personal Inadequacy was experienced as a dominant contributor of role stress in executives and supervisors and further revealed that the two groups viz. executives and supervisors differed significantly in respect of personal inadequacy dimension.

Pandey (1997) found experience to be positively and significantly associated with Personal Inadequacy.
2.5.8 Self-Role Distance (SRD)

When the role, a person occupies, goes against his self-concept, then he feels self-role distance type of stress. This essentially is a conflict arising out of a mismatch between the person and his job.

Sen (1981) found that people above 50 years of age have the lowest self-role distance. Similarly, Srilatha (1986) also reported low self-role distance among executives of public sector in the age groups of 47-58 years. On the other hand, Gupta (1988) indicated that self-role distance is higher in the beginning of the service amongst the executives; it decreases after 5 years of service and again increases slightly after 10 years of service. Kedar Nath (1988) stated that subjects who experience high role stress pertaining to self-role distance, showed less job involvement. Kumar (1989) identified self-role distance to be significantly higher among lower level executives.

Pandey (1997) found experience to be positively and significantly associated with self-role distance. Srivastava (1997) examined the dynamics of role stress and found that self-role distance was correlated positively and significantly with control climate and was correlated negatively with achievement climate. According to Sehgal (1997), junior level executives experienced relatively higher self-role distance, while senior level executives scored higher on total ORS as compared to junior and middle levels.
2.5.9 Role Ambiguity (RA)

It refers to the lack of clarity about the expectations of role which may arise out of lack of information or understanding. It may exist in relation to activities, responsibilities, personal style, and norms, and may operate at three stages:
- when the role sender holds his expectations about the role,
- when he sends it, and,
- when the occupant receives those expectations.

Role ambiguity has not been elaborately conceptualized in the literature (McGrath - 1976, Sarbin and Allen - 1968). Generally, role ambiguity has been defined as the degree to which clear information is lacking regarding, the expectations associated with a role, the methods for fulfilling known role expectations and the consequences of role performance (Graen - 1976, Kahn et al - 1964).

In other words, role ambiguity could possibly take one or all of the following forms:
Information is unclear regarding which potential role expectation e.g. A, B, or, C should be performed. It is understood that expectation A should be met, but information is unclear regarding what behavior will in fact yield A. The consequences of behavior A are unclear (Van Sell et al - 1981)

Kahn and Quinn (1970) suggested that four different kinds of roles are likely to experience ambiguity:

- Roles those are new to the organizations,
- Roles in expanding or contracting organizations,
- Roles in the organizations exposed to frequent changes in demand, and,
- Roles on processes.
Marshall and Cooper (1979) have pointed out that role ambiguity exists when an individual has inadequate information about his work role, that is, where there is lack of clarity about the work objectives associated with the role, about work colleagues' expectations of the work role, and about the scopes and responsibilities of the job.

Pareek (1981) defined it as 'When the individual is not clear about the various expectations people have from his role, he faces conflict which may be called role ambiguity'.

Since the path-breaking work of Kahn et al (1964), there have been many studies which have attempted to determine the relationship between role ambiguity and:

- personal characteristics - age, level of education, income etc.,
- job characteristics - number of subordinates, length of service, management level etc., and
- organization related variables such as task, performance measure type etc.

The negative relationship between age and ambiguity was supported by Peltit (1973), that is, as age increases; one tends to face lesser ambiguity because of routine work. But no significant relationship was obtained by Madhu and Harigopal (1980) in their study. Srilatha and Harigopal (1985) reported a significantly positive relationship between age and role ambiguity amongst managers of the private sector. The higher the level of education, the better the understanding of the job hence lesser the role ambiguity (Malhan, 1983; Zuzan, 1983; Wiggins & Kathlyn, 1985).
Fisher and Gitelsen (1983) reported factors such as organizational commitment, job involvement satisfaction with supervisors, tenure, education, and age were consistently related to role ambiguity. Those with job tenure in the range of 18-25 were found to experience a greater degree of role ambiguity than managers with job tenure in categories either above or below this range (Srilatha, 1986). But Gupta (1988) found that role ambiguity increases as the service of length increases among public sector executives. Yousef (2000) reported that role ambiguity independently and negatively affects job satisfaction.

Srilatha and Harigopal (1985) found that role ambiguity was significantly and negatively related to span of control and supervision of the job as a whole.

Pestonjee's study (1987) based on a sample of 326 management personnel and 77 IAS officers, reported that management personnel experienced higher role ambiguity than IAS officers. Among management levels, middle management group experienced high role ambiguity. T.V. Rao's (1987) studies on managerial role ambiguity were specific to a particular organization and found that employees of older organizations experienced ambiguity due to the influence of several factors but they did not necessarily experience more ambiguity.

Kedar Nath (1988) stated that subjects who experienced high role stress pertaining to role ambiguity, showed less job involvement. Raju and Madhu (1994) revealed that higher level employees experienced lesser role ambiguity than middle and lower level counterparts who obtained comparable scores. Satyanarayana (1995) revealed that the two groups, namely executives and supervisors differed significantly in respect of role ambiguity dimension.
Pandey (1997) found experience to be positively and significantly associated with role ambiguity. Mishra (1987) in the analysis of the data revealed that public relations officers of public sector experienced significantly higher occupational stress on the dimension of role ambiguity.

2.5.10 Resource Inadequacy (RIN)

This type of stress is evident when the role occupant feels that he is not provided with adequate resources. Luhadia (1991) investigated that three different levels of officers differed on role stress dimension. Role inadequacy caused maximum stress in higher level officers. Whereas, Satyanarayana’s (1995) analysis showed data that indicated that Resource Inadequacy was experienced as a dominant contributor for role stress in executives and supervisors. Srivastava (1997) examined that the dynamics of role stress and Resource Inadequacy were associated positively and significantly with control climate. In yet another study, Sehgal (1997) revealed that role erosion was a dominant contributor of role stress for the total sample.

2.6 Review of Independent Variables

**Age:** There is evidence of previous research that as employees grow in age they are better able to cope up with stress since they have experience and wider knowledge of work pressures etc. Parasuraman and Alutto (1984) in their study on 217 employees of a medium sized food procession plant found that increasing age was associated with the ability to tolerate stress. Srilatha and Harigopal (1985) reported a significantly negative relationship between Role expectation conflict and age. Also another study of Bose (1985) refuted the popular belief that advancing age makes a person more nervous.
**Marital Status:** Earlier studies of Sen (1981), S.Kumar (1989) study the impact of marital status on Organisational Role Stress. More stress among unmarried officers may be owing to their comparative lack of security, resulting in higher self esteem, autonomy, and self actualization needs. It may often lead to clashes and interpersonal conflicts (Sen - 1981).

**Income Level:** Studies of Sen (1981) and S. Kumar (1989), show that role stress is inversely related with income but not significant. Higher income gives a feeling of security and autonomy. Individuals with higher income generally feel confident compared to those individuals with lower income. The result of confidence, security and autonomy therefore helps in lowering role stress.

**Gender:** The effect of gender on work-related stress have been investigated in a number of studies (Jick & Payne, 1980; Quick & Quick, 1984, Quick et al., 1997) Jick and Mitz(1985) reviewed 19 studies related to gender differences in occupational stress and found that women more frequently experienced psychological distress in the workplace, while men experienced more severe physical distress. Recent study has shown that when work intrudes in family life, the women are likely to surface a negative perception towards work. For example, in a cross-sectional study, Rothbard(2001) found that work engagement had depleting effects on women’s family roles, but not on men's. A meta-analysis by Tamres et al. (2002) found that males and females had different coping patterns and that females rated stressors as more severe and used more coping strategies than males. In the Indian context many researchers have highlighted the existence of stress among working women (Srivastava and Srivastava, 1985; Tharakan, 1992; Pareek and Mehta, 1997; Mathur, 1997; Mishra et al., 1997)
Health Practices:

In a study by Tamina et al. (2009) it is reported that there were significant improvements in physiological and psychological measures suggesting that Tai Chi has considerable potential as an economic, effective and convenient workplace intervention. Health practices reflect a program of regular physical exercise, a good balanced diet, good sleep habits and refraining from excessive alcohol etc (Danna and Griffin, 1999).

Moreover health and energy are proven to be most useful in stressful encounters (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984). A body of literature also suggest that exercise is associated with improved sense of well being (McAuley et al. 2000; Gauvin and Spence 1996). Based on the above relationship between health practices and its outcome we propose to test the following hypothesis related to Jogging, Physical exercise, Yoga, Meditation and Game on role stress.

Management Level:

Earlier research studies proved that top level managers in the organization suffer a high level of job stress (Coates and Pallegrin, 1975). Other empirical findings however present the view that the incidence of heart attack was inversely related to occupation level (Pell and D'Alona). Another study revealed that middle level managers experience higher stress than their counterparts (Marshall and Cooper, 1978) Kahn et al (1964) stated that role conflict and ambiguity is higher in middle management group. Hence though there is a lot of speculation and thinking about the stress levels for the levels of management, most attention is normally given to the top level managers (Goldberg, 1973) Hence the surfacing question is whether the top level managers are at higher risk from occupational stress problems or other levels of management such as the middle level managers.
**Length of Service:** Higher length of service reduces role stress (Petitt, 1973; Richardson & Stanton, 1973; Nahta, 1980; Sen, 1981; Surd, 1982). Gupta (1987) however, had a contradictory finding that suggests that role stress increases with increase in length of service.

**Environmental Factors:** Interactions theory of stress (Appley and Trumbell 1967; Glass and Singer 1972) suggests that ambiguous work environment disturbs achievement because of excessive role conflict that discourages competitiveness. Anger and hostility leads to pathogenesis of hypertension (Crane 1981). Schabracq (2003), who reported that working in a dysfunctional task environment, leads individuals to "blindly" carry on working thus leading to stress.

A number of initiatives aimed at reducing and preventing stress that have tended to focus on improvements to the work and organizational environments seem to have produces some result (Murphy, 1995; Nigam et al., 2003), however finding lasting cures to workplace reflects the need of social and organizational aspects (Schabracq and Cooper, 2000).
2.7 Overview

The review of research literature reveals that stress occurs when the abilities of a person are not congruent with the demands of the job's environment or where obstacles arise in fulfilling the needs. If the organization meets the needs of a person and the person's abilities are useful to the organization, no stress occurs. Stress, thus can be viewed as the outcome of incongruence or lack of a person-environment fit. Hence, greater the incongruence of fit, more significant is the level of experienced stress.

Various personal-demographic factors like age, marital status, education level, income, family type and size, gender etc. and job/organizational factors like management level, span of control, length of service, role satisfaction, and, role efficacy can act as potential stressors. However, great attention has been given separately to various personal-demographic and job/organizational stressors in causation of stress but there is not enough conclusive evidence which deals with the intricate linkage that prevails between different types of role stresses and personal-demographic and job/organizational stressors. Thus, the present study focuses only on the potential role stresses arising from these personal-demographic and job/organizational factors.

Keeping in view the various research studies which have already been conducted and to further explore the area of research in this field, the following hypothesis has been formulated for the present study.
2.8 Hypotheses

- Organizational role stress decreases with increase in age.
- Unmarried Bank officers experience higher role stress than married officers.
- Organizational Role stress decreases with increase in income.
- There will be significant difference in role stress levels between men and women officers.
- Health practices such as physical exercise, games, meditation, jogging and yoga helps in reducing organizational role stress among private and public bank officers.
- Middle level officers experience higher role stress compared to lower and upper level officers.
- Organizational Role stress reduces with length of service.
- Role stress increases with high number of subordinates controlled by the officers.
- Environmental factors such as equipments, physical condition of work, service conditions, social support and superior support helps in reducing organizational role stress among private and public bank officers.