CHAPTER-6

IMPACT OF JOB STRESS ON EMPLOYEE MORALE AND JOB INVOLVEMENT

The core purpose of this chapter is to gauge the precise impact of job stress on employee morale and job involvement in banking sector, which has been carried out through simple linear regression analysis. Job stress and its sub variables form the independent variable, employee morale and job involvement constitute the dependent variable in two respectively exclusive analyses. Regression equation being \( Y = a_0 + a_1X_1 \), where \( Y \) is the dependent variable, \( X_1 \) is the independent variable, \( a_1 \) is the coefficient that describes the size of the effect the independent variable is having on the dependent variable and \( a_0 \) is the value \( Y \) is predicted to have when the independent variable is equal to zero, it is the constant. It can be said that regression equation helps to predict the most likely measure in one variable from known measure in other variable. If correlation between \( Y \) and \( X \) is perfect, we would make predictions of \( Y \) from \( X \) or \( X \) from \( Y \) with total accuracy; the errors of prediction would be zero. Conversely, if correlation was zero, prediction would be futile. Within these limits, predictions are possible with varying degrees of accuracy. Higher the correlation, greater the accuracy of
prediction and smaller the errors involved. Regression analysis, as explained, proves useful when the independent variable in the dataset has some correlation with the dependent variable. Therefore, after ascertaining the strength of association between the independent and dependent variables in the previous chapters, simple linear regression analysis has been carried out in this chapter.

The data analysis and interpretation of job stress impact is as follows:

- Impact of job stress on employee morale in banking sector.
- Impact of job stress on job involvement in banking sector.

The following hypotheses have been tested through analysis of data:

- Job stress has an impact on employee morale.
- Job stress has an impact on job involvement.

Job stress has been taken as an independent variable which has further ten sub variables: Inter-Role Distance, Role Stagnation, Role Expectation Conflict, Role Erosion, Role Overload, Role Isolation, Personal Inadequacy, Self-Role Distance, Role Ambiguity and Resource Inadequacy. In this study, therefore, regression equation has been separately applied in order to predict contribution of sub variables of job stress to employee morale and job involvement, which are the dependent
variables. Also, an effort has been made to find out the sub factors which have marked influence on employee morale and job involvement. This produces the following results:

**IMPACT OF JOB STRESS ON EMPLOYEE MORALE**

An attempt was made to ascertain those sub variables of job stress which have maximum impact on the dependent variable employee morale. This was done through the use of regression analysis, and the results so obtained have been exhibited in Table 6.1. R-square value is the measure of the overall predictive accuracy of a regression model. The interpretation of R-square is the amount of variance in the dependent variable that can be explained by the model. If the R-square value is 1.0, this means the model explains 100% of variance; and the model will produce perfect predictive accuracy. However, it never happens in the real world. It conveys that being closer to the R-square value of 1.0 means the better would be the model. The closer the R-square value is to 0, the worse would be the model.
## Table 6.1: Job Stress-Employee Morale*: Regression Analysis for Overall Banking Sector

**Coefficients (a) and R-square**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>R-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Role Distance</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.891</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Stagnation</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.887</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Expectation Conflict</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.614</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REC</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Erosion</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.265</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Isolation</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.550</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Inadequacy</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.706</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Role Distance</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.405</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.734</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Inadequacy</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.769</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.055</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data analysis provides that of all the ten sub variables of job stress, Role Overload has shown maximum impact on employee morale with the coefficient value of 0.415. Supplementary value of R-square for model RO is found to be 0.378. It explains 37.80% of variance in employee morale. Thus, the Regression equation is:

*Note: The scale used in employee morale questionnaire is inverse scale, i.e., higher score implies lower level of morale in the respondent executive and vice-versa.*
Low Employee Morale = 2.265 + 0.415 × Role Overload

(significant at <0.05 level)

This establishes that when an executive feels that there are too many expectations from his role, he experiences low morale. Role Overload could either be quantitative or qualitative. In quantitative terms, the executives might feel there is too much to do, while in qualitative terms, executives might find the work difficult together with a lot of accountability attached. Role Overload in either form would have an adverse effect on employee morale. In fact, this sub variable has turned out to be the most important having a significant negative impact on employee morale in the banking sector.

The coefficient value of Self-Role Distance is 0.364. This sub variable explains the conflict between self-concept and expectations from the role. It has the subsequent greatest impact on employee morale. Supplementary value of R-square for model SRD is found to be 0.331. It explains 33.10% of variance in employee morale. Thus, the Regression equation is:

Low Employee Morale = 2.405 + 0.364 × Self-Role Distance

(significant at <0.05 level)
This establishes the fact that when a certain role occupied by an executive goes against his self-concept, it causes low morale. Essentially, a conflict arising out of a mismatch between the person and his job inadvertently leads to low morale. The data analysis results indicate that Self-Role Distance is, in fact, the second most important sub variable showing an adverse impact on employee morale in the banking sector.

Role Isolation holds 0.351 as the value of coefficient. Supplementary value of R-square for model RI is found to be 0.327. It explains 32.70% of variance in employee morale. Here, Regression equation is:

\[
\text{Low Employee Morale} = 2.550 + 0.351 \times \text{Role Isolation}
\]

(significant at <0.05 level)

This ascertains that when an executive feels that depending upon frequency and ease of interaction certain roles in a role set are at a distance from him, he is bound to experience low morale. The feeling of an executive that other executives do not reach out easily, indicative of the absence of strong linkages, geographic or systemic, between an executive and the others is a certain perpetrator of low morale. The data analysis results bring out that Role Isolation is the third such sub variable adversely affecting employee morale in the banking sector.
The next sub variable is Role Erosion which has a coefficient value of 0.307. Supplementary value of R-square for model RE is found to be 0.286. It explains 28.60% of variance in employee morale. Here, Regression equation is:

Low Employee Morale = 2.640 + 0.307 × Role Erosion

(significant at <0.05 level)

Role Erosion occurs when an executive feels that some functions that he would like to perform are being performed by others, possibly in an organization which is redefining its role and creating new roles. It is sure to affect the employee morale. The results indicate that Role Erosion is the next such sub variable which has adversely affected the employee morale in the banking sector.

Role Expectation Conflict is another such sub variable affecting the employee morale with the coefficient value of 0.295. Supplementary value of R-square for model REC is found to be 0.271 showing a variance of 27.10% in employee morale. Thus, the Regression equation is:

Low Employee Morale = 2.614 + 0.295 × Role Expectation Conflict (significant at <0.05 level)

This indicates that the ambivalence erupting from conflicting expectations or demands from an executive by different key people,
superiors, subordinates, peers or clients causes negative employee morale. The data analysis results indicate that Role Expectation Conflict is yet another significant sub variable adversely affecting employee morale in the banking sector.

Personal Inadequacy appears as the next sub variable affecting employee morale with the coefficient value of 0.280. Supplementary value of R-square for model PIN is found to be 0.231 showing 23.10% of variance in employee morale. Thus, the Regression equation is:

Low Employee Morale = 2.706 + 0.280 × Personal Inadequacy

(significant at <0.05 level)

This signifies that an executive’s feeling of not being prepared enough to undertake the assigned role effectively is certain to impact employee morale negatively. Lack of regular periodic training and orientation to the employees, and lack of skill and experience in employees are the common reasons for executives feeling personally inadequate. The data analysis results indicate that Personal Inadequacy also significantly lowers the employee morale in the banking sector.

Resource Inadequacy appears as the next sub variable in order with a coefficient value of 0.264. Supplementary value of R-square for model
RIN is found to be 0.182, depicting 18.20% of variance in employee morale. Thus, the Regression equation is:

\[
\text{Low Employee Morale} = 2.769 + 0.264 \times \text{Resource Inadequacy}
\]

(significant at <0.05 level)

This means that when an executive has to deal with inadequacy or absolute non-availability of resources required by him for effective execution of assigned work he is prone to feeling low on morale. It implies that scarcity of information, people, material, finance and other facilities at work is bound to affect employee morale adversely. The results provide that Resource Inadequacy has adversely affected the employee morale in the banking sector.

Role Ambiguity appears as the next sub variable which has an adverse effect on employee morale. It has a coefficient value of 0.261. The corresponding R-square for RA model is found to be 0.208, depicting 20.80% of variance in employee morale. Thus, the Regression equation here is:

\[
\text{Low Employee Morale} = 2.734 + 0.261 \times \text{Role Ambiguity}
\]

(significant at <0.05 level)

The implication of the above is that if an executive is not clear about the various expectations people have from his role, it could be due
to lack of information available or due to lack of understanding of the cases available, ambiguity about activities, responsibilities, personal style or norms, he faces a conflict which throttles his morale level. The data analysis results bring out that the sub variable of Role Ambiguity has resulted in significantly lowering employee morale in the banking sector.

The above array is followed by Role Stagnation with a coefficient value of 0.248. The corresponding R-square for model RS is found to be 0.167, showing 16.70% of variance in employee morale. Thus, the Regression equation here is:

Low Employee Morale = 2.887 + 0.248 × Role Stagnation

(significant at <0.05 level)

As an individual grows older; he also grows in the role that he occupies in an organization, the feeling of being stuck in the same role is but natural. The resultant perception of the executive that there is no opportunity for progress, results in low employee morale. The data analysis provides that limited opportunities for learning and growth affect the employee morale adversely in the banking sector.

Last but not the least, Inter-Role Distance sub variable has a relatively small coefficient value of 0.205, but nevertheless it casts a
significant impact on employee morale. The corresponding R-square for model IRD is found to be 0.140, depicting 14.00% of variance in employee morale. Thus, the Regression equation is:

\[
\text{Low Employee Morale} = 2.891 + 0.205 \times \text{Inter-Role Distance} \\
(\text{significant at } <0.05 \text{ level})
\]

Usually, an individual has to perform more than one role; organization role and other roles, viz. parent, spouse, son/daughter, sibling, etc. and there may be conflict between these roles for not being able to share time between the work demands and family demands which, in turn, fades his morale. It is apparent from the data analysis that expanse between different roles, i.e., Inter-Role Distance results in significantly lower employee morale in the banking sector.

While taking into account the composite Job Stress variable, it comes to light that its coefficient value is 0.506. Supplementary value of R-square for model Job Stress is found to be 0.418, depicting 41.80% of variance in employee morale. Regression equation is explained as under:

\[
\text{Low Employee Morale} = 2.055 + 0.506 \times \text{Job Stress} \\
(\text{significant at } <0.05 \text{ level})
\]

Job stress, i.e., pressure faced by executives at workplace in coping with the constant demands made upon them is sure to affect their morale.
As is perceptible from the data analysis results, job stress attributed to its all the ten sub variables is responsible for casting a significant negative impact on employees’ morale in the banking sector. Apparently, in the overall banking sector, out of all the ten sub variables of job stress that are negatively correlated with employee morale (as established in the preceding chapters) the most significant negative impact on employee morale is that of Role Overload (coefficient value = 0.415). Too much burden on executives in terms of quantity or quality of work is the utmost cause of their low morale. Self-Role Distance (0.364) appears as the next sub variable affecting employee morale which is followed by Role Isolation (0.351), Role Erosion (0.307), Role Expectation Conflict (0.295), Personal Inadequacy (0.280), Resource Inadequacy (0.264), Role Ambiguity (0.261), and Role Stagnation (0.248), while Inter-Role Distance (0.205) has the least impact. Job stress with a coefficient value of 0.506 has a remarkably substantial and significant negative impact on employee morale in the overall banking sector.

The whole discussion made above leads to the fact that in order to raise the employee morale a sincere effort is required to be made to curb job stress among the executives in the banking sector.
Testing of Hypothesis

Thus, the hypothesis that job stress has an impact on employee morale is accepted because job stress leads to low employee morale. The correlation between job stress and employee morale is significant at 0.05 level. Sub variable-wise regression analysis between job stress and employee morale is also showing a positive and significant correlation in all the ten job stress sub variables with low employee morale.

IMPACT OF JOB STRESS ON JOB INVOLVEMENT

Subsequently, in relation to dependent variable job involvement, an attempt was made to ascertain the sub variables of job stress having maximum impact on job involvement in comparison to others. This was carried out by way of regression analysis, and the results so obtained are exhibited in Table 6.2. R-square value (as previously explained) helps to gauge the overall predictive accuracy of a regression model.
Table 6.2: Job Stress-Job Involvement: Regression Analysis for Overall Banking Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>R-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Role Distance</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.709</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRD</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.088</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Stagnation</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.801</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.142</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Expectation</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.697</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict REC</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.083</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Erosion</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.691</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.087</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.497</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.017</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Isolation</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.066</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Inadequacy</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.725</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.097</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Role Distance</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.676</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.076</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.854</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.138</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Inadequacy</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.584</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.049</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.874</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.149</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data analysis provides that of all the ten sub variables of job stress, Role Stagnation has a maximum negative impact on job involvement with the coefficient value of −0.142. Supplementary value of R-square for model RS is found to be 0.028, showing 2.80% of variance in job involvement. Regression equation is given as under:

Job Involvement = 4.801 + (−0.142 × Role Stagnation)

(significant at <0.05 level)
This explains that as the executives continue in the same job for many years they become bored, stagnant and uninterested in their job. A limit arises as to the amount of energy such executives are willing to devote to improvement of work thereby making them lesser job involved.

The coefficient value of Role Ambiguity is $-0.138$. Role Ambiguity arises due to non-clarity about the various expectations people have from an employee’s role. The results show that it has the subsequent greatest negative impact on job involvement. Supplementary value of $R^2$ for model RA is found to be 0.030, depicting 3.00% of variance in job involvement. Regression equation appears as under:

$$\text{Job Involvement} = 4.854 + (-0.138 \times \text{Role Ambiguity})$$

(significant at $<0.05$ level)

As is apparent, ambiguity about activities, responsibilities, personal style, norms, etc. gives rise to a conflict in the minds of the executives. They become unsure about what is expected of them and do not know what way their efforts are to be directed thereby causing a hindrance in job involvement. The data analysis brings out that Role Ambiguity has resulted in significantly lowering job involvement in the banking sector.
Personal Inadequacy holds $-0.097$ as the value of coefficient. Supplementary value of R-square for model PIN is found to be 0.014, depicting 1.40% of variance in job involvement. Regression equation is given as under:

$$\text{Job Involvement} = 4.725 + (-0.097 \times \text{Personal Inadequacy})$$

(significant at <0.05 level)

This signifies that an executive’s feeling of not being primed enough to execute the assigned role effectively is certain to be an impediment in his job involvement. When an executive is under equipped for a role there is an inherent feeling of inhibition and avoidance of taking the job head on. The data analysis brings out that Personal Inadequacy results in significantly lowering job involvement in the banking sector.

Inter-Role Distance is the next sub variable affecting job involvement. Its coefficient value is $-0.088$. Supplementary value of R-square for model IRD is found to be 0.013, depicting 1.30% of variance in job involvement due to Inter-Role Distance. Regression equation runs as under:

$$\text{Job Involvement} = 4.709 + (-0.088 \times \text{Inter Role Distance})$$

(significant at <0.05 level)
An employee always feels drawn between organizational role and different societal roles. Sometimes, family issues spill over into his work, or vice versa and cause strain. Such a situation is bound to interfere with both the roles causing an executive to be lesser involved with his job. The analysis of data also establishes this fact and explains that Inter-Role Distance results in significantly lowering job involvement in the banking sector.

Role Erosion is another such sub variable affecting job involvement with the coefficient value of −0.087. Supplementary value of R-square for model RE is found to be 0.012, depicting 1.20% of variance in job involvement. Regression equation follows as under:

\[
\text{Job Involvement} = 4.691 + (-0.087 \times \text{Role Erosion})
\]

(significant at <0.05 level)

This illustrates that when an executive finds that some tasks for which he bears an affinity and would like to execute are being assigned to others, he will most certainly be lesser involved in the tasks at hand as well. The data analysis results also confirm this fact that Role Erosion is one of the significant sub variables significantly lowering job involvement in the banking sector.
Role Expectation Conflict appears as the next sub variable affecting job involvement with the coefficient value of \(-0.083\). Supplementary value of R-square for model REC is found to be 0.011, depicting 1.10% of variance in job involvement. Regression equation runs as under:

\[
\text{Job Involvement} = 4.697 + (-0.083 \times \text{Role Expectation Conflict})
\]

(significant at <0.05 level)

This indicates that when an executive faces contradictory demands from superiors, subordinates, peers, clients, etc. a feeling of ambivalence emanates causing low job involvement. The data analysis results indicate that Role Expectation Conflict is adversely affecting job involvement in the banking sector.

Self-Role Distance has registered a coefficient value of \(-0.076\). Supplementary value of R-square for model SRD is found to be 0.007, showing 0.70% of variance in job involvement by this sub variable. Regression equation is as under:

\[
\text{Job Involvement} = 4.676 + (-0.076 \times \text{Self-Role Distance})
\]

(significant at >0.05 level)

This establishes that when an executive’s idea of the assigned job goes against his own notion about himself, he is likely to lose interest in
the job; and it leads to low job involvement. The data analysis results reveal that a disparity between the person and his job called Self-Role Distance has a negative impact on job involvement in the banking sector. However, this is found to be statistically insignificant.

Further, the sub variable of Role Isolation has recorded a coefficient value of \(-0.066\). Supplementary value of R-square for model RI is found to be 0.006, depicting 0.60% of variance in job involvement due to Role Isolation. Regression equation runs as under:

$$\text{Job Involvement} = 4.625 + (-0.066 \times \text{Role Isolation})$$

(significant at >0.05 level)

This describes that when there is lack of proper interaction among the employees, it is likely to result in lesser job involvement. The results of the study indicate that Role Isolation has a negative impact on job involvement in the banking sector, though it is statistically insignificant.

Resource Inadequacy appears next in order of impact on job involvement. Its coefficient value is \(-0.049\). The corresponding R-square for model RIN is found to be 0.003, explaining 0.30% of variance in job involvement due to this sub variable. Regression equation is as under:

$$\text{Job Involvement} = 4.584 + (-0.049 \times \text{Resource Inadequacy})$$

(significant at >0.05 level)
This means that when an executive is expected to manage with inadequate means; information, people, material, finance and other facilities, his flow in effective execution of work gets obstructed, thereby hindering his job involvement. The study brings out that Resource Inadequacy has a negative impact on job involvement in the banking sector. However, this impact is found to be statistically insignificant.

Role Overload appears as the last sub variable which has relatively the smallest coefficient value of −0.017. The corresponding R-square for model RO is found to be 0.000, depicting 0% variance in job involvement due to this sub variable. Regression equation runs as under:

\[
\text{Job Involvement} = 4.497 + (-0.017 \times \text{Role Overload})
\]

(significant at >0.05 level)

This implies that an executive being required to perform excessive amount or difficult nature of work would exhibit lower job involvement in the banking sector. But R-square value depicts that this model of RO has poor predictive accuracy; and further sig. value shows that this result is statistically insignificant.

Finally, in view of the composite job stress variable it comes to light that its coefficient value is −0.149. Supplementary value of R-square
for model Job Stress is found to be 0.019, depicting 1.90% of variance in job involvement due to Job Stress. Regression equation appears as follows:

\[
\text{Job Involvement} = 4.874 + (-0.149 \times \text{Job Stress})
\]

(significant at <0.05 level)

Job stress, i.e., the strain or anxiety an executive undergoes while executing an assigned job at workplace is the reason to a great extent for his low job involvement. The results of the study clearly reveal that job stress accredited to six sub variables, viz. Role Stagnation, Role Ambiguity, Personal Inadequacy, Inter-Role Distance, Role Erosion and Role Expectation Conflict out of the total ten is responsible for shedding a significant negative impact on job involvement in the banking sector. However, the remaining four sub variables (Self-Role Distance, Role Isolation, Resource Inadequacy and Role Overload) of job stress have exhibited insignificant negative impact on job involvement. This further validates our previous finding (as established in the preceding chapters) that these very four sub variables of job stress have insignificant correlation with job involvement in the overall banking sector. Prior findings had also shown that job stress together with its other six sub variables (Role Ambiguity, Role Stagnation, Personal Inadequacy, Inter-Role Distance, Role Erosion and Role Expectation Conflict) has a
significant correlation with job involvement. The findings of the present chapter reveal that the most significant negative impact on job involvement is that of Role Stagnation (coefficient value = −0.142). It states that executives doing the same job year after year become bored with it and feel less involved in their job. Further, Role Ambiguity (−0.138) is followed by Personal Inadequacy (−0.097), Inter-Role Distance (−0.088), Role Erosion (−0.087) and Role Expectation Conflict (−0.083). All these sub variables have a negative impact on job involvement. Self-Role Distance (−0.076.), Role Isolation (−0.066), Resource Inadequacy (−0.049) and Role Overload (−0.017) are the other sub variables of job stress that have statistically insignificant negative impact on job involvement. Job stress with a coefficient value of −0.149 has a significant negative impact on job involvement in the overall banking sector but this is far less in comparison to the impact of job stress on negative employee morale (coefficient value = 0.506).

To sum up, the findings of this study clearly point out that in order to have improved job involvement among banking sector executives an attempt has to be made to limit job stress.

Further, if we compare regression analysis between job stress-employee morale and job stress-job involvement, certain job stress sub variables are common for improvement such as Role Erosion, Role
Expectation Conflict, Personal Inadequacy, Role Ambiguity, Role Stagnation and Inter-Role Distance in both the cases and have a negative impact on employee morale and job involvement. This means that alleviating these job stress sub variables would improve both employee morale and job involvement in the banking sector.

**Testing of Hypothesis**

Thus, the hypothesis that job stress has an impact on job involvement is accepted because job stress has a significant negative impact on job involvement. The correlation between job stress and job involvement is significant at 0.05 level. Sub variable-wise analysis of regression between job stress and job involvement has also shown a negative and significant correlation in six out of ten job stress sub variables with job involvement.

**Main Findings**

Based on the above discussion, the main findings emerge as under:

- The regression analysis shows that the predictive accuracy of the regression model between job stress and employee morale is good. All the ten sub variables of job stress have shown a significant negative correlation with employee morale. The highest contribution towards negative employee morale is that of Role
Overload sub variable of job stress followed by Self-Role Distance, Role Isolation, Role Erosion, Role Expectation Conflict, Personal Inadequacy, Resource Inadequacy, Role Ambiguity, Role Stagnation and Inter-Role Distance. Job stress has a remarkably substantial and significant negative impact on employee morale in the overall banking sector.

- The regression analysis shows that the predictive accuracy of the regression model between job stress and job involvement is good. Six out of ten sub variables of job stress have shown a significant negative correlation with job involvement. The highest negative impact on job involvement is that of Role Stagnation sub variable of job stress followed by Role Ambiguity, Personal Inadequacy, Inter-Role Distance, Role Erosion and Role Expectation Conflict. Four sub variables of job stress, viz. Self-Role Distance, Role Isolation, Resource Inadequacy and Role Overload have a statistically insignificant negative impact on job involvement. Job stress has a significant negative impact on job involvement in the overall banking sector.

- On comparing the magnitude of impact of job stress on employee morale and job stress on job involvement it was found that job stress has a greater negative impact on employee morale in
comparison to the negative impact of job stress on job involvement.

- While comparing regression analysis between job stress-employee morale and job stress-job involvement, it has been found that certain job stress sub variables are common for improvement such as Role Erosion, Role Expectation Conflict, Personal Inadequacy, Role Ambiguity, Role Stagnation and Inter-Role Distance in both the cases and have a negative impact on employee morale and job involvement. This means that alleviating these job stress sub variables would improve both employee morale and job involvement in the banking sector.

It can be concluded that all the job stress sub variables have shown a significant contribution to negative employee morale and majority of job stress sub variables have shown a significant negative impact on job involvement. Quantum of their impact has also been studied. The results highlight the major contributing factors responsible for low morale and low job involvement in the banking sector.