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CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The main purpose of this chapter is to summarise the whole research effort and conclude by giving recommendations based on this study. This study is concerned with the identification of various organisational stressors which contribute to stress at work and coping strategies used to deal with these stressors by public and private sector bank managers in Punjab.

5.1 SUMMARY

5.1.1. Introduction

The modern world, which is said to be a world of achievements, is also a world of stress. Selye (1956) defined stress as “The force, pressure, or strain exerted upon a material object or person which oppose these forces and try to keep up its original state”. NIOSH (1999) defines job stress as the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker. Stress also occurs when the situation has high demands and the worker has little or no control over it. Job stress can lead to poor health. During the past decade, the banking sector had undergone quick and striking changes like policy changes due to globalisation and liberalisation, increased competition due to the entrance of more private (corporate) sector banks, downsizing, introduction of new technologies, etc. Due to these changes, the employees in the banking sector are experiencing a high level of stress. The advent of technological revolution in all walks of life coupled with globalisation, privatisation policies has drastically changed conventional patterns in all sectors. The banking sector is of no exemption. Evidence from existing literature states that more than 60% of the bank employees have one or other problem directly or indirectly related to these drastic changes (Xie & Jamal 1993; Havivoc & Keenan 1991; Ivancevich et al., 1990). Cardiovascular diseases due to job stress are among the most common
causes of illness and death in the working population in industrialized as well as in developing countries (Wielgosz 1993).

• Concept of Stress

Concept of stress was first introduced in the life sciences by Hans Selye in 1936. It is a concept borrowed from the natural sciences. Derived from the Latin word “Stringere”, stress was popularly used in the seventeenth century to mean hardship, strain, adversity or affliction (Selye, 1976). It was used in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to denote force, pressure, strain or strong effort with reference to an object or person (Pestonjee, 1999). In Engineering and Physics, the term implies an external force or pressure exerted on something with the intention to distort and being resisted by the person or object on which it is exerted (Pestonjee, 1999). In psycho-physiology, stress refers to some stimulus resulting in a detectable strain that cannot be accommodated by the organism and which ultimately results in impaired health or behavior (Pestonjee, 1999). Stress is the phenomenon of being stretched by the demands, made on an individual, beyond the limits of his/her potential to cope (Srivastava, 1998). Stress is basically a pressure that impinges on man and makes him suffer under it. Such situations constitute the rules and not the expectation in the life (Srivastava, 1998). Stress has been defined as a mismatch of individual’s resources, capabilities and the demands or requirements of one’s environment (David, 1998). Selye (1956) defined stress as “The force, pressure, or strain exerted upon a material object or person which oppose these forces and try to keep up its original state”.

• Stress Approaches

A major source of confusion is the divergence of opinion among researchers on where stress resides. Is it a characteristic of the environment, a response of the individual or a transactional phenomenon? Various researchers have defined stress by emphasizing on one or the other aspect as follows:

1. Stress as a Stimulus - The stimulus based stress approach assumes certain conditions to be stressful and dubs these stressors (i.e., workload,
heat and cold, time pressure, etc.) (Caplan et al., 1975; Margolis et al., 1974; Halls & Mansfield, 1971). Under this approach stress is considered as an external force, which is perceived as threatening (Cooper & Marshal, 1976).

2. **Stress as a Response** - The response based stress approach holds that stress is defined by the pattern of responses (i.e., behavioral, cognitive, and affective) that result from exposure to a given stressor (Beehr & Newman, 1978; McGrath, 1976; French et al., 1974).

3. **Stress as a Stimulus-Response Relationship** - Transactional models view stress as the interaction between the environment and individual, emphasizing the role of the individual’s appraisal of situations in shaping their responses. A stimulus-response relationship approach refers to an interaction between environmental stimuli (job stressors) and individual response (strains) (Schuler, 1980; Beehr & Newman, 1978; Lazarus & Launier, 1978).

- **JOB STRESS**

Today is a competitive world and every job is so much demanding that job stress is not a new phenomenon now. Every worker faces job stress in one or another way and also deals with it differently. There are many working conditions inherently stress inducing, such as fear of job loss, excessive workload demands, lack of control or clear direction, poor or dangerous physical working conditions, inflexible work hours, and conflicting job expectations. The present study concerns itself with the study of stress within organisational boundaries. The terms ‘ organisational stress’, ‘ job stress’, ‘ occupational stress’, ‘stress at work’, and ‘stress’ are used interchangeably to refer to organisational stress. French et al., (1974) defined stress as “Stress is a result of misfit between a person’s skills and abilities and demands of the job and a misfit in terms of a person’s needs supplied by the job environment”. Mc Grath (1976) defined stress as “Stress is involved in an environmental situation that perceived as presenting demand which threatens to exceed the person’s capabilities and resources for meeting it, under conditions where he or she expects a substantial differential in the rewards and costs from meeting the demand versus not meeting it”. Caplan et
al., (1975) pointed out that Lack of participation in the decision making process, lack of effective consultation and communication, unjustified restrictions on behaviour, office politics and no sense of belonging are identified as potential sources of stressors. Lack of participation in work activity is associated with negative psychological mood and behavioural responses, including escapist drinking and heavy smoking.

- SOURCES OF JOB STRESS

The primary sources of occupational stress within an organization originate from four areas. These areas include task demands, physical demands, role demands, and interpersonal demands (Knotts, 1996). “Any demand, either of a physical nature or psychological nature, encountered in the course of living is known as a ‘stressor’. (Knotts, 1996). Task-related stress is directly related to the specific characteristics of the job itself. This type of stress involves role ambiguity, conflicting task demands, work overload or work underload, inadequate resource support, no provision for meaningful participation in decision-making, and insecurity among others (Knotts, 1996). Physical demands of the workplace are another source to be considered. Environmental factors such as temperature variations, noise vibrations, and lighting may significantly affect individual stress. Role demands are external to the tasks associated with a job. This particular type of stress typically develops as a result of flawed organizational structures, ineffective organizational development, the inability of an individual to successfully pursue achievement goals within an organization, or some combination of all three (Knotts, 1996). The final source area of occupational stress relates to interpersonal demands. “Interpersonal stress at work is concerned with the demands that are placed on us in developing working relationships with other people in our organizations”. Job stress is often developed when an individual is assigned a major responsibility without proper authority and delegation of power. (Knotts, 1996).

- CATEGORIES OF STRESSORS

Stress tends to build up over a period of time through a combination of factors. The following are three broad categories of potential stressors which are the sources of stress for an individual.
1. Personality traits: Personality traits include Type-A, Locus of control, Affectivity, Hardiness, and Proactive orientation etc. (Cartwright & Cooper, 1997)

2. Intra-Organisational Factors: These include work overload, work autonomy and control, supervision, role ambiguity, role conflict, interpersonal relations, career growth, organisational structure and climate etc. (Cartwright & Cooper, 1997)

3. Extra-Organisational Factors: These include all factors outside work; for example home-family relationship, financial constraints, and other social commitments (Cartwright & Cooper, 1997).

There is no doubt that all the above mentioned categories of stressors are important and inseparable but it is difficult to study all the stress dimensions in a single study. Therefore, the focus of the present study is limited to organisational factors only. According to Hendrix et al., (1994) job stress is affected mainly by intra-organisational variables while life stress is affected by extra-organisational variables. The following categories of intra-organisational stressors are considered.

- **Job Characteristics**

  Job characteristics are one set of factors, which can produce stress (Hendrix et al., 1994). The important characteristics of a job which can be the potential sources of stress are Repetitive nature of task, Touring/travelling involved, Meetings, Frequent and higher degree of attention and alertness required, Spending maximum time in making and attending telephone calls, Over working, Higher risk and cost involved in decision making and Higher level of responsibility for the career of others etc.

- **Role Characteristics**

  Role is a set of potential behaviours expected of someone by others in his/her role set (Kahn et al., 1964). Role characteristics have been the most widely investigated organisational conditions in stress research. The important role characteristics which are the potential source of stress are Role...
ambiguity, Role conflict and Role overload/underload. Role overload can be a quantitative and/or qualitative.

- **Interpersonal Relations**

  It refers to the quality of working relationship employees have with one another. This quality of relationship is characterized by trust, cooperation, respect, considerate behaviour of the superior etc. French & Caplan (1973) define poor inter-personal relations as “those which include low trust, low supportiveness and low interest in listening to and trying to deal with problems that confront the organisational members.” An individual’s relations with his boss, peer group, and subordinates can be a source of stress.

- **Organizational Structure and Climate**

  Litwin & Stringer (1968) have defined “Organisational climate as a set of measurable properties of the work environment perceived directly or indirectly by the people who work in that environment and which influence their motivation and behaviour.” It is another set of potential stressors. Some important dimensions considered as potential stressors are Degree of formalization, Degree of centralization, Rigidity in rules and procedures, Frequency of changes in policies and procedures, Physical working conditions, Lack of effective communication, Lack of feedback for performance, Restriction on expression of feelings, Inconsistent and unrealistic management attitude, Office politics etc.

- **Career Growth and Development**

  It is another set of organisational factors, which have a potential to produce stress (Cartwright & Cooper, 1997). It is characterized by Lack of opportunity for growth, Thwarted ambitions, Unmet financial needs, Lack of job security.

- **SYMPTOMS OF STRESS**

  Stress manifests itself at individual, group and organizational levels. At individual level, it may be manifested in the form of
physiological, psychological, and behavioural changes. Beehr & Newman (1978) have classified these symptoms in the following three categories:

1. **Physiological**: Heart rate, respiration, headache, ulcer, BP, and heart attack, adrenaline, non adrenaline, thymus deduction, lymph deduction, gastric acid production, and ACTH production.

2. **Psychological**:
   1) Fight or withdrawal,
   2) Apathy, resignation, boredom,
   3) Regression,
   4) Fixation,
   5) Projection,
   6) Negativism,
   7) Fantasy,
   8) Forgetfulness,
   9) Tendency to misjudge people,
   10) Uncertainty about whom to trust,
   11) Inability to organize self,
   12) Inner confusion about duties or roles,
   13) Expression of boredom with much of everything,
   14) Dissatisfaction,
   15) High tolerance for ambiguity,
   16) Tunnel vision,
   17) Tendency to begin vacillating in decision-making,
   18) Tendency to become distraught with trifles,
   19) Inattentiveness: loss of power to concentrate,
   20) Irritability,
   21) Procrastination,
   22) Feeling of persecution,
   23) Gut level feeling or inexplicable dissatisfaction.

3. **Behavioural**: Behavioural stress symptoms are of two types:

   (I) **Individual consequences**: 1) Loss of appetite, 2) Sudden, noticeable loss or gain of weight, 3) Sudden change of appearance: decline/improvement in dress, 4) Sudden change of complexion (Sallow, Reddened, Acne), 5) Sudden change of hair style and length, 6) Difficult breathing, 7) Sudden change of smoking habits, 8) Sudden change in use of alcohol.

   (II) **Organizational consequences**: 1) Low performance - quality/quantity, 2) Low job involvement, 3) Loss of responsibility, 4) Lack of concern for organization, 5) Lack of concern for colleagues, 6) Loss of creativity, 7) Accident proneness.

- **COPING WITH STRESS**

  It has been acknowledged that individual well-being is influenced not only by the amount of stress experienced by the individual but also by how an individual copes with stress (Buunk et al., 1991). Individuals and organizations cannot remain in a continuous state of tension they adopt ways of
dealing with it. These ways or strategies used to deal with stress are called coping with stress. The word coping has implications in stress literature. It has been used to denote the way of dealing with stress, or the effort to ‘master’ conditions of harm, threat, or challenge when a routine or automatic response is not readily available. **McGrath (1970)** defined coping “as an array of covert or overt behaviour patterns by which the organism can actively prevent, alleviate, or respond to stress inducing circumstances.” **Folkman & Lazarus (1980)** defined coping “as the cognitive and behavioural efforts made to master, tolerate or reduce external and internal demands and conflicts among them which tax or exceed a person’s resources.” **Burke & Weir (1980)** coping refers to “any attempt to deal with stressful situations when a person feels he must do something about it, but which tax or exceed his existing adaptation patterns.” Thus coping can be defined as “all those responses (regardless of their success) made by an individual to reduce stress.” Coping can occur in anticipation of stressful encounter or in reaction to a present or past situation. Coping responses aim at eliminating/reducing the sources of discomfort, altering one’s appraisal of the stressor, and managing/reducing the feeling of discomfort within the individual. These coping responses are possible at three levels:

- Efforts made by the individual.
- Efforts made by the group of employees.
- Efforts made by the organization.

In this study focus is on individual effort, because the importance of individual differences in both perception of and reaction to stress suggests the potential efficacy of individual coping efforts. The effectiveness of coping depends on an individual’s coping skills which can be defined as “an ability to use an appropriate coping response/mix of responses at the appropriate time to reduce stress.” (Latak & Havlovic, 1992)

- **TYPES OF COPING**

There are large individual differences in the way individuals cope with their stress. It can be said with some certainty that stress and coping are ubiquitous in everyday life and affect everyone. Coping strategies
play a critical role in an individual’s physical and psychological well being when faced with challenges, negative events and stress. (Folkman & Lazarus, 1980). According to Schwarzer (2000), there are four types of coping.

- **Reactive coping**: Reactive coping is defined as an effort to deal with a stressful encounter that has already happened. Since the stressful events have already taken place, coping efforts are directed here to either compensating for a loss or alleviating harm. **Anticipatory coping**: Anticipatory coping is defined as an effort to deal with imminent threat; individuals face a critical event that is certain to occur in the near future. **Preventive coping**: Preventive coping may be defined as an effort to build up general resistance resources that reduce the severity of the consequences of stress, should it occur, and lessen the likelihood of the onset of stressful events in the first place.

- **Proactive coping**: Proactive coping consists of efforts to build up general resources that facilitate the achievement of challenging goals and promote personal growth (Greenglass, 2002).

  Lazarus (1974) has suggested a classification of coping processes which emphasizes two major categories of coping, namely, “direct action” and “palliative modes”. Direct action deals with the behavior of actions, which when performed by the organism in face of a stressful situation is expected to bring about a change in stress causing environment. Palliative approach of coping refers to those thoughts or action whose purpose is to relieve the organism of any emotional impact of stress.

- Problem-focused or approach coping happens when efforts are directed at solving or managing the problem that is causing distress. It includes strategies for gathering information, making decisions, planning, and resolving conflicts.

- Emotion-focused or avoidant coping is coping that is directed at managing or reducing emotional distress, which includes cognitive strategies such as looking on the bright side, or behavioral strategies such
as seeking emotional support, having a drink, or using drugs. (Lazarus, 1991; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984)

- Meaning-focused coping involves searching for meaning in adversity and drawing on values, beliefs, and goals to modify the meaning given to and personal response to a stressful situation. (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

- Positive appraisal is the reframing a situation to see it in a positive light. Positive reappraisal has been significantly and independently associated with increases in positive affect. (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

- **Coping Responses**

  There is a long list of proposed coping responses and these responses cover a wide array of potentially-effective operations. Latack’s (1986) conceptualisation of coping responses is used in the present study and is as follows:

  1. Control: It consists of both actions and cognitive reappraisals that are proactive, take charge in tone.

  2. Escape: It consists of both actions and cognitive reappraisal that suggest an escapist avoidance mode.

  3. Symptom Management: It consists of strategies that manage the symptoms related to job stress in general.

- **COPING PROCESS**

  Coping is a process that requires time and the following decisions to be made for its accomplishment.


  2. Evaluating coping responses.


- **COPING METHODS**

  It refers to the mechanism or mode the person uses to cope with stress. These can be classified as follows:
1. **Social vs. Solitary Method**

When an individual involves other people to cope with stress, s/he is using a social mode of coping and is labelled as social coping. On the other hand when an individual copes with stress alone, s/he is using a solitary mode of coping and is labelled as individual coping e.g. doing things oneself instead of with others.

2. **Behavioural vs. Cognitive Method**

This behavioural and cognitive distinction is prominent in coping literature. Coping can be behavioural, e.g. discussing the problem with supervisor, being organised, getting additional people involved, work faster and more efficiently, seeking help or advice etc., and cognitive, e.g. try to think oneself as winner – who always comes through, tell oneself that one can probably work things to one’s advantage, think about the challenge one can find in this situation etc.

3. **Control vs. Escape Method**

In control mode of coping an individual uses all those responses which try to find out as much as possible about the situation and emotions. It attempts to have control over the situation and/or emotions, e.g. being organized, putting extra attention on planning and scheduling, try to think oneself as winner – as someone who always comes through, works faster and more efficiently etc. Whereas in escape mode of coping an individual uses all those responses which take (temporarily or permanently) him/her mentally and/or physically away from the stressful situation.

**Objectives of the Study**

The following were the objectives of the present study:

- To study the level of job stress among the managers of public and private sector banks.
- To study the organisational factors which were the potential to produce stress?
To study the relationship (if any) between organisational factors & stress symptoms.

To study the level of stress among male and female managers.

To study the role of age in job stress.

To study the role of various coping strategies.

**Hypothesis**

**Null Hypothesis**

- It was hypothesized that there would be no difference in the level of stress among private bank managers and public bank managers.

- It was hypothesized that there would be no difference in the stress level between males and females.

- It was further hypothesized that age would not play an important role in job stress.

- It was hypothesized that there was not any relationship between organisational factors, job stress symptoms and coping strategies.

**Alternate Hypothesis**

- It was hypothesized that there would be a difference in the level of stress among private bank managers and public bank managers.

- It was hypothesized that there would be a difference in the stress level between males and females.

- It was further hypothesized that age would play an important role in job stress.

- It was hypothesized that there was a relationship between organisational factors, job stress symptoms and coping strategies.

**Limitation(s)**

- The present study was based primarily on survey conducted with the help of a standardized questionnaire on the managers working in public and private banks located in Punjab.
Stress as experienced on the job was also partly a function of factors off the job. By not considering these ‘life events’ the present study was limited in predicting stress for an individual.

The items related to organisational structure and climate, interpersonal relations and working of superior, were subject to defensive responses.

Although an effort had been made to cover almost all factors that affect stress in an organization and coping strategies, yet survey approach had its limitations in exploring human perceptions and practices.

**Delimitation(s)**

- The present study was delimited to 300 male and female managers of public and private banks located in Punjab.

- The present study was further delimited to the above mentioned aims.

- The present study was delimited to the contents of the standardized questionnaire used for demographic characteristics, representing various dimensions of a job as well as an organization, stress symptom measures and coping & stress symptom management.

**Significance of the Study**

In today’s competitive environment there is considerable reason to believe that people who are working in banking sector are significantly more at risk of poor health because the jobs in banking industry are becoming more and more stressful. There are a variety of factors which may be sources of stress for the people working in this industry. Very few research studies are available on bank managers especially who are working in Punjab, to study stress and stress related problems and coping strategies studied together on them.

**5.1.2. Research Methodology**

The present study is an attempt to investigate and to compare the level of job stress among managers of the public sector banks and private sector banks in Punjab and coping strategies adopted by them.
• **Conceptual Framework**

Conceptual framework is a design which is necessary to provide a clear cut approach to the research so that uncertainties should be avoided while conducting the investigation. The objective of the study was to identify organizational stressors and coping strategies used by managers in the Banking Industry. To achieve this objective, a conceptual framework has been developed by exhibiting the relationship among three major components of stress process, that is, Stressors, Coping and Symptoms. Various organizational factors like, Job characteristics, Role characteristics, Organizational structure and Climate etc. are perceived as the sources of stress that are present or absent. Once the individual perceives the presence of problematic organizational factors, s/he starts coping with those factors. Coping is possible in different ways like, Control and Escape coping. An Individual may also use various symptom management strategies when symptoms related with stress appear. Stress symptoms may appear in different forms such as, psychological, physiological and behavioural. Coping not only helps in managing problematic organizational factors but it also influences the perception of these factors.

• **Universe of the Study**

The universe of the study consisted of all public and private sector banks operating in Punjab. This study had been restricted to the managers working at junior, middle and senior management levels only.

• **Sample and Sampling Design**

In order to design the sample from the whole universe, Punjab was divided into three regions Majha, Malwa and Doaba. Stratified Random Sampling technique was used to draw out the sample for the study so that an efficient sample was there to represent the whole universe. Out of three regions the highest populated ten districts Ludhiana, Patiala, Ferozepur, Sangrur, Bathinda, Moga, Mukatsar, Amritsar, Jalandhar and Hoshiarpur were selected (at least fifty percent) for data collection.

The three hundred managers (comprised of male and female) from public sector banks and private sector banks located in Punjab were
voluntarily participated in this study. Out of three hundred managers, one hundred fifty participated from public sector banks and remaining one hundred fifty were from private sector banks. The sample of the study consisted five public sector banks (State Bank of India, State Bank of Patiala, Oriental Bank of Commerce, Punjab National Bank and Indian Bank) and three private sector banks (HDFC Bank Ltd., ICICI Bank and Axis Bank) were selected purely on random basis.

Data had been collected from three hundred respondents (managers) and thirty respondents from each district and out of these thirty, fifteen were from public sector banks and fifteen were from private sector banks. Further the data had been tried to collect from rural, urban and semi-urban areas proportionately. The data was collected on three hundred bank managers (i.e. respondents) and out of which one hundred and fifty were form public sector banks which constitute 50% of the total sample and remaining 50% (150) were from private sector banks.

With regard to gender out of total three hundred respondents only 14.3% (43) were females and 85.7% (257) were males. Further, in case of public sector banks 12.7% (19) were female and 87.3% (131) were male respondents. In private sector banks, there were 16% (24) female and 84% (126) were male respondents.

With regard to the sample description on the basis of age. It was found that 21.67% of the respondents belonged to the age group of 20-30 years, 45.67 per cent belonged to the 30-40 years age group and 28.66 percent belonged to the 40-50 years age group and only 4 percent belonged to the age group of 50-60 year. It reveals that the majority (67.34%) of the managers working in the bank sector (public & private) were either from the young and middle age group. Further, in private banks the percentage of managers whose age ranged in 20-30 years and 30-40 years were more than public sector banks. But in public sector banks the percentage of managers whose age ranged in 40-50 years and 50-60 years were more than private sector banks. Thus majority of the managers who were working in private banks were younger in age than public sector banks.
It was found that 26.7 percent of the respondents were experience less than 5 years, 21.3 percent of the respondents were experience of 5 to 10 years, 24.4 percent of the respondents were experience of 10 to 15 years, 17.33 percent of the respondents were 15 to 20 years, 7 percent of the respondents were experience of 20 to 25 years and 3.33 percent of the respondents were experience of 25 to 30 years. It has been revealed that 89.7 percent of the respondents were experience less than 20 years. The table shows that number of respondents experience less than 5 years was more in private sector as compare to public sector and from 5 to 10 years was more in public sector. Again in case of experience from 10 to 15 years number of private sector bank managers was more as compare to public sector bank managers and further in case of experience from 15-20, 20-25 and 25-30 years number of public sector bank managers was more as compare to private sector bank managers.

With regard to the sample description on the basis of management position level. It was found that 22.7 per cent of the respondents were working at the junior level of management, 63 per cent of the respondents were working at the middle level of management and only 14.3 per cent of the respondents were working at the senior level of management. Thus, the majority of the respondents were from junior and middle level of management.

With regard to the distribution of respondents on the basis of bank locations. It was found that 26.6% respondents were from rural, 36.67% from semi-urban and 36.67% respondents from urban area. Out of 150 respondents of public sector banks 50 were from rural, 50 from semi-urban and 50 from urban area and in case of private sector banks only 30 respondents were from rural, 60 from semi-urban and 60 from urban area.

- **Data Collection**

The data for the present study have been collected by personally interviewing the selected bank managers (i.e. respondents) with the help of a standardized pre-tested questionnaire. To study the different dimensions of stress management, direct questioning technique has been used. The questionnaire used for the data collection for this study was consisted of following four parts:
Part I: The first part of the questionnaire comprised of questions related to demographic characteristics such as Name, Age, Sex, Height, Weight, Marital Status, Type of Family (Nuclear or Joint), Number of Children (studying or service), Residential Address, Academic Qualifications, Name of Bank, Designation ,Pay Scale, Experience, Specialization, Medical History, etc.

Part II: The second part of the questionnaire was comprised of thirty four statements represent the various dimensions of a job as well as of an organization. The response to each statement was sought to be given on a five point Likert Scale ranging from ‘strongly agree’, ‘agree’, ‘undecided’, ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’.

Part III: The third part of the questionnaire consisted of stress measures. Sixty two stress symptoms had been used as statements to measure stress. The response to each statement was sought to be given on a five point scale ranging from ‘always’, ‘often’, ‘sometimes’, ‘rarely’ and ‘never’.

Part IV: The fourth part of the questionnaire consisted of Latack’s (1986) ‘Coping’ and ‘Symptom Management’ scales. It was further divided into two sections. In the first section, twenty five ‘Control’ and ‘Escape’ coping strategies were given, and in the second section, ten ‘Symptom Management’ strategies were given. The responses were sought to be given on a five point scale ranging from ‘always’, ‘often’, ‘sometimes’, ‘rarely’ and ‘never’ for both the scales. In the first section, for the coping scale, the respondents were instructed to mention, how they cope with stress produced by the stressors experienced in the first part. For the symptom management scale, the respondents were supposed to mention, how often they do the kind of things mentioned when they feel tensed because of their job.

Statistical Analysis

Statistical methods play a very significant role in the interpretation of numerical data obtained from individuals by giving numerical expression to the relationship and the variations with respect to different aspects.
1. The statistical computer software ‘SPSS 16.0 (free trial version)’ was used for interpreting the results of the present study and the level of significance was p<0.05. The data relating to the respondent’s perception towards stress, stressors and coping strategies have been analyzed in aggregate. Simple frequencies and percentages have been calculated to depict the presence/or absence of stressors, symptoms and use of coping strategies. In order to achieve the aims of the study following statistical tools were used.

2. Reliability of all the three scales, viz., organisational stressors, stress symptoms and coping strategies, was measured by using Cronbach Alpha (Hair et al., 1995; Brenstein 1981).

3. Factor Analysis had been used to understand the structure of organizational stressors and coping strategies.

4. Spearman’s Correlation Coefficient had been used to study the correlation between organisational stressors, symptoms and coping strategies.

5. Step-wise Hierarchical Regression Analysis had been employed to identify which stressor explained the greatest stress variance. Similarly, it had been used to identify which coping strategy explained the greatest stress variance. It provided a model for stress measurement by combining the effect of the different stressors and coping strategies.

6. Regression Analysis had been used to test the effect of coping strategies on the relationship between stressors and stress (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

7. The t-test had been applied to compare the stress levels among public and private sector bank managers and also to compare the stress levels of male and female bank managers.

8. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) had been used to investigate the difference between the stress levels of public and private sector bank managers.

5.1.3 Findings of the study

The present study is focused to investigate and to compare the level of job stress among managers of the public sector banks and private
sector banks in Punjab and coping strategies adopted by them. The data was collected on three hundred bank managers (i.e. respondents) and out of which one hundred and fifty were form public sector banks which constitute 50% of the total sample and remaining 50% (150) were from private sector banks. Keeping in view the aims of the study an appropriate descriptive and inferential statistics is presented. For the purpose of the analysis, data is tabulated based on organizational stressors, stress symptoms and organisational stress coping strategies. In order to identify the organizational stressors which generally lead to stress in the banking industry, in the present study a questionnaire containing a list of thirty-four statements representing the various dimensions of an organization and job had been used to collect the responses of the managers. The respondents were asked to express their level of agreement/ disagreement on a five point Likert Scale ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’, with respect to the above variables. The data was tabulated, by allocating the weights 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 to the responses ‘strongly agree’, ‘agree’, ‘undecided’, ‘disagree’, and ‘strongly disagree’ respectively. There are different signs and symptoms that can indicate that the person is under stress. In the present study, second part of the questionnaire was consisting of sixty two statements that deal with the stress symptoms. These sixty two statements of stress symptoms belong to three categories of stress viz., psychological, physiological and behavioural. The respondents of this study were asked to indicate the frequency with which they suffered from the given problems. A five point scale ranging from ‘always’ to ‘never’ was used for measuring the individual responses. To determine the frequency of occurrence of various stress related problems, the mean score values were computed by assigning weights 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 to ‘always’, ‘often’, ‘sometimes’, ‘rarely’, and ‘never’ in that order. In the present study, Latack’s (1986) conceptualization of coping was used which includes ‘Control’, ‘Escape’, and ‘Symptom Management’ coping. Twenty-five ‘Control’ and ‘Escape’ coping strategies were used in the present study and the respondents were asked to indicate the frequency of usage of the above strategies on a five point scale ranging from always to never. To determine the intensity of usage of various coping strategies, data was tabulated by assigning weights 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 to ‘always’, ‘often’, ‘sometimes’, ‘rarely’, and ‘never’ in that order. The second part of the coping scale was related to “Symptom Management”. Ten items were
extracted from the separate “Symptom Management” scale of Latack (1986). This has been defined as a separate coping method that focuses on job related tensions. The “Symptom Management” questionnaire consisted ten symptom management strategies and the respondents were asked to indicate the frequency with which they use the above strategies on a five point scale ranging from ‘always’ to ‘never’. To determine the intensity of usage of various “Symptom Management” strategies, the data was tabulated by assigning weights 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 to ‘always’, ‘often’, ‘sometimes’, ‘rarely’, and ‘never’.

The present study was focused to investigate and to compare the level of job stress among managers of the public sector banks and private sector banks in Punjab and coping strategies adopted by them. In order to judge the normality of the distribution skewness and kurtosis of all the three scales have been calculated and were well within the limits of normal distribution. For the organizational stress variables the value of skewness was 0.013 and kurtosis 0.942, for coping strategies the value of skewness was 0.019 and kurtosis 0.701 and for management strategies the value of skewness was 0.781 and kurtosis 0.998 and were well within the limits of normal distribution. For the normal distribution the value of skewness is 0 and kurtosis is 3. So the results showed that the distribution is a very little positively skewed but well within the limits of $\pm 1$ for normal distribution. Major findings of the study are as follows:

1) Factor analysis had been employed in the study to identify the structure of organizational factors and stress coping strategies. Factor analysis had been employed on thirty four organizational stress variables, which were measured on a five point Likert scale for 300 responses representing various dimensions of an organisation and job to summarise these different variables into fewer but more understandable factors. On the basis of results of factor analysis thirty four statements representing organisational stress variables were summarized in ten factors. All the ten factors extracted had been given appropriate names on the basis of various variables represented in each case. The factors S1 through S10 have been named as “Poor Organisational Structure and Climate” (S1), “Poor Interpersonal Relations” (S2), “Work Overload” (S3), “Work Inhibitors” (S4), “Time Pressure” (S5), “Financial Needs and Job Insecurity” (S6), “Inconsiderate
Superior” (S7), “Rigid Rules” (S8), “Role Ambiguity” (S9), and “Monotonous Job” (S10) respectively. In case of stress symptoms ten out of sixty-two items loaded on a single factor whose Eigen Value was 13.225. Sixteen out of sixty-two items loaded on a single factor whose Eigen Value was 4.944 and no apparent (conceptual) clustering of items for any of the eleven other factors (which carried Eigen Values between 1.306 to 3.124), the data suggest that the stress measure was primarily one-dimensional with two major factor accounting for most of the stress variance. It was decided to use the sum of ratings as a single score for further analysis and was denoted with ‘T’ (Summers et. al. 1994). In order to sharpen the understanding of the structure of coping strategies which are generally used to manage the organisational stress, the Factor Analysis technique has been applied. The Factor Analysis yielded four factors which have been given appropriate names on the basis of the variables describing the factor. These four factors had been named as “Escape/Avoidance” (C1), “Positive Thinking” (C2), “Problem Solving” (C3), and “Social Support” (C4). In case of Symptom Management Strategies the Factor Analysis yielded two factors which had been given appropriate names on the basis of the variables describing the factor. These two factors had been named as “Positive Symptom Management Strategies” (M1) and “Negative Symptom Management Strategies” (M2).

2) The study has found as per its first objective to judge the level of stress among public and private sector bank managers overall level of stress among bank managers were computed on the basis of Q1 (Quartiles) and Q3. Highest number of public sector bank managers 80 (53.33%) fall in the low stress category, 57 (38.00%) fall into medium stress category and only 13 (8.66%) fall in category of high level stress. In case of private sector bank managers highest number of bank managers 135 (90.00%) fall in high stress category and 15 (10.00%) private sector bank managers fall in medium stress category. Thus out of total 80 (26.67%) bank managers fall in low stress category, 72 (24.00%) bank managers fall in medium stress category and 148 (49.33%) bank managers fall in high stress category. Thus more than half of the respondents (73.33) were suffered from medium to high degree of stress. To judge the level of stress among public and private sector bank managers means and std. dev. of organizational stress variables were computed in total as well as for each of ten factors. The results
indicated that private sector bank managers were suffered with greater amount of stress than public sector bank managers while simply comparing the mean score values of organizational stress variables of both the sectors private sector bank managers mean stress score was 114.58 which was higher than 94.38 in case of public sector bank managers. The results were matched with the findings of Kumar (1995), who compared the level of stress experienced by employees of the nationalized and non-nationalized banks in the Kottyam and Erranakulam district of Kerala and found that the stress in the employees of non-nationalized banks were to be higher as compared to employees of nationalized banks. Results stated that amongst all organizational stress variables S1 Poor Organisational Structure & Climate (POSC) scored highest mean score value 25.55 with std. dev. 3.51 contributes highest to the stress. The second highest contributor to the stress of the bank managers was S3 Work overload (WO) (Shah (2012) also found that about 86% of the sample respondents were overweight due to high work load and Lehel (2007) also found that private sector had highly overloaded with work.) with mean score value 12.86 and std. dev. 1.53 followed by S2 Poor Interpersonal Relations (PIR) with mean score of 10.81 & std. dev. 2.03, S6 Financial Needs & Job Insecurity (FN&JI) with mean score value 10.17 & std. dev. 3.65, S8 Rigid Rules (RR) with mean score value 9.66 & std. dev. 0.85, S5 Time Pressure with mean score value 9.06 and std. dev. 1.28, S7 Inconsiderate Superior (IS) with mean score value of 7.79 std. dev. 1.97, S4 Work Inhibitors with mean score value 7.52 and std. dev. 2.11, S9 Role Ambiguity with mean score value 6.15 & std. dev. 1.25 and the last stress contributor to the stress level of bank managers S10 Monotonous Job with mean score value 4.71 and std. dev. 1.17.

3) Further the comparison of public sector and private sector revealed that that stress level was higher in private sector as compare to public sector. Private sector bank managers were more stressed as compare to public sector bank managers and the difference was significant. (Kumar, 1995; Malik 2011) While the comparison had been made individually for all the factors the private sector found to be more stressed at all the fronts as compare to the public sector as the mean score values for the organizational stress variables were significantly higher in case of private sector.
4) The second objective of studying the factors responsible for stress reveals that amongst all organizational stress variables S1 Poor Organisational Structure & Climate (POSC) and S3 Work overload (WO) were the highest contributor to the stress in both the sectors but mean score values in private sector were significantly higher for both the factors as compare to public sector. The third stress contributing variable in case of public sector bank managers was S2 Poor Interpersonal Relations but in case of private sector bank managers third stress contributing variable was S6 Financial Needs & Job Insecurity (FN&JI), thus the public sector was more stressed with the problem of Poor Interpersonal Relations but Financial Needs & Job Insecurity was more stressed induced for private sector bank managers as compare to public sector bank managers. The fourth stress contributor to the stress level of bank managers of public sector was S8 Rigid Rules and in case of private sector fourth stress contributor was S2 Poor Interpersonal Relations. Again for both the variables scores of private sector were higher than public sector. The fifth stress contributor to the stress level of bank managers of public sector was S5 Time Pressure and in case of private sector was S8 Rigid Rules. The sixth contributor to the stress level of bank managers of public sector was S6 Financial Needs & Job Insecurity and in case of private sector was S5 Time Pressure, the seventh contributor to the stress level of bank managers of both the sectors was S7 Inconsiderate Superior, the eighth contributor to the stress level of bank managers of both the sectors was S4 Work Inhibitors, the ninth contributor to the stress level of bank managers of both the sectors was S9 Role Ambiguity and the last ninth contributor to the stress level of bank managers of both the sectors was S10 Monotonous Job but mean score values in private sector were significantly higher for all the factors as compare to public sector.

5) For the purpose of third objective, to study the relationship (if any) between organisational factors & stress symptoms correlation analysis had been performed. The results of correlation of stress symptoms and organizational stress variables indicated that nine out of ten organisational stress variables found positively and significantly associated with stress and all these nine organizational factors were the source of stress for the bank managers except Rigid Rules which was negatively associated with stress. It clearly stated that if
the nine factors S1 (Poor Organisational Structure and Climate), S2 (Poor Interpersonal Relations), S3 (Work Overload), S4 (Work Inhibitors), S5 (Time Pressure), S6 (Financial Needs and Job Insecurity), S7 (Inconsiderate Superior), S9 (Role Ambiguity) and S10 (Monotonous Job) that positively and significantly associated with stress will be provided sufficiently then the managers may not mind to work under rigid rules. The results were in the line of various studies like Lehel (2004), Jain et al. (2007), and Adenike A. (2011) also found these variables of poor organizational structure and climate positively associated with stress. Schuler, (1982), Leiter & Maslach (1987), Ulrich (2010) and Shahid et al., (2011) found Poor interpersonal relationships at work as a major source of stress. Domenighetti et. al., (2003) examined the prevalence of work condition factors which influenced the level of stress and insecurity, found that one of the principal factors determining high levels of stress in dissatisfaction was the work carried out, in the lack of support from superiors and colleagues. Hedrix, et.al. (1994) also found ‘Job Boredom’ as one of the major variables affecting job stress. The higher one scored on ‘Job Boredom’, the higher the job stress reported.

6) Further to study the extent of using coping strategies amongst all the coping strategies, Problem Solving Coping Strategies C3 with mean score value 30.58 were used most frequently by bank managers. Folkman et al (1979) and Havlovic & Keenan (1994) also identified “Problem Solving” as a most important coping strategy. Coping through direct action represents task-focused, problem-solving efforts, such as devoting more time and energy to the job and working harder, longer hours. After Problem solving coping strategies the bank managers used Positive Thinking Coping Strategies C2 with score value of 20.30, followed by Escape/Avoidance coping strategies C1 with score value of 15.44 Latack (1986) and Folkman et al , (1986) found use of escape-avoidance both cognitive and behavioural strategies to get rid of the stressful situation and lastly Social Support coping strategies C4 got the score value of 15.29 Burke & Belcourt (1974) and Beehr et al. (2000) also identified Social support as the general global emotional and instrumental types and also as the more specific content of communication to cope up the stressful situations. While we compare public sector and private sector results indicated that the extent of using coping
strategies was higher in case of private sector as compare to public sector as the total mean score value was higher that was 83.81 in case of private sector bank managers and total mean score 79.39 in case of public sector bank managers the difference was significant. But while we compare the individual coping strategies used by the two sectors the results stated that in case of private sector for Escape/Avoidance Coping Strategies (C1) mean score values 16.37 was significantly higher as compare to the public sector with mean score values 14.50. The results indicated that in case of private sector for Problem Solving Coping Strategies (C3) mean score values 30.85 was significantly higher as compare to the public sector with mean score values 30.31. Similarly in case of private sector for Social Support Coping Strategies (C4) mean score values 16.15 and std. dev. 2.44 was significantly higher as compare to the public sector with mean score values 14.42. But that in case of private sector for, Positive Thinking Coping Strategies (C2) mean score values 20.43 was higher as compare to the public sector with mean score values 20.16 and the difference was not significant at any level. The results revealed that amongst two of the Symptom Management Strategies, Positive Symptom Management Strategies M1with mean score value 16.35 was used most frequently by bank managers. results indicated that the extent of using Symptom Management strategies was higher in case of private sector as compare to public sector as the total mean score was significantly higher that was 20.57 in case of private sector bank managers and total mean score 19.19 in case of public sector bank managers. But while we compare the individual symptom management strategies used by the two sectors the results stated that in case of private sector for Positive Symptom Management Strategies (M1) mean score values 16.91 was significantly higher as compare to the public sector with mean score values 15.79. Similarly in case of private sector for Negative Symptom Management Strategies (M2) mean score values 3.66 was significantly higher as compare to the public sector with mean score values 3.40.

7) Subject to fourth objective, to study the level of stress among male and female managers it has been found out that Stress suffered by female bank managers depicted through mean score value of 105.88 and in case of male bank managers mean score value was 103.02 but the difference was not significant. Akinnusi (1994), Kaushal (2001) and Jayashree (2009) also found female respondents
more stressed as compare to males. Lehel (2007) also found female executives more stressed as compare to male bank executives in public sector. The results stated that mean score values of organisational stress variables i.e. for nine organisational stress variables except Monotonous Job S10 were higher in case of female bank managers but the difference was significant only for the factor S1 Poor Organisational Structure & Climate. Further the results stated that the extent of adoption of coping strategies among female bank managers was higher as compare to male bank managers. The study found that the mean score value of coping strategies used by female bank managers in total was 82.12 and the mean score value of coping strategies used by male bank managers in total was 81.12 but the difference was not significant. But while we compare the individual coping strategies used by the two categories of bank managers the results stated that as extent of using Escape/Avoidance (E/A) (C1), Problem Solving (PS) (C3) and Social Support (SS) (C4) was higher in female bank managers as compare to male bank managers but the difference was insignificant. The extent of using Positive Thinking (PT) (C2) coping strategies was higher among male bank managers as the mean score value was higher in case of male bank managers as compare to female bank managers but this difference was also insignificant. The results indicated that the extent of using Symptom Management strategies was higher in case of female bank managers as compare to male bank managers as the total mean score was higher that was 19.95 in case of female bank managers and total mean score 19.80 in case of male bank managers and the difference was insignificant. The results stated that In case of individual symptom management strategies extent of using both the strategies was higher in case of female bank managers but the difference was not significant at any level of significance.

8) For the purpose of fifth objective, to study the role of age in job stress the respondents were divided four age groups as 20-30, 30-40, 40-50 & 50-60. In order to study the stress level of different age groups mean score values and std. dev. were calculated for each age group and Anova test was applied to test the significance of the difference of stress levels. Study found that in case of public sector bank managers of age group 30-40 years were more stressed as compare to the managers of other age group with mean score value 106.61. The results indicated that younger age bank managers were more stressed as compare to the
middle and senior age group bank managers. Kaushal (2001) found that younger employees were more stressed because of under utilization of energy, fresh view points, lack of proper inputs and pending promotions. The results stated that in case of public sector bank managers F ratios were significant almost for all the factors except S8. Thus the results of the test stated that there was a significant difference in the stress levels of bank managers of different age groups. In case of private sector bank managers of age group 30-40 years were more stressed as compare to the managers of other age group with mean score value 124.46. The results indicated that younger age bank managers were more stressed as compare to the middle and senior age group bank managers. The results stated that in case of private sector bank managers F ratios were significant for all the factors. Thus the results of the test stated that there was a significant difference in the stress levels of bank managers of different age groups. The younger age groups were more stressed than the senior age group bank managers. In case of combined (Public plus Private Sector) sector bank managers of age group 30-40 years were more stressed as compare to the managers of other age group with mean score value 116.24 and std. dev. of 9.59. It was followed by the age group of 20-30 years with mean score value 109.91 and std. dev. 10.94; age group of 40-50 years with mean score value 100.81 and std. dev. 9.19 and age group of 50-60 years with mean score value 90.96 and std. dev. 7.17. The results indicated that younger age bank managers were more stressed as compare to the middle and senior age group bank managers. The results of Anova test applied in case of Combined (Public plus Private Sector) bank managers. The results stated that F ratios were significant for all the factors. Thus the results of the test stated that there was a significant difference in the stress levels of bank managers of different age groups. The younger age groups were more stressed than the senior age group bank managers. Kaur (2006) was found highest stress in the younger employees due to late promotions and under or over utilization of capacity feel more stressed. Chandriah, K. et al., (2003) investigated the effect of age on occupational stress and job satisfaction among managers of different age groups. The results of the study showed that the young adults and early middle aged were experiencing more stress due to role overload, role ambiguity and strenuous working conditions compared to late middle aged.
9) For the purpose of sixth objective to study the role of various coping strategies regression analysis had been performed. To study the effect of different coping strategies on organisational stressors regression models prepared which revealed that the coping strategy C1 “Escape/Avoidance” exacerbated the relationship between organizational stressors S4 “Work Inhibitors”, S7 “Inconsiderate Superior”, S8 “Rigid Rules”, S9 “Role Ambiguity”, S10 “Monotonous Job” and stress. In the rest of the five relationships, it worked only as a mediator. It has been found that “Escape/Avoidance” coping has a potential to aggravate the stressor and stress relationship. Singh (2002) reported that “Escape/Avoidance” coping at the initial level may provide some temporary relief but subsequently it worsens the situation. Ultimately, the solution lies in the resolution of the problem. The Coping strategy C2 “Positive Thinking” moderated the relationship between organizational stressors S4 “Work Inhibitors”, S6 “Financial Needs and Job Insecurity”, S10 “Monotonous Job” and stress. In the rest of the seven relationships, it worked only as a mediator. The Coping strategy C3 “Problem Solving” moderated the relationship between organizational stressors S4 “Work Inhibitors”, S5 “Time Pressure”, S6 “Financial Needs and Job Insecurity”, S8 “Rigid Rules” and stress. In the rest of the six relationships, it worked only as a mediator. These findings of the moderating role of “Problem-focused” coping on the relationship between stressors and stress complement the findings of Folkman & Lazarus (1980). They reported a significant increase in the use of problem solving techniques when the subjects in their study confronted work related stressful episodes. The Coping strategy C4 “Social Support” moderated the relationship between organizational stressors S2 “Poor Interpersonal Relationships”, S3 “Work Overload”, S5 “Time Pressure”, S6 “Financial Needs and Job Insecurity”, S7 “Inconsiderate Superior”, S8 “Rigid Rules”, S9 “Role Ambiguity” and stress. In the rest of the three relationships, it worked only as a mediator. These findings of the moderating role of “Social Support” coping on the relationship between stressors and stress complement the findings of Moos & Billings (1982), Hammer & Marting (1988) and Dewe (1987) found a significant use of social support to reduce organizational stress. The symptom management strategy M1 “Positive Symptom Management” moderated the relationship between organizational stressors S2 “Poor Interpersonal Relationships”, S3 “Work Overload”, S4 “Work Inhibitors”, S5
“Time Pressure”, S7 “Inconsiderate Superior”, S8 “Rigid Rules”, S9 “Role Ambiguity” and stress. In the rest of the two relationships, it worked only as a mediator. The symptom management strategy M2 “Negative Symptom Management” exacerbated the relationship between organizational stressors S5 “Time Pressure”, S8 “Rigid Rules” and stress. In the rest of the eight relationships, it worked only as a mediator. It has been revealed that this “Symptom Management” strategy has the potential to worsen the stressor and stress relationship.

10) The contribution of each organisational factor and coping strategy in predicting stress and developing a model to explain maximum of stress variance had also been studied. Stress had been measured by using stress symptoms as a dependent variable for Regression Analysis in the present study. A single score had been calculated for each respondent by adding the original score given by the respondents to sixty-two stress symptoms. A set of ten organisational stress factors were used as a predictor category in regression analysis. A set of four coping strategies and two symptom management strategies were used as moderator variables in Regression Analysis. In order to study the contribution of Organisational factors in the stress, first of all, ten predictors had been entered individually. The results stated that Financial Needs and Job Insecurity (S6) had been identified as the biggest predictor which explained maximum 44.2 percent of stress variance. This was followed by Work Overload (S3) which explained 27.6 percent of stress variance, Work Inhibitors (S4) which explained 16.5 percent of stress variance, Role Ambiguity (S9) which explained 12.3 percent of stress variance, Monotonous Job (S10) which explained 12.1 percent of stress variance, Inconsiderate Superior (S7) which explained 10.9 percent of stress variance, Poor Inter-personal Relations (S2) which explained 10.1 percent of stress variance, Poor Organisational Structure and Climate (S1) which explained 7.40 percent of stress variance, Time Pressure (S5) which explained 1.00 percent of stress variance. The foregoing analysis revealed the nine out of ten organisational stressors contribute to stress significantly. After examining the individual contribution of each predictor to stress variance, the step-wise regression analysis has been performed to fit a regression model which explains the maximum stress variance. The five variables; S6, S8, S10, S3 and S5
had been selected for the final model which together, explain 51.6 percent of the stress variance. The individual contribution of each coping strategy was examined first, before fitting them to the final model. The results stated that **C4** (Social Support Coping strategies) explains the highest stress variance, 21.4 percent, followed by **C1** (Escape/Avoidance Coping strategies) explained 3.0 percent stress variance and C3 (Problem Solving Coping strategies) explained 2.0 percent stress variance. The coping strategy C2 (Positive Thinking Coping strategies) did not explain any stress variance. M1 (Positive Symptom Management Strategies) explained 13.6 percent of the stress variance and M2 (Negative Symptom Management Strategies) explained 7.2 percent of the stress variance. After examining the individual contribution of each moderator to stress variance, the step-wise regression analysis has been performed to fit a regression model which explains the maximum stress variance. The results stated that the regression model with four moderator variables, selected step-wise, was the most fit model with $R^2$ equal to 0.376 and F value of 44.467 which is significant at 1 per cent level. The entry of other coping strategies C2 and C3, not selected step-wise, did not add much to the explained stress variance. There was an increase of only 0.01 per cent in $R^2$ but on the other hand adjusted $R^2$ decreased by 0.04 per cent. The above analysis revealed that the four variable model is the most fit model in the given situation which explained 37.6 per cent of stress variance. A series of multiple regressions were performed to select variables for each set of Predictors and moderator variable category. First, predictor set of variables S6, S8, S10, S3, and S5 has been selected which together explained 51.6 percent of stress variance. Second, the Moderator set of variables C1, C4, M1 & M2 was selected which together explained 37.6 percent stress variance. Third, a set of interaction terms was developed. It consisted of 20 interaction terms, viz., S3C1, S3C4, S3M1, S3M2, S5C1, S5C4, S5M1, S5M2, S6C1, S6C4, S6M1, S6M2, S8C1, S8C4, S8M1, S8M2, S10C1, S10C4, S10M1 and S10M2. These three sets of variables (stressors, coping, and stress & coping) have been entered in the moderated regression model one by one. Finally, the set of 15 interactions (stress x coping) has been entered, which brings a significant change in $R^2$ and increasing it by 11.6 percent. The overall model with these three set of variables explained 72.2 percent of stress variance with overall F value equal to 24.167, which is significant at 0.01 level. It reveals that coping strategies not only help in
coping with stressful situations but also affect the stressor-stress relationship, that is, they influence the appraisal of the stressful situations.

5.2 Conclusion

In today's competitive environment there is considerable reason to believe that people who are working in banking sector are significantly more at risk of poor health because the jobs in banking industry are becoming more and more stressful. There are a variety of factors which may be sources of stress for the people working in this industry. The productivity of the work force is the most decisive factor as far as the success of an organization is concerned. The productivity in turn is dependant on the psychosocial well being of the employees. In an age of highly dynamic and competitive world, man is exposed to all kinds of stressors that can affect him on all realms of life. The growing importance of interventional strategies is felt more at organizational level. Stress is a stimulus or a response is still a matter of uncertainty thus its being real or perceived becomes questionable, however, this does not make any difference to the degree of stress felt. The situation overtaxes a person that robs his ability to function well and sometimes takes away the ability to function at all. This particular research was intended to study the impact of occupational stress on Public and Private sector Bank managers. Although certain limitations were met with study, every effort has been made to make it much comprehensive. The study concluded that there are various organizational dimensions which are the greater source of stress for the bank managers of both the categories. But Private sector bank managers are suffered with greater amount of stress as compared to the public sector bank managers. The increasing pressures on employees to deal with role, structure, climate, relationship, factors intrinsic to job and extra organizational factors and still contribute to the level of excellence has caused the stress to manifest in the form of absenteeism, lower morale, health problems, accidents at work place etc.

The present study concludes that female bank managers are more vulnerable to the effects of stress and are exposed to a greater magnitude of work stress than male bank managers in both public and private sector banks. Female bank managers felt overloaded with work due to their dual
roles as a professional as well as a home maker and the responsibilities they had to perform at both the fronts. Policies and programs need to be developed that are preventive in focus in order for women to maximize their career potential, and for organizations to benefit from the rich resources that women bring to the work force.

The present study concludes that younger age bank managers were more stressed as compare to the middle and senior age group bank managers. The younger employees due to late promotions and under or over utilization of capacity feel more stressed. The younger employees were more stressed in both public and private sectors as compare to the senior aged bank managers and the difference in stress levels were significant thus younger age felt more stressed due to late promotions, work overload, inconsiderate superior, time pressure and role ambiguity etc.

The present study concludes that “Problem Solving”, “Escape” and “Social Support” coping have been found being used mostly by the managers. Thus organisational surveys should be used to determine the coping strategies used by employees to deal with a variety of organisational stressors. Based on survey results, the need for organisational change should be determined. “Symptom Management” strategy has been found to be used in both the ways as “Positive Symptom Management” and “Negative Symptom Management”. The respondents have been using “Positive Symptom Management” strategies more as compare to “Negative Symptom Management” strategies to reduce job related tensions. Being “Negative Symptom Management” strategy it has a potential to aggravate the perceived stress. In each and every organization, employees have to be kept fully satisfied, happy and motivated so that productivity, efficiency and performance will be at its peak level. By this employees may understand the organization and start functioning in optimum efficiency. One of the most significant ways to achieve the organizational efficiency is to identify the reasons or causes of “stressors” and the way to cope with it.
5.3 Implications and Recommendations of the Study

The present study provides an insight into the identification of organisational stressors, measuring stress and coping strategies managers use to cope with stress in public and private sector banks in Punjab. The results of the study support the conjecture that this study has theoretical as well as practical implications.

1. All these organisational dimensions have been identified in specific terms. Further, these specific organisational dimensions have been examined for their stress producing potential. There are different organisational dimensions such as Poor Organisational Structure & Climate, Poor Interpersonal Relations, Work Overload, Work Inhibitors, Time Pressure, Financial Needs & Job Insecurity, Inconsiderate Superior, Rigid Rules, Role Ambiguity and Monotonous Job. The results indicated that all the nine organizational factors were the source of stress for the bank managers except Rigid Rules which was negatively associated with stress. Therefore, managers should provide more conducive working environments devoid of stress. There is a need to make policies at organizational level such as Job redesigning so that the work allotted must match the capabilities and expertise of the managers. There must be facilities of interdepartmental adjustments so that work assignments can be shifted if the work is overloaded and the working hours must not be excessive. In order to eliminate the role ambiguity proper job clarifications must be given to the managers so that they must be aware of their job responsibilities and job authorities. Job oriented training programs must be introduced from time to time so that timely improvements in the skills and the confidence level of managers can be made. There must be recognition of good work in the organisation and attractive reward policies for good performances. Organisations must organise stress audits and provide stress counselling on work related problems.

2. It is suggested that there is a need that all identified organisational dimensions should be categorised as those which are controllable by the
employee, partially or fully, and those which are not controllable by the employee. Because, for all organisational dimensions which are under the control of individual employee, individual coping efforts may be effective. But for all those organisational dimensions which are not directly under the control of the individual employee, stress coping efforts at the group level or organisational level may be effective.

3. There are certain factors found to be causing stress among females to a higher extent hence to eliminate their effect or at least to bring it to the level of their counterparts the intervention strategies need to be introduced an attempt to grant gender parity in organizations as well as society needs to be undertaken.

4. The study has found that stress reduces with an increase in age. which implies the customization to system with time, tends to reduce stress. Hence, efforts should be made to regulate the effective communication to help individuals adapt as early as possible.

5. Stress has been found to be present from a mild to moderate degree in the present sample, but the approach employed to measure stress among employees is potentially useful. It is more advantageous to give the employees a list of stress related problems and seeking their responses about the presence/absence of those problems. It will be of little use seeking employee responses through a few statements stating the presence/absence of stress.

6. It is important to formulate a comprehensive strategy for stress management. This may provide a more effective, broad-based intervention programme that will address the stress related problems of all bank managers, which can eventually lead to an improved level of organizational commitment.

7. Employee assistance programs, with the necessary access to counseling and therapy should be made available to all bank managers. This type of employee service would help to deal with stress related to work, family and trauma, which may influence the individual’s ability to perform optimally.