

THE STUDY OF ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS AND JOB PERFORMANCE AMONG EDUCATORS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

NISHA KUMARI¹ & SHASHI VERMA²

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Business Management, Uhf Nauni, Solan, Himachal Pradesh, India

²Professor (Retd.), University Business School, HP University, Summerhill, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

The present study covers the impact of the 'organizational role stress' on 'job performance' of the faculty members at institutions of higher learning in Himachal Pradesh. It highlights the role of an individual in an organization under various dimensions of organizational role stress that is inter role distance, role stagnation, role explosion and role overload for the effective performance in terms of obedience, efficiency, punctuality, public dealing, job knowledge and interpersonal communication of employees. The discussion presents an approach to accept the existence of role stress and its effects on the well being of the organization. Further, it expects to create a need for employee training in stress management. Conclusively, the presented paper is an effort to analyze the causes of stress and to suggest remedies for institutions of higher learning in particular and to care of human resources as a whole in general.

KEYWORDS: Organizational Role Stress, Job Stress, Workplace Stress, Managing Stress

INTRODUCTION

Stress has been defined as a forceful condition in an individual's life in which he/she confronted with an opportunity, constraint, or demand related to the desires that they have and for which the outcome is perceived to be both uncertain and important. Selye (1946) firstly describe the phases in response to which the body goes through when come across a threat i.e. the (stressor). According to Erkutlu and Chafra, (2006), the place of work is a potentially most important source of stress because an individual spends maximum time of life at this place and in its setting. Katz and Kahn (1966) said that office is a relational or power related concept. Role determines the obligations of the person holding that office and all organizations are perceived as a system of roles. According to Khetarpal & G. Kosher, 2006, role stress refers to the stress an individual experiences because of their job roles in an organization. The stress induced due to roles performed by individuals as the employee has been a potent organizational stressor (Kahn et al., 1964; Srivastava, 2007). The messed up individual functioning in the workplace is associated with Stress (Smith, 2000) and is a major barrier to organizational success too (Noblet, 2003). Recent estimates suggest that about 91.5 million working days are actually lost each year because of stress-related illness (Smith, 2000). The negative effects of stress consist of reduced efficiency, decreased capacity to perform, dampened initiative and reduced interest in working, increased rigidity of thoughts, a lack of concern for the organization and colleagues, and a loss of responsibility (Dua, 1994; Fairbrother & Warn, 2003).

The association of role conflict and role ambiguity with low satisfaction, absenteeism & low involvement, low expectancies and task characteristics as a low motivating potential and tension, all affected the productivity and efficiency at the organizational level (Conley & Woosley, 2000; Koustelios et al, 2004; Nwadiani, 2006; Chang and Lu, 2007). Further, stress is reported as related with reduction in output, decrease in product quality and service or morale

(Ben-Bakr et al, 1995; Brown & Uehara, 2008), increased wages/overtime payments, organisational sabotage, all which are the costs to the organisations (Lim & Teo, 1996; Brown & Uehara, 2008). Work-related stress claims of teachers in particular represent a large proportion of the total. The cost of these claims for school systems is the billions of dollars in terms of medical & substitute teachers' costs, and the payment for disability in some of the cases (Brown & Uehara, 2008). Mohsen keshavarz and Reza Mohammadi (2011), Reported that most of the university employees are under a high degree of job stress. The common job stressors affecting the maximum number of the employees included: role conflict and role ambiguity, lack of promotion and feedback, lack of participation in decision making, lack of authority, workload, unsatisfactory working conditions and interpersonal relationships. So these job stressors affected their performance negatively.

Further Anshula Krishna and A.K. Srivastava (2011) found Organizational role stress and job performance inversely correlated. Arbabisarjou Azizollah, Ajdari Zaman, Omeidkhaled and Jalalinejad Razieh (2013), reported a negative correlation between Job stress and performance. Whereas Akif Lutfi Al-khasawneh and Sahar Moh'd Futa (2012-13) found a significant positive relationship between the studied stressors and performance. P. Vanishree, (2014) suggested that the different dimensions of job stress such as work overload, work's ambiguity and work conflict are resulting in poor concentration, mental block and poor decision making skills among workers. Muwafaq Alkubaisi (2015), the analysis has shown that the unclear roll given to the employees and the workload have a direct relationship with work stress. One of the main findings is work stress has a negative impact on the employee's performance. Also, the employee's level of stress perception is influenced by their job title.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To study the inter- relationship between organizational role stress and the dimensions of job performance.
- To find out the impact of organizational role stress dimensions on job performance dimensions.
- To analyze the extent of the relationship between organizational role stress dimensions and job performance dimensions.
- To suggest the measures for coping and managing the organizational role stress.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

- The dimensions of organizational role stress and job performance are not interrelated.
- There is no inter-effect between organizational role stress and job performance and their dimensions.
- Organizational role stress has no contributions to job performance.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

For conducting the study, primary data were collected to help of organizational role stress scale, 1981, 1983 by Uday Pareek and job performance questionnaire 2002, by Bharti Gandhi. A representative sample was selected with the help of a multi-stage sampling technique. Further the colleges with highest, moderate and the lowest number of teachers were identified and two colleges were selected from each category. Finally, twelve colleges, six (government) and six (private) constituted the sample and the number of units studied were two hundred fifty (125 males, 125 females).

Variables

Variables studied include organizational role stress variables, namely –inter role distance, role stagnation, role explosion and role overload (the dimensions of organizational role stress scale Uday Pareek, 1983; ORS, Scale). And the dimensions of job performance consist of (job performance questionnaire by Bharti Gandhi, 2002) obedience, efficiency, punctuality, job knowledge, public dealing and interpersonal communication.

Statistical Tools Used

Correlation analysis was used to measure the strength and the direction of the relationship between variables. One way ANOVA, the analysis of variance was used for the comparison of mean and standard deviation values to clear the impact of different categories of the personal variables i.e. gender, age and education on organization role stress dimensions. Besides, regression analysis was used to ascertain the probable form of the relationship between dependent variables and independent variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Correlation Analysis

Table 1: Relationship Between Inter Role Distance, Role Stagnation, Role Explosion, Role Overload and Job Performance Dimensions

Job Performance Dimensions Organizational Role Stress Dimensions	Obedience	Efficiency	Punctuality	Public Dealing	Job Knowledge	Interpersonal Communication
Inter Role Distance	-.199**	-.004	-.174**	-.046	-.196**	-.348**
Role Stagnation	-.188**	-.053	-.125*	-.065	-.055	-.169**
Role Explosion	-.125**	.023	-.152*	-.037	-.099	-.169**
Role Overload	-.004	.085	-.054	-.062	-.062	-.163**

*p < 0.05 **p < 0.01

Inter Role Distance

Table-1 predicts the relationship between inter role distance and job performance dimensions. A significant negative relationship between inter role distance and obedience ($r = -.199$, $p < 0.01$), punctuality ($r = .174$, $p < 0.01$), job knowledge ($r = - .196$, $p < 0.01$), and interpersonal communication ($r = -.348$, $p < 0.01$) is observed, whereas the insignificant negative relationship of inter role distance with efficiency ($r = -.004$) and public dealing ($r = -.046$) is noted. The above discussion suggests that inter role distance negatively and significantly affects obedience, punctuality, job knowledge and interpersonal communication. In short, it is concluded that increased degree of inter role distance brought the job performance of the respondents down as per the study.

Role Stagnation

Table-1 explains the relationship between role stagnation and job performance dimension which is negative. However, it is significant with obedience ($r = -.188$, $p < 0.01$), punctuality ($r = -.125$, $p < 0.05$) and interpersonal communication ($r = -169$, $p < 0.01$). All other relationships that are between role stagnation and efficiency ($r = -.053$), public dealing ($r = -.065$), and job knowledge ($r = -.055$) are found to be negative, but not significant. The analysis above reveals that increased role stagnation decreases the job performance of the respondents.

Role Explosion

The Table-1 above reports the significant negative relationship of role explosion with obedience ($r = -.125, p < 0.01$), interpersonal communication ($r = -.169, p < 0.01$) and punctuality ($r = -.152, p < 0.05$), meaning thereby that an increase in role explosion decreases the obedience, punctuality and the interpersonal communication within the respondents. The relationship between role explosion and public dealing ($r = -.037$), job knowledge ($r = -.099$) is negative insignificant whereas the relationship of role explosion with efficiency ($r = .023$) is positively insignificant. The above discussion suggests that role explosion affects obedience, punctuality, public dealing and interpersonal communication negatively and, significantly, whereas it is related positively but not significantly with efficiency.

Role Overload

Table-1 above reveals that role overload is related negatively and significantly with interpersonal communication ($r = -.163, p < 0.01$) that is, when the role overload increases it reduces the interpersonal communication ability of the individuals. On the other hand it rejects the null hypothesis of no correlation between role overload and interpersonal communication. The relationship between role overload, obedience ($r = -.004$), punctuality ($r = -.054$), public dealing ($r = -.062$) and job knowledge ($r = -.062$) is negative, but not significant. Positive relationship between role overload and efficiency ($r = .085$) is also insignificant.

ANOVA ANALYSIS

Table 2: Organizational Role Stress and Job Performance

Job performance Dimensions ORS Dimensions	Obedience		Efficiency		Punctuality		Public Dealing		Job Knowledge		Interpersonal Communication	
	F Value	P Value	F Value	P Value	F Value	P Value	F Value	P Value	F Value	P Value	F Value	P Value
Inter Role Distance (IRD)	2.98*	.000	.956	.515	3.08*	.000	1.607	.056	2.998*	.000	5.137*	.000
Role Stagnation (RS)	2.01*	.015	.551	.909	1.537	.093	1.367	.165	.484	.947	1.650	.062
Role Explosion (RE)	2.73*	.001	.773	.715	1.288	.206	.853	.624	1.154	.306	2.054*	.011
Role Overload (RO)	1.565	.079	1.151	.310	.989	.416	.771	.718	1.973*	.016	1.316	.188

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

The one way ANOVA in Table-2 reports the effects of organizational role stress on job performance. It suggests that all the role stress dimensions, i.e. inter role distance ($F = 2.986, p < 0.05$), role stagnation ($F = 2.018, p < 0.05$), inter role conflict ($F = 2.333, p < 0.05$), role explosion ($F = 2.734, p < 0.05$), role isolation ($F = 3.833, p < 0.05$), personal inadequacy ($F = 3.710, p < 0.05$), self role distance ($F = 4.791, p < 0.05$), role ambiguity ($F = 3.010, p < 0.05$) and resource inadequacy ($F = 3.250, p < 0.05$) except role overload ($F = 1.565$) affect the obedience of respondents significantly. It is further noticed that efficiency is affected by inter role conflict ($F = 2.208, p < 0.05$), role isolation ($F = 3.632, p < 0.05$), personal inadequacy ($F = 2.533, p < 0.05$), self role distance ($F = 2.760, p < 0.05$) and resource inadequacy ($F = 3.103, p < 0.05$), whereas punctuality of the respondents has been affected by inter role distance ($F = 3.080, p < 0.05$), personal inadequacy ($F = 1.780, p < 0.05$), self role distance ($F = 1.877, p < 0.05$) and role ambiguity ($F = 1.890, p < 0.05$). Job knowledge of the individuals is affected significantly by inter role distance ($F = 2.998, p < 0.05$), role overload ($F = 1.973, p < 0.05$), personal inadequacy ($F = 1.785, p < 0.05$) and role ambiguity ($F = 2.009, p < 0.05$).

Inter role distance (F=5.137, p<0.05), inter role conflict (F=2.468, p<0.05), role explosion (F=2.054, p<0.05), personal inadequacy (F=3.133, p<0.05), self role distance (F=4.252, p<0.05) and role ambiguity (F=3.213, p<0.05) have affected interpersonal communication of the respondents.

REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Table 3: Organizational Role Stress and Job Performance

Job Performance & Org. Role Stress Dimensions	Obedience			Efficiency			Punctuality			Public-Dealing			Job Knowledge			Inter Personal Communication		
	R ²	B Value	T Value	R ²	B value	T value	R ²	B Value	T value	R ²	B Value	T Value	R ²	B value	T value	R ²	B value	T Value
Inter Role Distance	0.214	-5.86	3.204	0.010	-2.34	.064	0.41	-6.88	2.787**	.002	-9.81	.725	.320	-7.36	3.145**	.412	-.141	5.836**
Role Stagnation	.351	-6.34	3.018**	.003	-3.54	.840	0.361	-5.67	1.990**	.004	-1.60	1.034	.003	-2.35	.861	.325	-6.36	3.019**
Inter Role Conflict	.009	-3.53	1.516	.003	3.802	.827	.011	-5.20	1.665	.003	-5.71	.337	.007	-3.92	1.317	.461	-9.59	3.028**
Role Explosion	.325	-3.82	1.983**	.001	1.405	.367	.236	-6.25	2.424**	.001	8.24	.585	.011	-3.88	1.567	.461	-7.16	2.706**
Role Overload	.010	-1.04	.056	.007	4.920	1.346	.003	-2.12	.850	.004	-1.32	.981	.004	-2.32	.975	.271	-6.61	2.605**

Inter Role Distance

The regression Table-3 reveals that there is the significant negative contribution of inter role distance towards punctuality and interpersonal communication that is 41 percent (t=2.787, p<.01); 41.1 percent (t=5.836, p<0.01) respectively; significant moderate negative contribution toward obedience and job knowledge that is 21.4 percent (t=3.204, p<0.01); 32 percent (t=3.145, p<0.01) respectively. The variations within efficiency and public dealing due to inter role distance are in the same direction but not significant. The β -value given above further explains that the change of one point within inter role distance changes obedience negatively by 5.86 points, punctuality by 6.88 points, job knowledge by 7.36 points and interpersonal communication by .141 points.

Role Stagnation

The analysis of the Table-3 above reports significant moderate contributions of role stagnation toward obedience that is, 35.1 percent (t=3.018, p<0.01); punctuality 36.1 percent (t=1.990, p<0.01) and interpersonal communication 32.5 percent (t=3.019, p<0.01). The β – value further explains that the role stagnation puts obedience, punctuality and interpersonal communication into negative direction, meaning thereby that one point increase in role stagnation reduces obedience by 6.34 points, punctuality by 5.67 points and interpersonal communication by 6.36 points. Role stagnation shows negative minor, but insignificant contributions toward efficiency, public dealing and job knowledge.

Role Explosion

The calculation from Table-3 above exhibits significant strong negative variations in the performance of respondents due to varying degrees of role explosion that is, interpersonal communication 46.1 percent (t=2.706, p<0.01) where as it refers significant moderate changes toward the obedience 32.5 percent (t=1.983, p<0.01); punctuality 23.6 percent (t=2.424, p<0.01) of the respondents. The β -value suggests that an increase of one point in role explosion reported decrease of 3.82 points in obedience, 6.25 points in punctuality and 7.16 points in interpersonal communication. The study further reveals that role explosion makes minor negative contributions in job knowledge and punctuality and minor positive contributions in efficiency but these contributions are not significant.

Role Overload

It is evident from Table-3 above that the contribution of role overload toward interpersonal communication that is 27.1 percent ($t=2.605$, $p<0.01$) is significantly moderating and negative. The β -value reveals that an increase of one point in role overload reduces the interpersonal communication ability of the respondents by 6.61 points. The study further suggests some insignificant minor negative changes in obedience, punctuality, public dealing and job knowledge and insignificant minor positive changes due to varying degrees of role overload in efficiency is being detected.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTION

The experience of work stress can alter the way a person feels, thinks, and behaves, and certainly change their psychological, physiological and behavioral functions. The findings showed that organizational role stress dimensions, such as: (i) inter role distance, (ii) role stagnation, (iii) role explosion, and (iv) role overload; have a significant negative correlation with maximum of job performance dimensions like: (i) obedience, (ii) efficiency (iii) punctuality, (iv) public dealing, (v) job knowledge, and (vi) interpersonal communication.

These findings from presenting data are in line with existing literature. The negative relationship of stress and job performance has already been well established in previous researches (e. g. Smith, 2000; Noblet, 2003; Dua, 1994; Fairbrother & Warn, 2003; Conley & Woosley, 2000; Koustelios et al, 2004; Nwadiani, 2006; Chang and Lu, 2007; Ben-Bakr et al, 1995; Brown & Uehara, 2008; Anshula Krishna and A.K. Srivastava (2011; ArbabisarjouAzizollah, AjdariZaman, Omeidikhaled and JalalinejadRazieh2013; P. Vanishree, 2014).

In special situations this may not be true, but in general low performance can be anticipated where stress is high. Further in teacher's stress it is very necessary to keep in mind that the stressors vary from organization to organization and class room to class room.

As far as the stress management is concerned the first step is its recognition by the individual as well as by the stakeholders. For self stress assessments help can be taken from many of online centers'. Another common method used to quantify stress is the Holmes and Rahe Stress Scale. The identification and acceptance help to create the required environment for improvements of stressful situations highly influential variable. However, there is a range of stress management techniques, scientific and non scientific. But the effectiveness of these techniques depends on individual differences. Individual willingness and personality traits are the moderators of the extent of improvement achieved. So this requires a thorough analysis for the selection of an appropriate technique and the support from the stakeholders. It can be scientifically approved one, like yoga or something as simple as a walk in the lap of nature without worries for physical appearance. The only thing is that it must suit to the situation of the individual.

REFERENCES

1. AkifLutfi Al-khasawneh and 2Sahar Moh'dFuta (2012-13), Asian Journal of Business Management 5 (2): 267-275, 2013 ISSN: 2041-8744; e-ISSN: 2041-8752 © Maxwell Scientific Organization, 2013
2. Anshula Krishna and A.K. Srivastava (2011) Indian Journal of Social Science Researches, Vol. 8 No. 1-2, March & Oct. 2011, pp. 91-98, ISSN 09749837
3. ArbabisarjouAzizollah, AjdariZaman, Omeidikhaled and JalalinejadRazieh (2013), World of Sciences Journal; 2013 [02]

4. Baerga, Nova). South Eastern University, 2008 IABR & TLC Conference
5. Ben-Bakr, K.A., Al -Shammari, I. S., Jefri, O.A. (1995), Occupational stress in different organizations: a Saudi Arabian survey. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 10 (5): 24-28.
6. Borg, M (1990), "Occupational stress in British educational settings: A Review", *Educational Psychology*, Vol-10, pp-103-126.
7. Brown, M., and S. Ralph (1992), "Towards the identification of stress in Teachers". *Research in education*, Vol-48, pp-103-110
8. Brown, Z.A., &Uehara, D. L. (2008), *Coping with teacher stress: A research synthesis of Pacific Resources for Education and learning*. Retrieved June 29, 2009, from.
9. Brown, Z.A., &Uehara, D. L. (2008), *Coping with teacher stress: A research synthesis of Pacific Resources for Education and learning*. Retrieved June 29, 2009, from <http://www.prel.org/products/>.
10. Chang, K., Lu, L. (2007), Characteristics of organizational culture, stress and wellbeing: The case of Taiwanese organizations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22 (6): 549-68.
11. Conley, S., Woosley, S.A. (2000), role stress, higher order needs and work outcomes. *Journal of educational administration*, 38 (2): 179-201.
12. Dua, J.K. (1994), Job Stressors and Their Effects on Physical Health, Emotional Health and Job Satisfaction in a University. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32 (1): 59-78.
13. Erkutlu H. V. and Chafra J. (2006), "Relationship between Leadership Power Base and Job Stress of Subordinates: Example from Boutique Hotels." *Management Research News*, Vol.29, No.5, p. 59-78.
14. Fairbrother, K., & Warn, J. (2003), Workplace dimensions, stress and job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 18 (1): 8-21.
15. Goffman (1961), "The Relationship Between Organizational Role Stress of
16. Ivancevich and Matteson (1980), "Organisational Role Stress and its Management among IT Professionals". By RajnishRatna, SaniyaChawla, International Conference on Technology and Business Management March 28-30, 2011
17. Katz and Kahn (1966), "Coping with Stress: A Framework." *Indian Management*, 1975, p. 58-66.
18. Khetarpal & G. Kochar, 2006, "Role Stress and Preventive". *The Internet Journal of World Health and Societal Politics*. Vol-3, No- 1.
19. Koustelios, A., Theodorakis, N., Goulimaris, D (2004), Role ambiguity, role conflict and job satisfaction among physical education teachers in Greece. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 18 (2): 87-92.
20. Lim, V.K.G., &Teo, T.S.H. (1996), Gender differences in occupational stress and coping strategies among IT personnel, *Women in Management Review*, 11 (1): 20-8.

21. McGrath (1978), "Organisational Role Stress and its Management among IT Professionals". By RajnishRatna, SaniyaChawla, International Conference on Technology and Business Management March 28-30, 2011
22. Mohsen keshavarz and Reza Mohammadi (2011), SciVerse Science Direct, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 30 (2011) 390 – 394
23. Mwamwenda, T. S., Monyooe, and M.J. Glencseross (1997), "Stress of secondary school teachers in Transkei, South Africa", Psychological Reports, Vol-80, pp. 379-382.
24. Noblet, A. (2003), Building health promoting work settings: identifying the relationship between work characteristics and occupational stress in Australia. International Health Promotion, 18, 351–359.
25. Nwadiani, M. (2006), Level of perceived stress among lectures in Nigerian universities. Journal of Instructional Psychology, Retrieved June 2, 2008, from <http://www.thefreelibrary.com/>
26. P. Vanishree, 2014 Research, Journal of Management Sciences, Vol. 3 (1), 10-13, January (2014)
27. Pestonjee and Pareek (1997), "Organisational Role Stress and its Management among IT Professionals". By RajnishRatna, SaniyaChawla, International Conference on Technology and Business Management March 28-30, 2011
28. Proceedings, San Juan, Puerto Rico, USA
29. Project Managers and Voluntary Turnover and Intention to Leave (by Jose A
30. Reitz (1987), "Organisational Role Stress and its Management among IT Professionals". By RajnishRatna, SaniyaChawla, International Conference on Technology and Business Management March 28-30, 2011
31. Selye (1946), "Managing Work Place Stress" (by Susan Cartwright, Cary L. Cooper). Sage Publications, 1997, London, New Delhi, p. 3
32. Smith, A. (2000), The scale of perceived occupational stress. Journal of Occupational Medicine, 50 (5): 294-98.
33. MuwafaqAlkubaisi (2015), "How can Stress Affect Your Work Performance? Quantitative Field Study on Qatari Banking Sector", Business and Management Research Vol. 4, No. 1; 2015.