

The Impacts of Occupational Stress of Selected Banking Sector Employees in Tamilnadu

Ayyappan, M.Com, P.hD^a, M.SakthiVadivel^b

^aAssociate Professor, Sakthi Institute of information and Management Studies, Pollachi-642003, India

^bAssistant Professor, Dr. Mahalingam College of Engineering and Technology, Pollachi-642003, India

Abstract

Stress Management is getting more and more attention now-a-days, particularly in the financial sectors. There is no such thing like stress-free job. Everyone in their work is exposed to tension and anxiety as they get through the duties assigned to them. Banking industry which is the backbone of the country's economy is not an exceptional one. The job nature of banking employees is very tedious as it involves the direct customer interaction in all levels. So this study aims to analyse the level of stress faced by bank employees who are under different categories from both public and private sectors of selected banks which resides in Tamilnadu.

Keywords: Stress Management, Financial sector Banking Industry, country's economy

1. Introduction:

Stress has been defined in different ways over the years. It is a condition in which any human is confronted with an opportunity or demand related to what they desire and for which the outcome is perceived to be both uncertain and important. There are number of studies and surveys have been conducted by the researchers through out the world for suggesting improved techniques to manage stress.

Anna West (2006) in his study, "Management: Stress: coping strategies for employers, explained that since stress was very often caused by how a person copes in the job, rather than the job itself, it was important to make sure that at the recruitment stage an individual's skills are accurately matched to the demands of the job. The study suggested training during employment and increasing the control, an employee has, over the work may help to reduce stress. Jamshed et al., (2011) suggested that "The workplace is potentially an important source of stress for bankers because of the amount of time they spent in their respective banks." And that stress often decrease their performance. "Therefore occupation of human could be a major source of stress. When individuals face stress due to various conditions of their occupation and fail to cope with stress, it results into burnout,". Basically in banking sector lack of administrative support from boss(manager), work overload & time pressure, riskiness of job, poor relationship with customers & coworkers, and work family balance cause stress which in turns decrease employee performance.

2. Scope of the study

The present study focuses on the occupational stress in the banking sector. The study is designed to gain a better understanding of the factors that contribute to occupational stress experienced by the employees in this industry.

3 Hypothesis

^{*}Corresponding author. Dr. S. Ayyappan, +91 9942220699. E-mail address: sapacet@gmail.com

The researcher has formulated and test the following null hypotheses:

3.1 There is no difference between type of the banks, gender, age, education , marital status , and its impact of occupational stress on employees.

3.2 There is no difference between occupation, length of the service, job role , family type , of the respondents and impact of occupational stress

4. Selection and description of the state

The objectives of the study warranted the selection of a state where predominant banking activities are carried out. Among the states of India, the choice had fallen on Tamil Nadu for the conduct of the present study because the state occupies 5th position in the country on its size, it has a vast potential and scope for the banking activities and has a predominant agriculture involvement as well as industrial involvement that may bring to limelight still more banking organisations successfully in the future also.

5. Field work for data collection

The researcher himself has collected the responses by making personal visits to the respondents are their convenience. The data thus collected were categorized and processed manually and further it was cross checked through computers. Further processing was done with the help of the master table. The data were fed into computers for analysis and the results were appropriately incorporated.

6. Statistical tools used for analysis

The primary data have been collected from the 300 potential respondents from different areas and has been properly sorted, classified, edited, tabulated in a proper format and analyzed by deploying appropriate statistical tools. The statistical tests are conducted at 5 per cent level of significance. The following statistical tools are used.

- Descriptive Analysis.
- One way Analysis of Variance

Table 1.1

Type of Bank and Impact of Occupational Stress

S.NO.	TYPE OF BANK	FREQ	%	MEAN	S.D.	RANGE	
						MIN	MAX
1	Public	220	73.3%	81.3500	28.18417	35	146
2	Private	080	26.7%	73.3125	36.07573	35	146
TOTAL		300	100				

Source :Primary Data and Computed

It is identified from table 1.1 that 73.3 per cent of the respondents are from public sector bank employees and the impact of occupational stress on the public sector bank employees ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 81.35 and remaining 26.7 per cent of the respondents are employees from private sector bank employees ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 73.3125. Thus the table vividly reveals that occupational stress had a high impact on public sector employees than private sector employees. In order to identify the difference between the type of bank and impact of occupational stress on banking employees, ANOVA test was employed.

Table 1.2
ANOVA - Type of Bank and Impact of Occupational Stress

	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F-value	P-value	S/NS
Between Groups	3789.949	1	3789.949	4.081	.000**	S
Within Groups	276777.2	298	928.783			
Total	280567.2	299				

** P<0.01 * P<0.05 S-Significant NS- Not Significant

It is found from the table 1.2 that the p-value is less than 0.01 ($p < 0.01$); and the results are significant. Hence, the hypothesis “there is no difference between type of the banks and impact of occupational stress on employees” disproved. This shows that there is significant difference between type of the bank and impact of occupational stress on employees.

Table 2.1
Gender and Impact of Occupational Stress

S.NO.	GENDER	FREQ	%	MEAN	S.D.	RANGE	
						MIN	MAX
1	Male	179	59.7	84.3799	29.87109	35	146
2	Female	121	40.3	71.5537	30.25777	35	146
TOTAL		300	100				

Source :Primary Data and Computed

It is identified from table 2.1 that 59.7 per cent of the respondents are male and the impact of occupational stress on the males ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 84.3799 and remaining 40.3 per cent of the respondents are female and the impact of occupational stress on the females ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 71.5537. In order to identify the difference between the gender and impact of occupational stress on banking employees, ANOVA test was employed.

Table 2.2
ANOVA- Gender and Impact of Occupational Stress

	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F-VALUE	P-VALUE	S/NS
Between Groups	11877.118	1	11877.118	13.173	.000**	S
Within Groups	268690.1	298	901.645			
TOTAL	280567.2	299				

** P<0.01 * P<0.05 S-Significant NS- Not Significant

It is found from the table 2.2 that the p-value is less than 0.01 ($p < 0.01$); and the results are significant. Hence, the hypothesis “there is no difference between gender and impact of occupational stress” disproved. This implies that there is significant difference between gender and impact of occupational stress.

Table 3.1
Age and Impact of Occupational Stress

S.NO.	AGE	FREQ	%	MEAN	STD	RANGE	
						MIN	MAX
1	Up to 30 years	122	40.7	77.0000	32.42538	35	146
2	31-40 years	33	11.0	92.5758	23.01227	35	146
3	41-50 years	21	7.0	45.0000	0.00000	35	146
4	Above 50years	124	41.3	83.6129	28.92792	35	146
TOTAL		300	100.0				

Source :Primary Data and Computed

It is observed from table 3.1 that 41.3 per cent of the respondents belong to age group Above 50 years and that impact of occupational stress on this age group ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 83.6129, 40.7 per cent of the respondents are from up to 30 years age group and the impact of occupational stress on this age group ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 77.00, 11 % of the respondents belong to 31 - 40 years of age and that impact of occupational stress on this age group ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 92.57, 7.0 % of the respondents belong to 41 – 50 years of age and the impact of occupational stress on this age group ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of with an average of 45.00 .In order to identify the difference between the age of the respondents and impact of occupational stress , ANOVA test was employed.

Table 3.2

ANOVA- Age and Impact of Occupational Stress

	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F-value	P-value
Between Groups	33471.707	3	11157.236	13.365	.000**
Within Groups	247095.5	296	834.782		
TOTAL	280567.2	299			

** P<0.01 * P<0.05 S-Significant NS- Not Significant

It is disclosed from the table 3.2 that the p-value is less than 0.01; and the results are significant. Hence, the hypothesis “there is no difference between age of the banking employees and impact of occupational stress” is disproved. This shows that there is difference between age and impact of occupational stress among bank employees.

Table 4.1
Education and Impact of Occupational Stress

S.NO.	EDUCATION	FRE	%	MEAN	S.D	RANGE	
						MIN	MAX
1	Degree	123	41.0	83.9593	32.82527	35	146

2	Post-Graduation	132	44.0	71.2879	29.84426	35	146
3	ICWA/CA	45	15.0	89.4444	19.45923	35	146
TOTAL		300	100.0				

Source :Primary Data and Computed

It is perceived from the table 4.1 that the Education and level of impact of occupational stress among degree holder was ranged between 35 and 146 with a percentage and an average of 41.0 and 83.95 respectively. The level of impact of occupational stress among the Post graduate degree holders ranged between 35 and 146 with the percentage and an average of 44.0 and 71.2879 respectively .The level of impact of occupational stress among ICWA/CA holders ranged between 35 and 146 with the percentage and an average of 15.0 and 89.44 respectively .In order to identify the difference between the education of the respondents and impact of occupational stress, ANOVA test was employed.

Table 4.2
ANOVA- Education and Impact of Occupational Stress

	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F-VALUE	P-VALUE
Between Groups	15772.2	2	7886.109	8.845	.000**
Within Groups	264795.0	297	891.566		
Total	280567.2	299			

** P<0.01 * P<0.05 S-Significant NS- Not Significant

It is indicated from the table 4.2 that the p-value is less than 0.05; and the results are significant. Hence, the hypothesis “there is no difference between education of the employees and the impact of the occupational stress” is disproved. This shows that there is difference between education and impact of the occupational stress among bank employees.

Table 5.1
Marital Status and Impact of Occupational Stress

S.NO.	GENDER	FREQ	%	MEAN	S.D.	RANGE	
						MIN	MAX
1	Married	214	71.3	80.8879	29.86537	35	146
2	Single	86	28.7	75.0233	32.26252	35	146
	Total	300	100.0				

It is identified from table 5.1 that 71.3 per cent of the respondents are males and the impact of occupational stress on them ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 80.88 and remaining 28.7 per cent of the respondents are single and the impact of occupational stress on them ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 75.02. Thus the table vividly reveals that had a high impact on married respondents of banking employees than unmarried persons. With a view to find the degree of association between the marital status and the impact of occupational stress among banking employees , In order to identify the difference between the marital status of the respondents and impact of occupational stress, ANOVA test was employed.

Table 5.2

ANOVA- Marital Status and Impact of Occupational Stress

	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F-VALUE	P-VALUE	S/NS
Between Groups	2109.9	1	2109.925	2.258	.000**	S
Within Groups	78457.3	298	934.420			
TOTAL	80567.2	299				

** P<0.01 * P<0.05 S-Significant NS- Not Significant

It is found from the table 5.2 that the p-value is less than 0.01 (p<0.01); and the results are significant. Hence, the hypothesis “there is no difference between marital status and impact of occupational stress on banking employees” disproved. This shows that there is significant difference between marital status and impact of occupational stress on banking employees.

Table 6.1

Length of Service and Impact of Occupational Stress

S.NO.	LENGTH OF SERVICE	FREQ	%	MEAN	S.D.	RANGE	
						MIN	MAX
1	Up to 5 years	96	32	89.0937	36.62242	35	146
2	6-11 years	21	7	47.0000	0.00000	35	146
3	11-15 years	32	10.7	84.2500	24.91922	35	146
4	Above 15 years	151	50.3	76.3311	25.90668	35	146
TOTAL		300	100				

Source :Primary Data and Computed

It is found from the table 6.1 that 32 per cent of the respondents having experience up to 5years and level of impact of occupational stress ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 89.093 and seven per cent of the respondents are with 6-11 years of experience and the level of impact of occupational stress ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 47.0000, 10.7 % of the respondents are having experience between 11 to 15 years and the level of impact of occupational stress ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 84.2500 and 50.3 per cent of the respondents have more than 15 year experience and level of impact of occupational stress ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 76.3311 per-cent

Table 6.2

ANOVA- Length of Service and Impact of Occupational Stress

	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F-VALUE	P-VALUE
Between Groups	3229	3	11076.529	13.256	.000**
Within Groups	247337	296	835.600		
TOTAL	280566	299			

** P<0.01 * P<0.05 S-Significant NS- Not Significant

It is revealed from the table 6.2 that the p-value is less than 0.05; and the results are significant. Hence, the hypothesis “there is no difference between length of the service and its impact of occupational stress on employees” is disproved. This shows that there is the difference between length of the service and its impact of occupational stress on employees.

Table 7.1
Responsibility and Impact of Occupational Stress

S.NO.	RESPONSIBILITY	FREQ	%	MEAN	S.D.	RANGE	
						MIN	MAX
1	Customer	59	19.7	80.2712	29.28624	35	146
2	Accountancy	17	5.7	61.4706	6.97422	35	146
3	Cash operation	58	19.3	58.4483	11.32483	35	146
4	Marketing	35	11.7	84.7429	39.69616	35	146
5	Credit Management	121	40.3	85.4793	30.02863	35	146
6	Remittances	10	3.3	128.2000	8.85438	35	146
TOTAL		300	100				

Source :Primary Data and Computed

It is found from the table 7.1 that 19.7 per cent of the respondents are in customer service role and level of impact of occupational stress ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 80.2712 and 5.7 per cent of the respondents are in accountancy section and the level of impact of occupational stress ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 61.4706, The 19.3 per cent of the employees involved in cash operation with an average of 58.4483, 11.7 % of the respondents are in marketing section and level of impact of occupational stress ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 84.7429per-cent.The table also reveals that 40.3 per cent of the employees involved in credit management operation and the level of impact of occupational stress ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 85.4793, The 3.3 % are working in remittances section with an average of 128.2000per-cent.

Table 7.2
ANOVA- Responsibility and Impact of Occupational Stress

	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F-VALUE	P-VALUE
Between Groups	60244	5	12048.892	16.078	.000**
Within Groups	220323	294	749.397		
TOTAL	280567	299			

** P<0.01 * P<0.05 S-Significant NS- Not Significant

It is revealed from the table 4.9.3 that the p-value is less than 0.05; and the results are significant. Hence, the hypothesis “there is no difference between responsibility of the employees and impact of occupational stress” is disproved. This shows that there is responsibility of the employees and impact of occupational stress

Table 8.1
Designation and Impact of Occupational Stress

S.NO.	DESIGNATION	FREQ	%	MEAN	S.D.	RANGE	
						MIN	MAX
1	Chief Manager	16	5.3	103	0.0000	35	146
2	Senior Manager	49	16.3	55.2041	15.31473	35	146
3	Manager	77	25.7	100.4805	24.10973	35	146
4	Assistant Manager	48	16	61.3750	8.13091	35	146
5	Special Assistants	16	5.3	93	0.0000	35	146
6	Clerks	94	31.3	77	37.54911	35	146
TOTAL		300	100.0				

Source :Primary Data and Computed

It is found from the table 4.7.1 that 5.3 per cent of the respondents are chief manager and level of impact of occupational stress ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 103 and 16.3 per cent of the respondents are senior manager and level of impact of occupational stress ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 55.2041, 25.7 per cent of the respondents are Manager and level of impact of occupational stress ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 100.4805 and 16 per cent of the respondents are Assistant Managers and level of impact of occupational stress ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 61.3705 and 5.3 per cent of the respondents are Special Assistants and level of impact of occupational stress ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 93. The remaining 31.3 per cent of the respondents are clerks and level of impact of occupational stress ranged between 35 and 146 with an average of 77. In order to identify the difference between the designation of the respondents and impact of occupational stress, ANOVA test was employed

Table 8.2
ANOVA- Designation and Impact of Occupational Stress

	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F-value	P-value
Between Groups	90900	5	18180.151	28.181	.000**
Within Groups	189667	294	645.124		
TOTAL	280567	299			

** P<0.01 * P<0.05 S-Significant NS- Not Significant

It is revealed from the table 4.7.3 that the p-value is less than 0.05; and the results are significant. Hence, the hypothesis “there is no difference between designation of the employees and impact of occupational stress” is disproved. This shows that there is difference between the designation and the impact of occupational stress on banking employees.

7.Conclusion:

The technological growth has revolutionized the way banking sector works and the competition is globalised now a days because of the economy conditions . The level of stress faced by the employees in banking sector also growing rapidly. The present study clearly found that there is a significant relationship between type of the banks, gender, age, education , marital status ,length of the service, job role , family type , of the respondents and impact of occupational stress. So the banking sector employees should adopt new coping strategies for maintaining good physical and mental condition which will improve productivity level of the bank.

References:

Atkinson , When stress won't go away, HR Magazine, Vol.45, No.12, Dec. 2000, pp 104-110.

Briner R (2000), Stress management: Effectiveness of interventions, IRS Employment Review, No.717, Dec.2000, Employee Health Bulletin 18, pp 12-17.

Ahmed, Bhatt and Ahmad (1990), Stress and coping strategies among executive technocrats. Unpublished paper referred in D.M. Pestonjee, Stress and coping, New Delhi, Sage, 1992.

Luthar H.K. (1999), Learning the Tao of meditation training, Workforce, Feb. 1999, Real HR Real Impact, Supplementary, pp 10- 11.

Cristallini V (2000), Stress and the improvement of working ' - conditions: An individual and collective responsibility, Gestion 2000 Vol. 17, No. 5, Sep-Oct , pp 15-33.

Jamshed K. Khattak, Muhammad A. Khan, Ayaz Ul Haq, Muhammad Arif & Amjad A. Minhas.(2011).Occupational stress and burnout in Pakistan's banking sector. African Journal of Business Management, 5(3), pp810-817

Saranya A S (1999), Job Stress of Bank Employees, Ph.D. Thesis

Sanders D (1999), Post Office Counters Stress, IRS Employment Review, No. 693, Dec. 1999, Employee Health Bulletin 12, pp 8-11.

Tansik D.A. and Routhieaux R (1999), Customer stress-relaxation: the impact of music in a hospital waiting room, International Journal of Service Industries Management, Vol. 10, No. 1, 1999, pp 68-81.