A STUDY OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS AND MOTIVATION

Dr. Babaraju K. Bhatt*

Vishal J. Mali**

Abstract: *Stress causes various psychological problems like anger, depression, anxiety, irritability and tension and this influences the motivation of employees to a considerable extent. Researches provide concrete evidence of problems caused by job stress. The productivity of employees and overall productivity of organization is affected by levels of stress and motivation. Looking to the present competitive scenario in any organization work stress has emerged as one of the significant and crucial areas for research. As with the increase of the stress risk among the employees worship in the banking industry enough investigation yet to be done in the banking industry so as to find out various features, like tight worship schedule, work load, changing working scenario of banking industry, sizeable increase in the volume of banking business due to entry of new private sectored and foreign banks through which competitive environment increased so far.*

In order to assess the Organizational Role Stress and its impact on motivation of employees in banking industry the present study has been undertaken on 100 banking employees of various banks (belonging to Loan Section) of Surat City and various statistical tests such as Paired Sample t-test, ANOVA have been used for data analysis.

***Keywords:** Organizational Role Stress, Employee Motivation, Productivity.*

*Principal, Shri Manilal Kadakia College of Management and Computer Studies, Ankleshwar, Gujarat State, India

**Assistant Professor, Naran Lala School of Industrial Management & Computer Science, Navsari, Gujarat State, India

INTRODUCTION:

Beehr and Newman (1978) had defined stress as "a situation which will force a person to deviate from normal functioning due to the change (i.e., disrupt or enhance) in his/her psychological and/or physiological condition, such that the person is forced to deviate from normal functioning". Hans selye, probably the leading authority on the concept of stress, described stress as, 'the role of all wear and tear caused by life'.

Stress is associated with constraints and demands. Constraints prevent the person from doing things what he or she desires. Demand refers to the loss of something desired. Stress is highest for the individuals who perceive they are uncertain as to whether they will win or lose and lowest for those who think that winning or losing is a certainty.

Stress at workplace is the harmful physical and emotional response that occurs when there is a poor match between job demands and the capabilities, resources or needs of the worker. The stress may have to do with the responsibilities associated with the work itself or be caused by conditions that are based in the corporate culture or personality conflicts.

In 1936 an endocrinologist, Hans Selye, discovered stress. Stress is present in every human being and it occurs in people's lives in day to day working. Stress is a body condition that occurs in response to actual or anticipated difficulties in life (Rice, 1987). Stress can also be defined as the sum of physical and mental responses our bodies experience in relationship to any change. There are many causes of stress and many different ways to handle stress. Stress can also be harmful to one's health, both physically and mentally. There are two main types of stress, which are distress and eustress**.**

Distress is the bad stress. It is much the same as a state of anxiety, fear, worry or agitation. Distress is a negative, painful experience and is something to avoid. On the other hand, there is a good stress, eustress. Eustress is pleasurable and satisfying experiences that people encounter i.e., Participation in a wedding ceremony, anticipation of competes etc.

Stress is an inherent factor in any type of vocation or career. At its best, the presence of stress can also be a motivator that urges the individual to strive for excellence. However, excess amounts of stress can lead to a lack of productivity, a loss of confidence and the inability to perform routine tasks. As a result, quality employees lose their enthusiasm for their work and eventually withdraw from the company.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964) were the first to describe organizational stress in general and role stress in particular. Katz and Kahn (1966) continued such research and suggested that an organization can be defined as a system of roles and they used three categories to define role stress: role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload.

According to Locke (1975), in Herzberg's theory there is a tendency for those who have chosen to work in large firms to be more likely to report hygiene and less likely to report motivators as sources of satisfaction. Locke also points out that Herzberg's theory lacking the distinction between individuals and cannot be applied to everyone in all situations.

Organizational role stress is a chronic disease caused by conditions in the workplace that negatively affect an individual`s performance and/or overall well-being of his body and mind. Role is the position that one occupies in an organization and is defined as the functions one performs in that organization. Role is thus defined as "the position one holds in an organization having a set of functions to perform in response to the expectations of others and his/her own expectations about the role" (Pareek, 1976).

Tansley et al.(2006) pointed out that talent can be considered as a complex amalgam of employees' skills, knowledge, cognitive ability and potential. Employees' values and work preferences are also of major importance. Whilst, Ingham (2006) considers people who are in the key position, the team leader, the individual who has the scarce capability or making particular contribution to the organization is talent.

Goffee and Jones (2007) define talent as handful of employee whose Ideas, knowledge and skills give them the potential to produce the disproportionate. According to Webster (2008), motivation can be defined in many different ways, one definition explains that motivation can be defined as a stimulus, a drive or incentive in this case, that drives individuals to accomplish personal and organizational goals. Psychologists have studied the aspects that lead to job satisfaction for employees and attempt to explain what motivates people to achieve success not only for themselves but for their company as well.

Pareek's (1976) organizational role stress model expands on and is linked to Kahn's (1973) views of conflict, ambiguity and overload by exploring inter-role relationships. Many researchers have used Katz and Kahn's (1966) definition of role stress, but recent studies do

not capture the entire work experience of those being researched (O'Driscoll & Cooper, 1996).

Each role is a system of functions and there are two important aspects of an individual's role that should be considered when examining role stress:

(1) Role set, which is the role system in an organization that defines individual roles

(2) Role space, which is the roles people occupy and perform.

The following are the role stressors defined by Dr. Udai Pareek.

1. INTER-ROLE DISTANCE (IRD):

   It is experienced when there is a conflict between organizational and non-organizational roles. For example, the role of an executive vs the role of a husband/wife. The researcher Goffman (1961) introduced the concept of role distance to describe how an individual may demonstrate that his or her identity is not fully defined by a role in an organization.

2. ROLE STAGNATION (RS):

   It is the feeling of being stick in the same role. Such type of stress results in perception that there is no opportunity for the progress of one's career. In some cases, if an individual occupies a role for a long period of time, he or she may feel too secure to take on new roles and challenges.

   In other cases, especially during middle age and usually at middle-management levels, an individual may have fewer chances to advance in an organization. Job opportunities are fewer and those jobs that are available take longer to master and old knowledge and methods become obsolete.

3. ROLE EXPECTATION CONFLICTS (REC):

   This type of stress is generated by different expectations by different significant persons, i.e., superiors, subordinates and peers, about the same roles and the role occupant's ambivalence as to whom to please. For example, a professor may feel that the demands of teaching and doing research are incompatible, whether they are or not. Netemeyer, Johnston, and Burton, (1990) explained that individuals confront conflict or ambiguity with respect to his or her job expectations.

4. ROLE EROSION (RE):

This type of role stress is the function of the role occupant's feeling that some functions which should properly belong to his/her role are transferred to/or performed by some other role. This can also happen when the functions are performed by the role occupant but the credit for them goes to someone else.

Another manifestation is in the form of underutilization in the role. Role erosion is likely to be experienced in an organization that is redefining roles and creating new roles. In these situations, people have not enough to do or not enough responsibility for a task experience as much stress as those with too much to do. People do not enjoy feeling underutilized (Beukel & Molleman, 2002).

5. ROLE OVERLOAD (RO):

When the role occupant feels that there are too many expectations from the significant roles in his/her role set, he/she experiences role overload. There are two aspects of this stress: quantitative and qualitative. The former refers to having too much to do, while the latter refers to things being too difficult and the accountability in the role.

Marchall and Cooper (1979) also categorized overload into quantitative and qualitative. Researchers Kahn and Quinn (1970) suggested some conditions under which role overload is likely to occur: (a) in the absence of role integration, (b) in the absence of role power, (c) when large variations exist in expected output, and (d) when duties cannot be delegated.

6. ROLE ISOLATION (RI):

This type of role stress refers to the psychological distance between the occupant's role and other roles in the same role set. It is also defined as role distance which is different from inter-role distance, in the sense that while (IRD) refers to the distance among various roles occupied by the same individual, role isolation (RI) is characterized by the feelings that others do not reach out easily, indicative of the absence of strong linkages of one's role with other roles. This can be geographic or systemic. The main criterion of perceived role distance is frequency and ease of interaction. When relationships are strong, the role distance is considered low. When relationships are weak, the role distance can be measured in terms of the gap between desired and existing

relationships. Kahn et al. (1964) and French and Caplan (1970) concluded that mistrust of coworkers is positively related to high role ambiguity and low job satisfaction.

7. PERSONAL INADEQUACY (PI):

It arises when the role occupant feels that he/she does not have the necessary skills and training for effectively performing the functions expected from his/her role. This is bound to happen when the organizations do not impart periodic training to enable the employees to cope with the fast changes both within and outside the organization.

McMurray (1973) identified the executive neurosis: that is, an over-promoted manager who becomes grossly overworked in the attempt to keep the job and hide a sense of insecurity and feelings of personal inadequacy.

8. SELF-ROLE DISTANCE (SRD):

When the role a person occupies goes against his/her self-concept, then he/she feels self-role distance type of stress. This is essentially a conflict arising out of a mismatch between the person and his/her job. An introverted person may have trouble fulfilling the role of salesperson. It is also fairly common for people to experience conflict between the way they treat others in everyday life and the way they are required to treat others in their organizational roles, where maintaining distance from others may be necessary. Such conflicts are very common. Self-efficacy is a belief in one's ability to perform specific tasks.

9. ROLE AMBIGUITY (RA):

It refers to the lack of clarity about the expectations regarding the role which may arise out of lack of information or understanding. It may exist in relation to activities, responsibilities, personal styles and norms and may operate at three stages:

  a. When the role sender holds his/her expectations about the role,

  b. When he/she sends it, and,

  c. When the occupants receives those expectations.

According to Kahn and Quinn (1970), four types of roles are most likely to experience ambiguity:

  (a) roles new to an organization,

  (b) roles in expanding or contracting organizations,

  (c) roles in organizations exposed to frequent changes in demand, and

(d) roles concerned with process.

Kahn et al. (1964) found that people who suffered from role ambiguity experienced low job satisfaction, high job-related tension, a sense of futility and low self-confidence. Kahn (1973) distinguished two components of role ambiguity: present ambiguity and future-prospect ambiguity.

10. RESOURCE INADEQUACY (RIn):

This type of stress is evident when the role occupant feels that he/she is not provided with adequate resources for performing the functions expected from his/her role, whether it is a lack of supplies, personnel, information, historical data, a lack of knowledge, education, or experience. Deficiency in any of these areas will adversely affect people's outcome and affect individual's work motivation (Klein, 1990).

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

1. To study the motivation level of employees.

2. To study the organizational role stress of the employees.

3. To study the relationship between motivation and organizational role stress.

HYPOTHESIS OF STUDY:

H0: There is no relationship between employees' motivation and organizational role stress.

H1: There is strong relationship between employees' motivation and organizational role stress.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND SOURCES OF DATA:

The study has been confined to one banking organizations within the Surat city only. For the convenience of the researchers, the sample size of 100 employees has been selected from these organizations. Both primary and secondary sources have been used for the data collection. Besides, discussions and deliberations with the concerned employees, a well-designed questionnaire has been used for the study. The questionnaire prepared for the purpose constitutes the primary source of data. The questionnaire was divided into three parts. Part-I was containing twelve statements of Employee Motivation. Part-II of the questionnaire was containing twenty five statements of Organizational Role Stress and Part III was regarding demographic data of employees.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS:

Hypothesis:

H0: There is no relationship between employees' motivation and organizational role stress.

H1: There is strong relationship between employees' motivation and organizational role stress.

Paired sample t-test to know the relationship between employees motivation and organizational role stress.

Paired Samples Statistics		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Motivation	48.09	100	6.310	.631
	ORS	38.23	100	15.004	1.500

Paired Samples Correlations		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Motivation & ORS	100	-.049	.627

Paired Samples Test		Paired Differences			95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	Df	
Pair 1	Motivation - ORS	9.86	16.561	1.656	6.574	13.146	5.954	99	0

This hypothesis was meant to know the relationship between employees' motivation and organizational role stress of employees. Paired sample t-test has been used to find out this relationship. At 5 percent level of significance the computed p value from the sample is 0.000 which is much smaller than 0.05 (level of significance). The calculated t value from the sample is 5.954 which is higher than the table value (i.e., 2.326 for two tailed, 1.96 for one tailed).The null hypothesis is rejected. Paired sample correlation table shows the correlation of 0.627, which shows the high level of relationship between employee's motivation and organizational role stress. It can be concluded that there is significant relation.

FINDINGS:

From the mean value of ORS one can say that there exists lesser stress in banking employees (Loan section) of Surat city. From the correlation analysis we can say that there is a negative relationship between different stressors and motivation i.e., there exist negative relationship between stress and motivation. Therefore, as the stress increases motivation decreases. Employees are having good level of motivation. Perception regarding pay, self determination and dimensions of ORS differs as per different age group through which company should focus on different age group and treat them differently for their satisfaction.

CONCLUSION:

Employees are having good motivation level but they are not that much stress free. And because of their combined effect employees are not having good level of job satisfaction. The present study focuses that Organizational Role Stress has an impact on level of motivation and to ensure good amount of overall satisfaction among employees the factors like ORS and motivation should be taken proper care by banks through which Banks can increase effectiveness of their employees by focusing each dimension of ORS and motivation.

REFERENCES:

1) Alderfer, C. P., (1969), *"Empirical Test of New Theory of Human Needs: Organizational Behavior and Human Performance".*

2) Beehr, T. A., & Newman, J. E., (1978), *"Job Stress, Employee Health, and Organizational Effectiveness: A Facet Analysis, Model and Literature Review",* Personnel Psychology, 31, pp. 665-699.

3) Cohen, J. A., Tarule, J. M., Rambur, B. A., Vallet. C., Virginia Hill Rice, ed., (2012), *"Handbook of Stress, Coping, and Health : Implications for Nursing Research, Theory, and Practice",* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, p. 624.

4) Cooper, C. L., and Cartwright, S., (1994), *"Healthy Mind, Healthy Organization- A Proactive Approach to Occupational Stress",* Human Relations, vol. 47.

5) Hackman J.R., Oldham G.R., (1976), *"Motivation Through the Design of Work: Test of a Theory, Organizational Behavior and Human Performance"*, Vol 16.

6) Lazarus, R.S., (1993), "*From Psychological Stress to the Emotions: A History of Changing Outlooks",* Annual Review of Psychology, 44.

7) Luthans, F.,(1992), *"Organizational Behavior",* Mc Graw Hills publications.

8) Monat A,Lazarus., (1991), *"Stress and Coping",* Columbia University Press, New York, 3rd edition.

9) Robins Stephen p., (1995), *"Organizational Behaviour: Concepts, Controversies and Application",* Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi, 6th edition.

10) Ross, Randoll R., Altmaier Elizabeth M., (1994), "*Intervention in Occupational Stress",* A Handbook of Counseling for Stress at Work, Sage publications.

11) Selye, H., (1976c). *"Forty Years of Stress Research: Principal Remaining Problems and Misconceptions",* CMA Journal, 115, pp. 53–55.

12) Selye, H., (1980), *"Selye's Guide to Stress Research",* New York, NY: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

13) Srivastava, A. K., (1999), "*Management of Occupational Stress, Theories and Practice",* Gyan Publishing house, New Delhi.

14) Udai Pareek & Surbhi Purohit., (2011), *"Training Instruments in HRD and OD",* 3rd Edition: Tata McGrawhill, pp. 178-185.

15) Udai Pareek., (1993), *"Organizational Role Stress Scale (ORS), Standardize Scale*", Agra Psychology Cell, Agra.

16) Vroom V.H., (1964), *"Work and Motivation*", John Wiley and Inc; New York.