

Workplace Stressors in Private Sector Banks: A Study of Women Executives

*Dr. Sunita Bishnoi & **Dr. Gurjeet Kaur

* & ** Associate Professors (Department of Management), DAV Institute of Management, Faridabad, Haryana

Abstract

Today, stress is an integral part of every person irrespective of their age, profession, etc. Stress originates from personal and work spheres, which influences individuals as well as their performance at workplace. Therefore through this paper an attempt is made to study the workplace stressors faced by women executives working in private sector banks located in Central National Capital Region. The primary objective of this paper is to study the various workplace stressors of women executives in private sector banks and to analyze the relation between the workplace stressors and socio-economic variables. Primary data is collected, from 500 women executives, through structured questionnaire. The purposive sampling method was used to collect data. Further factor analysis is used to find the workplace stressors and data is analyzed with the help of statistical tools like frequency distribution, mean and standard deviation. To test the hypothesis, t-test and ANOVA have been used. The study concluded that the women executives living in nuclear family, having children and/or dependents in their family, without domestic helper, less experience of work life and using public transport for commuting have shown higher degree of agreement about workplace stressors.

Key words: Workplace stressors, Women Executives, Private Sector Banks, Factor Analysis, Socio-economic variables.

1.0 Introduction

Stress at workplace is expected up to some extent and considered as vital motivator but increasing level of workplace stress becomes a serious issue these days, as it badly affects physical and emotional health of employees; and production and profit of organizations. Workplace stress may be due to perceived pressure due to heavy targets, unrealistic deadlines, insecurity, anxieties, low levels of job satisfaction, and lack of autonomy in the working environment. It is defined as adaptive response to an external situation that results in physical, psychological and or behavioral deviations for organizational participants.

Workplace stress is a state of tension that is created when a person responds to the demands and pressures that come from work, family and other external sources, as well as those that are internally generated from self imposed demands, obligations and self criticism.

Beehr & Newman (1978), define occupational stress as “A condition arising from the interaction of people and their jobs and characterized by changes within people that force them to deviate from their normal functioning”.

A basic definition of job stress given by US National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (1999) says job stress is “a harmful, physical and emotional response that occurs when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker. Job stress can lead to poor health and even injury”.

The roles of women in India have been evolving with the growth of literacy rate and increasing desire to gain economic and social recognition in the society. Priorities of women are changing from caring and rearing of children to diversified professions. Globalization gave this opportunity to women with the opening of MNCs in India and helps them in living vibrant life. No doubt this life gives them self satisfaction and confidences, but stereotypes of our society still prevail.

1.1 Review of Literature

Stress induced due to roles performed by individuals as employees has been a potent organizational stressor (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoeck, & Rosenthal, 1964). According to Kahn & Quinn (1970), “Stress is the outcome of facet of the assigned work role that caused harmful effect for individual”. Landy & Trumbo (1976), identified five categories of stressors excessive competition, hazardous working conditions, job insecurity, task demands and long or unusual working hours. Cooper and Marshal (1976), classified stress as intrinsic to a job or role, career growth, relationship with colleagues and organizational climate and structure as five main work stressors. Occupational stress is further defined as a condition arising from the interaction of people and their jobs, and characterized by changes within people that force them to deviate from their normal functioning (Beehr & Newman, 1978). Ivancevich & Matteson (1980), recognized work stressors into four categories physical environment, individual level (a mixer of role and career development variables), group level (primarily relationship-based) and organizational level (a mixture of climate, structure, job design and task characteristic). According to research conducted by Ivancevich & Matteson (1980), causes of stress are work overload, staff retrenchment, change at work, lengthy working hours, shift work, lack of supervision, inadequate training, inappropriate working conditions, and poor relations with colleague. Srivastava & Singh (1981), categorized sources of workplace stress as role conflict, role ambiguity, group and political pressures, role overload, responsibility for persons, powerlessness, under participation, poor peer relations, low status, intrinsic impoverishment, unprofitability and strenuous working conditions. According to Schuler (1982), organizational stress perceived due to job qualities, organizational structure, career development, physical qualities, change and role as main categories of work stressors. Parker and Decotiis (1983), suggested six specific sources of work stress which included job characteristics, organizational structure, climate and information flow, role, relationship, career development and external commitments and responsibilities. Cummins (1990), suggested role conflict and ambiguity, work overload, under utilization of skills, resource inadequacy and lack of participation as the main sources of stress at work. While in the study of Borg, Riding and Falzon (1991), found that job stress is result of role overload, role ambiguity, role conflict, lack of work environment, more demands from the agencies, inadequate working environment and poor relation with colleagues etc. Various studies have classified occupational stress in terms of physical environment; role stressors, organizational structure, job characteristics, professional relationships, career development, and work-versus-family conflict (Burke, 1993). These advancements in organizations have created stress among employees in the form of occupational stress. Sauter, Lim, & Murphy (1996), defined occupational stress as the harmful physical and emotional responses that arise when the demands of a job do not match the worker’s abilities, resources, or needs. Nelson & Burke (2000), advocated that a number of factors such as role ambiguity, lack of power and role conflict can also be stressful. Achievement of conflicting demands in the organization often leads to role stress (Wetzels, Ruyter & Bloemer, 2000). Role based factors like lack of power, role ambiguity, and role conflict can be stressful (Burke, 1988; Nelson & Burke, 2000). Various studies suggested that role overload, lack of senior level support, inequity at workplace, role stagnation, lack of group cohesiveness, resource inadequacy in the role, constraints of change contribute to the stress of employees (Sen, 1981; Kumar, 2006; Sharma & Devi, 2008). Budhraj (2008), studied the causes of stress among insurance employees and analysed, organizational and individual factors for availing a focused perspective on the causes of stress. He found that most of the employees suffered from stress due to heavy work load and unattainable targets which consequently lead to work life imbalances and anxieties.

Modekurti & Chattopadhyay (2008), suggested that working women experience severe stress in meeting the demands of their professional tasks along with handling traditional family and societal expectations, which affects their life styles. Researcher found that stress level was

more overwhelming in the case of women employees due to the greater need among them to strike a balance between their personal and professional lives.

Sharma & Devi (2008), further add that role overload, lack of senior level support, lack of group cohesiveness, inequity at workplace, role stagnation, resource inadequacy in the role, constraints of change contribute to the stress of employees. Srivastava (2009), found that the role of an employee in the organization may create conditions, that cause stress for employees at work affecting the quality of work life. In the study of Ahsan, Abdullah, Fie & Alam (2009), the job stress consists of workload pressure, management role, homework interface, relationship with others, performance pressure and role ambiguity. Organization is an important source of stress, and employees' workloads and professional deadlines have increased manifold.

Singh & Singh (2009), examined the role of life events stress and work culture on job satisfaction by conducting a study on 210 managerial personnel of different private sector organizations. They concluded that the managers with high stress are more satisfied with job and also their overall satisfaction is also very high. Further, work cultures also have positive relation with job satisfaction.

According to Malik, Waheed & Malik (2010), job stress occurs when the individual doesn't have the skills and abilities to perform the job effectively, when employee is not given the proper training or some necessary resources have not been given to perform the job or when individual is confronted with conflicting job demands.

Rathod & Gaur (2010), conducted a study on stress covering the sources, effects and resolution strategies with references to the marketing employees. The study has been conducted from the personal and organizational point of view. They have found that stress in marketing job was primarily because of three factors including unfavorable company policy, unhealthy competition and inter-personal and intra-personal conflicts. The study has also demonstrated a positive relationship between length of experience and level of stress among the sampled marketing personnel.

Sharma, J. & Devi A. (2011a), through their research aimed to understand individual differences account for variation in work stress among the employees on the basis of survey conducted on a sample of 575 employees working in various sub-sectors of service sector of Jammu & Kashmir using Occupational Stress Index designed by Srivastava and Singh (1981). **Results indicated existence of significant differences between the level of work stress and personal characteristics age, salary, work experience, marital status and educational qualification besides the personality traits. Further research explains that level of stress decreases with the increasing age, experience, level of education and salary of respondents. And higher level of workplace stress experienced by unmarried respondents in comparison to married respondents.**

Sharma, J. & Devi, A. (2011), tried to explore the antecedents of organizational role stress in the commercial banks which are role indistinctness, role excess, role invasiveness, role divergence, role augmentation, self-diminution, role fortification, and resource shortage. They also pointed out the need for public sector banks, which significantly differ for employee experiences of role stress in role augmentation, self-diminution and role fortification, to give emphasis on providing opportunities for learning, training and development to its employees. A study in Pakistan concluded that due to stress among employees, managers were unable to utilize abilities of their employees, where development in technologies is becoming reasons of stress (Ram, Khoso, Shah, Chandio & Sheikh 2011).

Somya, K. R. & Panchanatham, N. (2011), focused to investigate the influencing effects of occupational stress on the professional's work life balance using instrument occupational stress scale – Srivastava & Singh (1981). Sample of 150 professionals were selected on stratified random sample basis by considering their different categories of lecturer's, bank

officers, doctors, engineers in Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu. Results of Pearson's Correlation Coefficient revealed that there exists a significant relationship between influence of occupational stress and work life balance dimensions of women professionals.

Chincholkar & Krishna (2012), tried to identify sources of work-family conflict and to analyse the relationship between different types of work-family conflict and various parameters like size of the family, number of children, traveling time and flexibility at work etc. Results found that work-family conflict is experienced more by women executives stayed more away from their home in comparison to those who spend less time away from their home and results indicated husbands expectations that his wife take care of household chores for in-laws and other family members declined with an increase in working hours of the woman.

Nina Ciric (2013), conducted research to determine influence of different workplace policies on the job satisfaction and level of job stress among female employees (full time and part time) using a sample of 172 female. Results indicated that women with children working in perceived family-friendly organizations experience less job stress and greater job satisfaction than women with children working in perceived non family-friendly organizations. Also perceived family friendly culture shows negative correlation with job stress and positive relation with job satisfaction.

Muhammad Rizwan, Arooba Waseem & Syeda Anam Bukhari (2014), emphasized on the root causes of job stress like role conflict and role ambiguity, and identifies its effects on job satisfaction and job performance. The results showed significant positive association of job stress with role conflict, role ambiguity and negative association with job satisfaction. The results also showed that there was no significant relation of job stress with job performance. In addition, role ambiguity has significant negative relationship with job satisfaction, whereas role conflict has no significant relation with job satisfaction.

Choudhary, A. (2014), gave the conceptual frame work of stress management on the basis of 60 numbers of respondents and found about 97 percent of the respondents perceived high level of stress due to professional and personal reasons. The research explained that the respondents were overburdened at their work place and in the perception of respondent's major sources of stress is work overload and lack of cooperation among the impatient customers. Work life imbalance is found as major attribute which contribute to stress for an employee.

Shueh-Yi Lian & Cai Lian Tam (2014), aimed to evaluate research relating to the effects of coping strategies and resilience on the level of workplace stress. Researchers concluded on the basis of review of literature that working females experienced more work stress as compared to men and in Malaysia, social policies that support working females, especially working mothers, has not been adopted fully by most corporations. It was also concluded that correlation between work stressors and the adopted coping strategies may vary depending on the type of problems being dealt. Moreover, resilience literature revealed this concept as an enhancement of an individual's adaptability and survival in the presence of occupational stressors and success in overcoming the stressors results in increased flexibility to future hardships.

George (2015), studied the efficacy of organizational culture and quality of work life, in predicting the job attitude of engineering college teachers and to find out the relationships between organizational culture, quality of work life and job attitude on personal effectiveness. From the application of regression it was found that different predictor variables quality of work life (well-being, work and life balance, relationship with co-workers and authorities, self development, intrinsic aspects, organization and management), organizational culture(organizational group, organizational mission and organizational adaptability) and job attitude (job involvement) were positive indicators of the personal effectiveness.

Tiwari & Bansal (2015), studied causes of stress (within organization and family) perceived among the group of women, working in the education and finance sectors at Bangalore city. The factors identified for the stress include anxiety about the relocation and uncertainty, future of their children and financial implications. The study suggested that level of stress can be managed by maintaining balance between the professional and the personal obligations, where professional responsibilities require time management, completion of task, meeting deadlines, proving her competencies and handling problems skillfully, while at the personal end, she has to maintain relationship, bringing up children and meeting both the ends.

1.3 Research Methodology

1.3.1 Objectives of the Research

1. To extract the various workplace stressors of women executives working in private sector banks operated in CNCR.
2. To analyze the relation between workplace stressors and socio-economic variables.

- **Population and Sample:** the population defined for this research paper was limited to the women executives working in private sector banks in CNCR. In this study purposive sampling technique has been used and data collected from 500 women executives.

- **Database and procedure of analysis:** Primary data collection method is used for the purpose of the study. A structured questionnaire was used to collect primary data for the study. The respondents were asked to indicate their perception regarding various workplace stressors on a five point Likert scale (1 for strongly agree and 5 for strongly disagree).

- **Statistical tools and techniques:** the collected data further has been analyzed by using descriptive statistics such as percentages, mean scores and standard deviation. To find out the variation of opinion among various categories t test and F test have been applied. These statistical techniques are run through SPSS version 19 for windows.

1.4 Results and Discussions:

Respondent's Profile:

Respondents were from Old Private Sector (14.6%), New Private Sector (66.6%) and Foreign Sector banks (18.8%) located in Faridabad (24%), Gurgaon (28%), Noida (18%) and Delhi (30%) cities. Table 1 is presenting the distribution of respondents and their percentages based on various socioeconomic variables.

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents on the basis of Socio Economic Variables

Variables	Categories	No. of Respondents
Sector of Bank	Old Private Sector	73(14.6%)
	New Private Sector	333(66.6%)
	Foreign	94(18.8%)
Location of Bank	Faridabad	120(24%)
	Gurgaon	140(28%)
	Noida	90(18%)
	Delhi	150(30%)
Designation	Lower Level	268(53.6%)
	Middle Management Level	204(40.8%)
	Top Managerial Level	28(5.6%)
Qualification	Graduation	70(14%)
	Post Graduation	430(86%)
Work Experience	Less than 5 Years	288(57.6%)
	6 to 10 years	148(29.6%)
	Above 10 Years	64(12.8%)
Age (in years)	Below 24 years	90(18%)
	24 - 33 years	279(55.8%)
	34 - 43 years	115(23%)
	Above 43 years	16(3.2%)
Marital status	Single	192(38.4%)
	Married	292(58.4%)
	Divorced/Widowed	16(3.2%)
Children	Yes	207(41.4%)
	No	293(58.6%)
Type of Family	Joint	169(33.8%)
	Nuclear	331(66.2%)
Domestic Helper	Yes	404(80.8%)
	No	96(19.2%)
Dependents in the Family	Yes	145(29%)
	No	355(71%)
Mode of Transport	Public	288(57.6%)
	Private	212(42.4%)

The findings of the study are discussed below:

1.4.1 Workplace Stressors

In line with the findings of various studies discussed above, the present study identified some workplace stressors faced by women executives working in private sector banks using factor

analysis. To apply factor analysis, the scale of variables put to analyzed the ‘KMO and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity’ and ‘Reliability Test’. To test reliability, cronbach’s alpha has been used and value is 0.911, which is satisfactory. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy is also applied and results showed the value as 0.85 (> 0.5) revealing that the factor analysis applied to the scale is appropriate (Malhotra 2006). Further Bartlett’s test of Sphericity is also applied which resulted in the 0.000** level of significance, which indicated that the variables are correlated in the population. The results of the factor analysis along with factor labels are shown in table 2.

Table 2: Factor Labels and Factor loading

Sr. No.	Factor Statements	Factor Loading
F1	Factor 1(Organizational Climate)	
1	I see that popularity and politics are more important than work and performance.	0.843
2	I feel that my rating is not based on my performance.	0.842
3	I feel that superior do not value my suggestions.	0.720
4	I do not have clarity regarding parameters for evaluation of my work performance.	0.714
5	I feel that there is lack of encouragement from superiors.	0.712
6	I have to receive work-related calls at home.	0.651
7	I feel lack of support or acceptance at the work place.	0.648
8	My supervisor or boss is Biased.	0.611
9	There is no grievance cell or it is not effective.	0.595
10	I feel that management do not provide Social support to bank employees.	0.565
11	I feel that my work is not noticed or appreciated.	0.562
12	My superior did not guide properly regarding work assigned to me.	0.502
13	I feel that there is no proper channel for consultation and communication.	0.453
F2	Factor 2 (Absence of Employee Involvement)	
1	I have no contribution in setting duration of projects assigned to me.	0.789
2	I have no involvement in setting my targets for a specific time period.	0.776
3	I feel lack of power/authority to accomplish my job.	0.677
4	I have no participation in planning of my work activities.	0.645
5	I am not free to choose plan of action for assigned job.	0.625
6	I am unable to decide the execution plan of my work.	0.612
F3	Factor 3 (Job Rigidity)	

1	I can't take decision regarding delegation of work to my subordinates.	0.779
2	I find lack of mapping (mismatch) between work assigned and my skills and capabilities.	0.716
3	I do not have right to set precedence of activities assigned to me.	0.645
4	I do not have authority to interrupt my work in case of emergency.	0.638
5	I do repeatedly same tasks, lack of variation in the work and does not have space for creativity.	0.403
F4	Factor 4 (Job Ambiguity)	
1	It is not clear about the responsibilities associated with my job.	0.753
2	Nature of job role assigned to me is not clear.	0.750
3	I do not understand what is expected from job assigned to me.	0.694
4	My superior do not follow proper channel to give instructions related to work.	0.426
F5	Factor 5 (Inequality at Workplace)	
1	I feel that there are no clear promotional prospects in the bank.	0.781
2	I feel that there is no scope for career advancement opportunities.	0.722
3	I work under incompatible policies and guide lines.	0.700
4	I feel that there is a lack of formal communication system.	0.690
F6	Factor 6 (Lack of Senior Support)	
1	I have to achieve/complete the targets/assignments decided by higher authorities.	0.858
2	No clarity regarding the authority provided to perform my work.	0.747
3	I receive insufficient information related to assigned job.	0.411
4	I get orders from more than one person.	0.402
F7	Factor 7 (Resource Inadequacy)	
1	I feel that resources in the bank do not match with available resources.	0.660
2	I feel overburdened due to staff shortage and high turnover.	0.501
3	I feel there is lack of support from bank to resolve problems associated with assigned job.	0.407
4	I have to take work at home.	0.401
F8	Factor 8 (Work Overload)	
1	I have to work for more hours than scheduled.	0.803

2	My job is having too much hidden administrative work.	0.614
F9	Factor 9 (Adaptability to Change)	
1	My Job Role requires me to keeping up with new techniques, ideas, technology or innovations or new challenges.	0.732
2	I feel that my skills and capabilities are not properly utilized.	0.467
F10	Factor 10 (Performance Pressure)	
1	I have to attend official meeting in odd timings.	0.869
2	My job is more demanding at the time of closing. (Monthly /Quarterly/ Half Yearly/ yearly)	0.664
F11	Factor 11 (Job Insecurity)	
1	I feel threat of impending redundancy(loss of job/ Job Insecurity).	0.541
2	I feel that management does not understand my work related problems.	0.478
F12	Factor 12 (Workplace Politics)	
1	Managerial links and power game is used to get promotions/assignments by passing the framed policies.	0.827

In order to get better understanding of the workplace stressors amongst women executives working in private sector banks, mean values and their respective ranks are calculated (table 3). The results revealed that women executives felt ‘workplace politics’ (mean = 3.83) as the most intense workplace stressor, followed by ‘adoptability to change’ (mean = 3.72), ‘performance pressure’ (mean = 3.71) and ‘work overload’ (mean = 3.60). One very important finding of the study revealed that women executives have reflect lowest stress level towards the ‘job ambiguity’.

Table 3 : Overall Mean of Workplace Stressors

Sr. No	Factors	Mean	S.D.	Ranks
1	Organizational Climate	3.25	0.654	6
2	Absence of Employee Involvement	2.96	0.687	10
3	Job Rigidity	3.02	0.690	9
4	Job Ambiguity	2.40	0.637	12
5	Inequality at Workplace	3.04	0.697	8
6	Lack of Senior Support	2.74	0.638	11
7	Resource Inadequacy	3.11	0.484	7
8	Work Overload	3.60	0.647	4
9	Adoptability to Change	3.72	0.609	2
10	Performance Pressure	3.71	1.962	3
11	Job Insecurity	3.32	0.733	5
12	Workplace Politics	3.83	2.009	1

1.4.2 Impact/Relation of Demographic Factors on Workplace Stressors

Table 4 represents the relation between workplace stressors and demographic variables. F values and t values indicated that workplace namely 'organizational climate' showed association with demographic variables 'sector of bank', 'location of bank', 'qualification', 'work experience', 'age', 'children' and 'dependents in the family' at 1 percent level of significance. The stressor namely 'organizational climate' revealed association with 'designation' at 5 percent level of significance. Further women executives were highly stressed those working in old private sector banks; situated in Gurgaon; working at top managerial level; post graduate; having age above 43 years; and having children and/or dependents in the family.

Workplace stressor namely 'absence of employee involvement' explained association with 'location of bank', 'designation', 'age', 'marital status', 'type of family' and 'mode of transport' at 1 percent level of significance and with 'sector of bank' at 5 percent level of significance. Results indicated that level of stress was more among women executives working in new private sector banks; working in the banks located in Noida; working at middle management level; having experience 6 to 10 years; belongs to age group 34 to 43 years; living in joint family; and using public transport, because of 'absence of employee involvement'.

Results of this study indicated significant association of workplace stressor 'job rigidity' with demographic variables namely 'sector of bank', 'location of bank', 'designation', 'age', 'work experience', 'marital status' and 'mode of transport' at 1 percent level of significance. Level of stress was perceived high by women executives working in new private sector banks; working in a bank located in Noida; working at lower level designations; having experience 6 to 10 years; having age below 24 years; having marital status single; and using public transport.

The workplace stressor namely 'job ambiguity' explained association with 'location of bank', 'age' and 'dependents in the family'. The study found that workplace stressor namely 'inequality at workplace' showed association with 'sector of bank', 'location of bank', 'qualification' and 'dependents in the family' at 1 percent level of significance and with different categories of 'age' at 5 percent level of significance. Level of stress was felt more by women executives working in old private sector banks; working in the banks situated in Faridabad; postgraduate; having age above 43 years; and having dependents in their family.

Workplace stressor 'lack of senior support' has shown association with different categories of 'location of bank' and 'work experience' at 1 percent level of significance. Results indicated that 'lack of senior support' was not a very prominent stressor, which affect women executives.

Results of this study reflected association of 'resource inadequacy' with different 'location of bank', 'designation', 'age', 'work experience', 'having children', 'having dependents in the family' and 'using different mode of transport' at 1 percent level of significance. Further on the basis of outcomes of this study it was evident that level of stress perceived more by those women executives, who are working in banks located in Noida; working at top managerial level; having experience more than 10 years; belonging to age group 43 years and above; having children and/or dependents in the family; and using public transport for commuting between home and bank in the context of 'resource inadequacy'.

The workplace stressors namely 'work overload' highlighted association with demographic variables namely 'sector of bank', 'location of bank', 'designation', 'qualification', 'age', 'work experience', 'marital status', 'children' and 'mode of transport' at 1 percent level of significance, whereas association was found significant at 5 percent level of significance with demographic variable 'domestic helper'. Level of stress perceived more by women executives, working in new private sector banks; working in banks situated in Noida; working at middle or top managerial levels; postgraduate; having experience between 6 to 10 years; with age above

43 years; are married; having children; not having domestic helper; and using public transport.

According to results of this study workplace stressor 'adaptability to change' showed association with demographic variables namely 'sector of bank', 'location of bank', 'designation', 'age', 'work experience' and 'domestic helper' at 1 percent level of significance. On the basis of results, it was highlighted that perceived stress level was high among women executives, working in new private sector banks; working in banks located in Noida and Delhi; working at lower level designations; having experience between 6 to 10 years; with age between 24 to 33 years; and not having domestic helper.

The study found that workplace stressor 'performance pressure' explained association with level of 'qualification' at 1 percent level of significance and 'performance pressure' was considered as source of stress by women executives irrespective of the categories of demographic variables.

Workplace stressor 'job insecurity' explained association with demographic variables 'sector of bank', 'designation' and 'domestic helper' at 1 percent level of significance, whereas it showed association with 'location of bank', 'marital status', 'children' and 'mode of transport' at 5 percent level of significance. Further results revealed that stress level is high among women executives working in old private sector banks; working in banks located in Noida; working at top and middle managerial levels; having children; not having domestic helper; and using public mode of transport.

According to the results of this study workplace stressor 'workplace politics' revealed association with 'qualification', 'marital status' and 'domestic helper' at 1 percent level of significance. Whereas 'workplace politics' was found associated with demographic variables 'age', 'dependents in the family' and 'mode of transport' at 5 percent level of significance. Results explained that high level of stress is found among women executives, with higher qualification, having age above 43 years, not having domestic helper; having dependents in the family; and using public transport for commuting between home and bank in the reference of 'workplace politics'.

Table 4: Values of t test and F test with Significance Level

Demographic Variables	Work Place Stressors											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
t- value and Significance												
Qualification	-2.804 .006**	0.903 .369	1.804 .074	-0.068 .946	-4.208 .000**	0.771 .442	-2.112 .037*	-4.907 .000**	0.216 .829	-2.755 .006**	-1.79 .076	-1.79 .076
Children	3.653 .000**	-1.316 .189	-1.762 .079	.157 .875	1.748 .081	-1.885 .060	4.088 .000**	4.896 .000**	0.292 .771	0.442 .659	2.502 .041*	2.052 .041*
Type of Family	1.59 .113	2.887 .004**	1.762 .079	2.352 .019*	1.583 .114	1.691 .092	2.406 .017*	0.557 .578	0.379 .705	-1.183 .230	-0.969 .333	-0.969 .333
Domestic Helper	-1.437 .151	-1.069 .285	0.935 .351	-1.949 .053	-0.938 .349	-0.542 .584	.050 .960	2.417 .016*	3.702 .000**	1.937 .053	5.827 .000**	5.827 .000**
Dependents in the Family	2.78 .006**	0.98 .328	1.324 .187	2.456 .015*	4.578 .000**	0.793 .428	2.852 .005**	-1.625 .105	0.599 .550	-1.085 .278	0.281 .788	0.281 .788
Mode of Transport	1.736 .083	4.439 .000**	2.77 .006**	-0.245 .807	1.134 .257	-2.068 .039*	4.305 .000**	2.806 .005**	-0.347 .728	-0.632 .528	2.169 .031*	2.169 .031*
F value and Significance												
Sector of Bank	20.926 .000**	3.734 .025	4.728 .009**	0.247 .781	30.462 .000**	0.87 .420	1.843 .159	6.782 .001**	5.915 .003**	2.750 .065	29.931 .000**	29.931 .000**
Location of Bank	4.421 .004**	15.931 .000**	8.106 .000**	15.999 .000**	9.186 .000**	20.262 .000**	13.25 .000**	4.262 .005**	4.475 .004**	0.699 .553	3.492 .016*	3.492 .016*

Designation	4.264 .015*	10.183 .000**	12.498 .000**	0.137 .872	1.791 .168	0.829 .437	8.375 .000**	4.681 .010**	6.847 .001**	1.614 .200	5.898 .003**	5.898 .003**
Work Experience	8.546 .000**	21.714 .000**	22.792 .000**	4.343 .014*	0.391 .677	6.541 .002**	8.702 .000**	11.269 .000**	4.829 .008**	0.380 .684	0.193 .825	0.193 .825
Age (in years)	9.873 .000**	4.356 .005**	9.752 .000**	8.754 .000**	2.968 .032*	2.104 .099	5.934 .001**	18.384 .000**	13.159 .000**	1.054 .368	1.857 .136	1.857 .136
Marital status	1.845 .159	8.062 .000**	9.269 .000**	1.621 .199	2.544 .080	3.000 .052	1.956 0.143	4.896 .000**	1.275 .280	0.801 .449	3.607 .028*	3.607 .028*

Normality condition checked before applying parametric tests

Note : * * Significant at 1 percent level of Significance

* Significant at 5 percent level of Significance

1.5 Major Findings

According to results of the present study, women executives working in old private sector banks are more stressed than the other two categories (new private sector and foreign sector banks).

workplace namely 'organizational climate' showed association with demographic variables 'sector of bank', 'location of bank', 'qualification', 'work experience', 'age', 'children' and 'dependents in the family'.

Workplace stressor namely 'absence of employee involvement' explained association with 'location of bank', 'designation', 'age', 'marital status', 'type of family' and 'mode of transport'. Results of this study indicated significant association of workplace stressor 'job rigidity' with demographic variables namely 'sector of bank', 'location of bank', 'designation', 'age', 'work experience', 'marital status' and 'mode of transport'.

The study found that workplace stressor namely 'inequality at workplace' that the level of stress was felt more by women executives working in old private sector banks; working in the banks situated in Faridabad; postgraduate; having age above 43 years; and having dependents in their family.

Results indicated that 'lack of senior support' was not a very prominent stressor, which affect women executives. The workplace stressors namely 'work overload' highlighted association with demographic variables namely 'sector of bank', 'location of bank', 'designation', 'qualification', 'age', 'work experience', 'marital status', 'children' and 'mode of transport'.

The study found that workplace stressor 'performance pressure' explained association with level of 'qualification' at 1 percent level of significance and 'performance pressure' was considered as source of stress by women executives irrespective of the categories of demographic variables. Results regarding 'Workplace Politics' explained that high level of stress is found among women executives, with higher qualification, having age above 43 years, not having domestic helper; having dependents in the family; and using public transport for commuting between home and bank in the reference of 'workplace politics'.

It is found in the study that there is lack of involvement of executives having very short experience, consequently they feel neglected. Further women executives having marital status as 'married' and having children and/or dependents in their family; having average work experience (6 to 10 years) feeling under more workplace stress; and using public transport for commuting between home and workplace.

1.6 Managerial Implications

The study extracts workplace stressors, which cause stress for the women executives working in private sector banks. The study highlights that stressors namely workplace politics, adaptability to change, performance pressure and work overload are significant stressors at workplace, so the executives who are involved in decision making process and the human resource department can gain adequate information from the current study, while developing the organizational strategies to smooth and uninterrupted working environment. Further the stressor work politics is considered as the most important stressor, so the policy makers should try to maximise the transparency. Private sector banks should develop training programs in the light of major stressors found by this research. For instance the training programs must include the topics on minimizing work politics, improving organizational climate, improving relationship among subordinate and superior and teamwork in decision making activities.

1.7 Future Research Directions

The present study is confined to measure the work-life stressors among women executives working in private sector banks ignoring public sector banks. Further it is based on the data

collected through structured questionnaire from only 500 women executives working in private sector banks. Due to financial and time constraints, the study has been conducted in Delhi-NCR, so the results of the study may not represent the women executives of whole of India. The workplace stressors may be different in public and private sector banks, so the results of the research are not applicable for public sector banks.

References:-

- [1] Ahsan, N., Abdullah, Z., Fie, D.Y.G & Alam, S.H. (2009). A Study of Job Stress on Job Satisfaction among University Staff in Malaysia: Empirical Study. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 8 (1).
- [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(4), 665–699.
- [3] Beehr, T. A., & Newman, J. E. (1978). Job Stress, Employee Health, and Organizational Effectiveness: A Facet Analysis Model and Literature Review. *Personnel Psychology*, 31(4), 665–699.
- [4] Borg, M.G., Riding, R.J. & Falzon, J.M. (1991). Stress in Teaching: A Study of Occupational Stress and its Determinants, Job Satisfaction and Career Commitment among Primary Schoolteachers; *Educational Psychology*, 11 (1), 59-75.
- [5] Budhraj (2008). Causes of Stress among Insurance Employees: An Empirical Study. *The ICFAI journal of Marketing research*, 7(10), 7 – 14.
- [6] Burke, R. J. (1988). Sources of Managerial and Professional Stress in Large Organization. In Cooper C. L., Payne, R. (Eds.), *Causes, Coping and Consequences of Stress at Work*, John Wiley and Sons, Chicester, 77-112.
- [7] Burke, R. J. (1993). Toward an Understanding of Psychological Burnout among Police Officers. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 8(3), 425–438.
- [8] Chincholkar, S. & Krishna, N. (2012). Work- Family Conflict of Married Women Business Executives in Mumbai. *SIES Journal of Management*, September 2012, 8(2).
- [9] Choudhary, A. (2014). Stress Management with special reference to Public Sector Bank Employees in Delhi NCR region, *NICE Journal of Business*, 9(1&2), 2014.
- [10] Cooper, C. L., & Marshall, J. (1976). Occupational Sources of Stress: A Review of the Literature Relating to Coronary Heart Disease and Mental Ill-Health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 49(1), 11–28.
- [11] Cummins R.C. (1990). Job Stress and the Buffering Effort of Supervisory Support. *Group and Organizational Studies*, 15(1), 92-104.
- [12] George, R. (2015). Personal Effectiveness as Dependent Variable in a Multiple Regression Analysis upon Organizational Culture, Quality of Worklife and Job Attitude. *Pratibimba*, 15(1), 7-15.
- [13] Ivancevich, J.M. & M.T. Matteson (1980). *Stress and Work. A Managerial Perspective*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company. Kahn & Quinn (1970),
- [14] Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R.P., Snoeck, J.D. & Rosenthal, R.A. (1964). *Organizational Stress Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.
- [15] Kumar, D. M. (2006). A Study on Job Stress of Nationalized and Non Nationalized Bank Employees. Retrieved from http://www.indianmba.com /Faculty_Column on 13th june 2015.
- [16] Landy, F.J. & Trumbo, D.A. (1976). *Psychology of Work Behaviour*. USA, Dorsey Press.

- [17] M. & Chattopadhyay, R. (2008). The Relationship Between Organizational Role Stress and Life Satisfaction Levels among Women Employees: An Empirical Study. *The ICFAIAN Journal of Management Research*, 7(5), 25-34.
- [18] Malik, O. F., Waheed, A. & Malik, K-Ur-R. (2010). The Mediating Effects of Job Satisfaction on Role Stressors and Affective Commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*. 5(11), 223 – 235.
- [19] Nelson, D.L. & Burke, R.J. (2000). Women Executives: Health, Stress, and Success. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(2), 107-21.
- [20] Nina Ciric (2013). Family-Friendly Work Environment? An Investigation of Women's Job Stress and Satisfaction. Master of Arts Thesis, Published by ProQuest LLC (2013).
- [21] Parker, D. F. & Decotiis, T. A. (1983). Organizational Determinants of Job Stress. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 32, 160-177.
- [22] Ram, N., Khoso, I., Shah, A. A., Chandio, F.R. & Sheikh, F.M. (2011). Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity as Factors in Work Stress among Managers: A Case Study of Manufacturing Sector in Pakistan. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 7(2).
- [23] Rathod & Gaur (2010). A Study on Stress: Sources, Effect and Resolution Strategies With Reference to Marketing Employees. retrieved from <http://www.studymode.com/essays/a-Study-On-Stress-324021.html>.
- [24] Rizwan, M. Waseem, A. & Bukhari, S. A. (2014). Antecedents of Job Stress and its Impact on Job Performance and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Learning & Development*, 4(2), 187-203.
- [25] Sauter, S. L., Lim, S.-Y. & Murphy, L. R. (1996). Organizational Health: A New Paradigm for Occupational Stress Research at NIOSH. *Japanese Journal of Occupational Mental Health*, 4, 248–254.
- [26] Schuler, R. S. (1982). An Integrative Transactional Process Model of Stress in Organizations. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 3, 5-19.
- [27] Sen, P. C. (1981). A Study of Personal and Organizational Correlated of Role Stress and Coping Strategies in Some Public Sector Banks. Ph.D. Thesis, Gujarat University, Ahmedabad.
- [28] Sharma & Devi (2008). An Empirical Study of Factors Causing Stress Among Banking and Insurance Sector Employees. *Gumbad Business Review*, 3(2), 1-11.
- [29] Sharma & Devi (2008). An Empirical Study of Factors Causing Stress Among Banking and Insurance Sector Employees. *Gumbad Business Review*, 3(2), 1-11.
- [30] Sharma, J. & Devi A. (2011a). Individual Differences and Stress at Workplace. *Asia-Pacific Business Review*, 7(3), 198 – 207.
- [31] Sharma, J. & Devi, A. (2011). Role Stress among Employees: An Empirical Study of Commercial Banks. *Gurukul Business Review*, 7, 53-61.
- [32] Shueh-Yi Lian & Cai Lian Tam (2014). Work Stress, Coping Strategies and Resilience: A Study among Working Females. *Asian Social Science*, 10(12).
- [33] Singh, A. P., & Singh, S. (2009). Effects of Stress and Work Culture on Job Satisfaction. *The ICFAI Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 8 (2), 52-62.
- [34] Somya, K. R., & Panchanatham, N. (2011). Job Burnout: An Outcome of Organizational Politics in Banking Sector. *Far East Journal of Psychology and Business*, 2(1), 49-58.
- [35] Srivastava, A. K. & Singh, A.P. (1981). Construction and Standardization of an Occupational Stress Index: A Pilot Study. *Indian J. Clinical Psychology*. 8(2), 133-136.

- [36] Srivastava, A. K. & Singh, A.P. (1981). Construction and Standardization of an Occupational Stress Index: A Pilot Study. *Indian J. Clinical Psychology*, 8(2), 133-136.
- [37] Srivastava, A.K. (2009). Control Climate in Public Sector: Relationship with Role Stress, Coping Strategy and Personal Variables. *Pranjana*, 12(1), 51-63.
- [38] Tiwari, S., & Bansal, R. (2015). Women, Work and Stress Management- A Comparative Study of Education and Finance Sectors. *Women, Work and Stress Management- A Comparative Study of Education and Finance Sectors*, 4(3), 1173 – 1181.
- [39] Wetzels, M., Ruyter & Bloemer, J. (2000). Antecedents and consequences of role stress of retail sales persons. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 7(2), 65-75.