
A Study on - Job Stress of Managers in Public Sector and Private Sector

*Dileep Kumar, M.**

Introduction:

Globalization and privatization led policies has compelled many industries in India, to go for organizational reforms in order to get competitive edge to cope with multinational's led organisational environment. The advent of technological and organisational changes has further reformed the work patterns of the managers and made it inevitable to the organization to smart-size, reorganize, restructure and modify the existing labour force in both public and private sector organisations.

Industrialisation and resultant organisational changes has brought many problems associated with organisational and individual stress. Stress not only affects the individual domain but also affects the organisational and social domains. Understanding stress, especially the level of stress in industrial organisations, is of great importance today because job stress affects the mental and physical health of the members at individual level and efficiency and effectiveness at organisational level.

Occupational stress is an increasingly important occupational health problem and a significant cause of economic loss. Occupational stress may produce both overt psychological and physiological disabilities. However it may also cause subtle manifestation of morbidity that can affect personal well being and productivity (Quick, Murphy, Hurrell and Orman, 1992). A job stressed individual is likely to have greater job dissatisfaction, increased absenteeism, increased frequency of drinking and smoking, increase in negative psychological symptoms and reduced aspirations and self esteem (Jick and Payne, 1980). The use of role concepts suggests that occupational stress is associated with individual, interpersonal and structural variables (Katz and Kahn, 1978). Studies on burnout found that, it is related to exhaustion and work over load factors in various organisations (Chermis, 1980). Stress on the job is costly for employers, reflected in lower productivity, reduced motivation and job skills, and increased accidents. High stress is also related to increase in turn over intentions and counter productive behaviour such as theft and drug and alcohol abuse (Jones, Boye, 1992).

In tune with the changes at the global level many public sector industrial undertakings also have taken stands to cope with the global changes. Constraints of the changes thus felt by the labour force in both public and private sector industrial organisations. Of course, the task of carry forward an organisation with fidelity and accuracy rest with the leaders, the new plans and policies have to be implemented at the shop floor under the close scrutiny and supervision by the middle level supervisory managers who come in between the organisational hierarchy. Obviously, the occupational difficulty would be more on those supervisory managers recently promoted to the middle level of organisational hierarchy. Schuler (1980) rightly argued in this context that stress in organizations is an important occupational health problem and new research knowledge about stress is needed within the field of organisational behaviour. Thus, the present study is an attempt to investigate, understand and compare the level of job stress experienced by the recently promoted supervisory level managers of the public and private sector industrial organisations in Kerala.

*** Dr. Dilip Kumar, M.**
*Professor, Dept. of Management
Acharya Inst. of Management &
Sciences, Bangalore
e-mail : dilmail @ rediffmail.com*

Literature Review

Stress and Stress Consequences

Stress has become an integral part of everyday living. Selye (1936) defined stress as "the force, pressure, or strain exerted upon a material object or person which resist these forces and attempt to maintain its original state." Schuler (1988) Stress is "a dynamic condition in which an individual is confronted with an opportunity, constrained or demand related to what he or she desires and/or which the outcome is perceived to be both uncertain and important." "It is a substantial imbalance between environmental demand and the response capability of the focal organism" McGrath (1976). Stress is bound to persons. In its most general form stress is an individual's psychic and somatic reactions to demands that approach or exceed the limits of his coping resources. On the person side, the occurrence of stress is determined by the individual's vulnerability in terms of physiological predispositions, perceptual cognitive appraisals and coping competence (Zubin and Spring, 1977). Lazarus and Folkman (1983) indicate that Psychological stress occurs when a particular relationship between the person and the environment that is appraised by the person as taxing or exceeding his or her resources and endangering his or her well being"

The effect of objectively described aspects of stressful situations on behaviour has been discussed by researchers like Homes and Rahe (1967); Kagan and Levi (1974); Lazarus (1966); Levine and Scotch (1970); and McGrath (1976). These can be broadly divided in to individual and organisational consequences. Individual consequences can be further classified in to three categories. They are: Behavioural; Psychological; and Physiological consequences. Organisational consequences of stress include decline in performance, withdrawal and negative changes in attitudes, absenteeism, turn over and finally burnout. Individual consequences include distress and feelings of dissatisfaction and anger, together with anxiety and depressive responses, which may contribute to mental ill health. The cognitive manifestations of stress include alteration in information processing and attentional and memory functions, which can in turn influence performance and decision making capability.

Job Stress and Consequences

Shilendra Singh (1990) defined "job stress is an individual's reaction to the characteristic of the work environment, which appears threatening to the individual."

Beehr and Newman (1978) defined job stress as "a condition arising from the interaction of people and their jobs and characterised by changes within people that force them to deviate from their normal functioning."

Steers (1981) indicate that "occupational stress has become an important topic for study of organisational behaviour for several reasons: 1. Stress has harmful psychological and physiological effects on employees, 2. Stress is a major cause of employee turn over and absenteeism, 3. Stress experienced by one employee can affect the safety of other employees, 4. By controlling dysfunctional stress, individual and organisation can be managed more effectively."

Rapid industrialisation provided the initial impetus for the stimulus model based approach. The rationale of this approach is that some external forces impinge on the organism in disruptive way. Interactive model of stress incorporates stimulus based and response based models of stress. Within this model accidents could be either short term or long-term manifestations of exposure to stress. In this context McGrath (1976) suggests that stress must be perceived and interpreted by the individual. Within this model, it is necessary to consider all three conceptual domains of the stress process: 1. Sources of stress. 2. Mediators of stress. 3. Manifestations of stress. This model provides the person - environmental fit approach to the understanding of stress at work, (French, 1973; Cooper, 1981). The transactional model of stress is based on expectancies and appraisals. According to this model, stress occurs when the subject believes that his resources are insufficient. The effect of stress is manifest in four distinct domains: Physiological, Behavioural, Subjective experience and Cognitive function.

Cobb (1975) has the opinion that, the responsibility load creates severe stress among workers and managers." If the individual manager cannot cope with the increased responsibilities it may

lead to several physical and psychological disorders among them. Brook (1973) reported that qualitative changes in the job create adjustment problem among employees. The interpersonal relationships within the department and between the departments create qualitative difficulties within the organisation to a great extent.

Miles and Perreault (1976) identify four different types of role conflict: 1. Intra-sender role conflict 2. Inter sender role conflict. 3. Person - role conflict; and 4. Role over load. The use of role concepts suggests that job related stress is associated with individual, interpersonal, and structural variables (Katz and Kahn, 1978). The presence of supportive peer groups and supportive relationships with supervisors are negatively correlated with R.C. (Caplan et al., 1964).

There is evidence that role incumbents with high levels of **role ambiguity** also respond to their situation with anxiety, depression, physical symptoms, a sense of futility or lower self esteem, lower levels of job involvement and organisational commitment, and perceptions of lower performance on the part of the organisation, of supervisors, and of themselves (Brief and Aldag, 1976).

Ivancevich and Matteson (1950) indicate, lack of group cohesiveness may explain various physiological and behavioural outcomes in an employ desiring such sticks together. Workplace interpersonal conflicts and negative interpersonal relations are prevalent sources of stress (Dewe, 1993; Lang, 1992), and are existed with negative mood depression, and symptoms of ill health (Israel et al., 1989; Karasek, Gardell and Lindell, 1987).

Lack of participation in the decision making process, lack of effective consultation and communication, unjustified restrictions on behaviour, office politics and no sense of belonging are identified as potential sources of stressors. Lack of participation in work activity is associated with negative psychological mood and behavioural responses, including escapist drinking and heavy smoking (Caplan et al., 1975).

According to French and Caplan (1975), pressure of both qualitative and quantitative overload

can result in the need to work excessive hours, which is an additional source of stress. Having to work under time pressure in order to meet deadlines is an independent source of stress. Studies shown that stress levels increase as difficult deadlines draw near. Kornhauser (1965) found that unpleasant working conditions, the necessity to work fast, to expand a lot of physical effort and working excessive and inconvenient hours were related to poor mental health. According to Sutherland and Cooper (1990), the worker who struggles to do job that is too difficult is likely to take more time to finish the task and need to work extra hours in order to complete the job to satisfactory standard. A link between long hours of work and stress and ill health has been established.

Stress is often developed when an individual is assigned a major responsibility without proper authority and delegation of power. Interpersonal factors such as group cohesiveness, functional dependence, communication frequency, relative authority and organisational distance between the role sender and the focal persons are important topics in organisational behavior (Vansell, Brief, and Schuler).

Stress develops when an individual feels he is not competent to undertake the role assigned to him effectively. The individual feels that he lacks knowledge, skill and training on performing the role. Unless adequate training is provided, potentially stressful situation may develop when new technology is introduced in to the work place and the employee's feel unable to do the given task (Cooper, 1974). Caplan et al. (1975) reported that job complexity and qualitative workload arose job difficulties among managers.

Anoop Singh et al. (1991) indicate that "Greater support from supervisors and co-workers in the workplace is strongly associated with greater feeling of well-being and any undermining from their part put the employee under irritability, anxiety, depression, and somatic disorders."

Quinn (1973) observed that, "Increased regulations in work environment produce increased dissatisfaction among employees."

Studies on burnout found that, it is related to exhaustion and work over load factors in various

organisations (Chermiss, 1980). Stress on the job is costly for employers, reflected in lower productivity, reduced motivation and job skills, and increased and accidents.

Singer (1975) reported that among 1142 male government employees, under utilisation of abilities and insufficient participation on the job accounted for more variance in psychological and somatic symptoms on occupational life stressors.

Job stress results from a variety of extreme or noxious conditions created within or associated with job environment. Such conditions include job qualities, organisational roles and responsibilities for people, relationships at work, career development, and organisational structuring and climate, and office politics (Beehr and Newman, 1976; Brief et al, 1981; Cooper and Marshall, 1976; Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980; Schuler, 1980).

Work stress, particularly that related to the lack of self direction in the work setting, has been demonstrated to exert a negative influence on employee mental health (Ganster, 1989; Karasek and Theorell, 1990;) emotional distress (Spector, 1986) and depression Braun and Hollander, 1988; Kawakami et al., 1990;). Hamner and Tosi, 1974 and Caplan and associates (1975) reported sufficient association between job conflict and anxiety.

Two people exposed to the same threatening situation may differ substantially in the magnitude and duration of stress responses and stress related health problems might emerge in several contrasting ways both physically and mentally. Some of these variations result from differences in temperament, social resources and the effectiveness of the coping responses that the individual brings to bear on the stressful transaction. The present study is an attempt to investigate and to compare the level of stress experienced by the employees of the Public Sector and Private Sector in Kerala. The study will be helpful to understand the occupational; stress and drawn up adequate policy on management development.

As the world of work is becoming more and more complex, the potential to meet the amount of stress in work is also increasing. Because employees

spend roughly one third of their lives working in an organizational setting, employee mental health is of particular importance.

The employees in any institution are observed to be experiencing stress at their work place. It is also seen that the employees in the same occupation (organization) belonging to different sectors differ in the amount of stress experienced by them. The literature review incorporates various studies

The study doesn't consider female population due to the inadequate representation of recently promoted female managers in ten departments selected for the study.

Research design

This research tries to make comparative study of the level of stress of recently promoted supervisory level male managers, in Public Sector and Private Sector industries. Since the objective of this research is to find out the level of stress this research follows descriptive research design as its plan of action.

Sampling

The sampling population of this research includes 100 male supervisory level male managerial members, of 1 Public Sector establishment and 1 Public Sector establishment in Eranakulam district, of Kerala. Out of 100 sample population, selection is made with 50 recently promoted male managerial members from one Public Sector establishment and remaining 50 from Public Sector establishment. Recently promoted male managerial members belonging to finance, production, marketing, human resources, materials, purchase, electrical, instrumentation, plant and systems are considered for this research. This research followed the systematic random sampling method for representative population. From each department 10 recently promoted male managers, who are coming under the age group of 30-40, are initially selected and every 2nd item from a group of 10 members are selected randomly for the study. Thus 5 managers from each departmental selection are made.

**Sample Design
Table 1
Public Sector**

F	H	M	Pr	Mt	Pu	E	In	Pt	Sy
10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Private Sector

F	H	M	Pr	Mt	Pu	E	In	Pt	Sy
10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Tool of data collection

The study used two Standardised questionnaire of Dr. Shailendra Singh to assess the level of stress and coping strategies of executives. The stress questionnaire consists of 10 independent variables having 32 items. The independent variables selected for the study consists of Lack of group cohesiveness (3 items), Role conflict (5 item), Role ambiguity (4 item), Feeling of Inequality (3 items), Role Overload (5 items), Lack of Supervisory Support (3 items), Constraints of Rules and Regulations (2 items), Job Requirement Capability mismatch (3 items), Inadequacy of Role Authority (2 items), Job Difficulty (2 items).

**Table 2
Standardised alpha of sub variables of
organisational stress**

Sl. No.	Job stress Variables	No. of items	Theoretical 1 range	Standardised alpha
1	LOG	4	4-20	0.80
2	RC	5	5- 25	0.81
3	FI	3	3-15	0.90
4	RA	4	4-20	0.71
5	RO	5	5-25	0.83
6	LSS	3	3-15	0.83
7	CRR	2	2-10	0.61
8	JRCM	2	2-10	0.63
9	IRA	3	3-15	0.65
10	JD	2	2-10	0.79

The study also incorporates a socio demographic tool which consists of variables like education, marital status and hobbies.

The variables selected for the study are:

Role Conflict

Role conflict can be defined as behaviour pattern expecting of a person undertaking a particular task or positioning any organization. Role conflict can be thus defined as condition of job stress where employees are expected to perform according to contradictory demands and task assigned to them.

Role Overload

Role overload can be defined as a condition of job stress where the requirements of the role exceed the capabilities of the individual performing it within the assigned time and resources.

Role Ambiguity

Role ambiguity can be defined as a condition of job stress where employees are not provided necessary information to carry out the job and in which there is uncertainty surrounding the requirements of a particular role.

Lack of Group Cohesiveness

Lack of group cohesiveness can be defined as a condition of job stress where employees do not get along very well or stick together either physically for group decisions and activities.

Feeling of Inequality

Feeling of inequality has been defined as a condition of job stress where employees feel that the rewards provided to them are not proportionate to the efforts done by them compared to their counter parts within and outside the organization.

Lack of Supervisory Support

Lack of supervisory support can be defined as a condition where the employees perceive the role of leadership as passive or discouraging at times when they need support and encouragement in carrying out the job assigned by their superiors.

Constraints of Changes, Rules and Regulations

Constraints of changes, rules and regulations can be defined as a condition of job stress where the employees' experience in coping with technological and administrative changes as well as rigid rules and policies.

Job Difficulty

Job difficulty can be defined as a condition of job stress where the employees feel their assignments quite difficult and are taxing their ability.

Inadequacy of Role Authority

Inadequacy of role authority can be defined as a situation of job stress where the employees perceive that they are not delighted with adequate authority to discharge their responsibilities.

Job Requirements Capability Mismatch

Job requirements capability mismatch can be defined as a condition of job stress where the employees feel that their abilities significantly do not match with the requirements of the job.

Objectives

1. To understand the job stress among the supervisory level managers of public and private sector industrial organisations.
2. To make a comparative analysis of the level of job stress among supervisory level managers of public and private sector industrial organisations.
3. To suggest, if necessary, any stress management measures to alleviate the job stress among supervisory level managers of public and private sector industrial organisations.

Hypothesis

1. There will be significant difference between public and private sector industrial organization's supervisory level managers on job stress.
2. Stress will be higher among public sector supervisory managers compared to private sector supervisory level managers.

Analysis and Results

Table 3

Mean SD and CR-values of stress scores of respondents with respect to their organization.

Sl.	Variable	N	Public		Private		CR
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1	Total Stress	100	75.84	08.9	86.97	9.17	**

** Indicates significance at 0.01 level

The table (Table 3) indicates the significant difference between the nationalized and non-nationalized bank employees in their level of stress. The table (Table 1) indicates that the private sector managers have high mean score (86.97) in relation to occupational stress compared to public sector managers (75.84) in this particular research. This shows private sector member's high-level stress compared to public sector members.

Table 4

Mean, SD and CR- values of stress scores of respondents with respect to selected Job stress variables

Variable	Public		Private		CR Value	Dr.	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
LCG	6.16	1.06	7.35	0.72	2.17	98	0.01
RC	10.27	0.6	11.56	0.56	2.54	98	0.01
FI	6.85	0.87	8.83	0.89	2.4	98	0.01
RA	9.03	0.46	10.41	1.60	3.84	98	0.01
RO	12.3	1.76	16.15	1.16	6.00	98	0.01
LSS	9.21	1.4	9.68	0.88	1.25	98	>.05
CRR	6.51	1.5	5.96	1.61	2.45	98	0.01
JRCM	5.47	0.99	4.39	0.33	2.99	98	0.01
IRA	5.83	0.58	6.92	1.26	0.44	98	>.05
JD	4.21	0.74	5.72	0.88	5.85	98	0.01
Total stress	75.84	9.96	86.97	9.89	5.92	98	0.01

The above table (Table 4) indicates that among the selected occupational stress variables role over load has the highest mean value of (12.3) followed by role conflict (10.23) in the public sector industrial organisations. In the private sector industrial organisations also these variables have the high mean scores with 16.15 and 11.56 respectively. Job difficulty has the lowest mean score in both categories (4.21 and 5.92 respectively) followed by inadequacy of role authority (5.83 and 5.72 respectively).

MAJOR FINDINGS:

1. There is significant difference in the level of occupational stress among the supervisory level managers of public and private sector industrial organisations.
2. Occupational stress is found higher among supervisory level manager's of private sector compared to public sector managers.

-
3. Among different occupational stress variables Role over load, Role ambiguity, and Role conflict contribute more to the occupational stress among private sector managers compared to public sector managers.
 4. Lack of Supervisory Support and Inadequate Role Authority are found less significant at 0.01 levels.
 5. On Job Requirement Capability Mismatch and Constraints of Rules and regulations job stress sub variables, public sector is having high stress compared to private sector.

Discussion

The objective formulated in this research is to investigate and understand the level of stress of recently promoted supervisory managerial members in the public and private sector industrial organizations. The findings of this research are in tune with the hypothesis formulated in this research, even though the study found significant difference at all variable selected for the study. The hypothesis stated that 'stress would be higher among private sector industrial organizations compared to public sector industrial organizations. The findings clearly indicate that the recently promoted supervisory manager's of private sector industrial organizations are having high stress compared to public sector industrial organization. The findings of the present research, thus accept the research hypothesis, as it observed significant difference between the two sectors, in the level of organizational stress.

The four major stress factors, role conflict, role ambiguity and role over load which are widely recognized in both public and private sector industrial organizations. The sub variable analysis of stress in both public and private sector industrial organizations indicates that in both sectors Role over load, Role authority and Role conflict are the major stressors to recently promoted supervisory managers in this research.

The study indicates that the private sector managers are having high role over load compared to public sector managers. This shows that in private sector, the recently promoted supervisory level managers consider their work allotment is taxing to

them and it is beyond their expertise and limit. Cobb (1975) has rightly pointed out in this context that the responsibility load creates severe stress among workers and managers. Member's confidence on his or her own performance expectations and contributions at work are found affected because of task allotted to the members which are beyond their skills and expertise. A feeling of incongruity between the new work related skills to perform their responsibilities and the workload given to them, is taxing to them. Top management of private sector organizations expects more proactive behavior of members that help to cope with the global industrial changes. They expect managers to be prepared to devote more hours to complete the work and meet the dead lines. Obviously, the members have to spend long working hours to meet their added responsibilities. In public sector this incongruence is found at lower level. This indicates that the managers of public sector are having only such allotted task which can be manageable with their skills and capacities.

The study further indicates that the recently promoted private sector managers are having high role conflict compared to public sector managers. Role conflict can be defined as behaviour pattern expecting of a person undertaking a particular task or positioning any organization. It is the condition of job stress where employees are expected to perform according to contradictory demands and task assigned to them. The finding indicates that a set of target given to the recently promoted managers by the organization and the functional role they perform at present within the organization is not in congruence with each other. Lower the levels of role clarity members feel at work higher the level of job stress. Cooper and Marshall (1978) rightly indicate that role conflict exists when an individual in a particular work role is torn by conflicting demands or doing things he or she really does not want to-do or does not think our part of job satisfaction.

To the top management, organization should always strive to meet the market condition, competition, deadlines, quality, quantity etc to generate the business surplus. The organizational change initiatives and decision making process is to meet the business profit and organizational development. The set of objective drafted to the managers are many time supposed to redraft and redesign in accordance

with the market changes. Since, the private management are more proactive than reactive at functional level they take steps to change the policies and practices in accordance with the market condition. It derails the statuesque functional procedures and managers have to work under different department with different set of skills and expertise. Since the job security is based on their contribution and performance in private sector, the managers have to follow the instructions of the top management and work in tune with the market condition and deadlines. It develops more job stress among managers especially those who are recently promoted to perform higher responsibilities. While in public sector, such constraints do affect at lesser level compared to private sector. There the managers are getting better job security and social security. More than proaction public sector managers are reactive in their behaviour and feel less anxious about their stand on the demanded changes. Here member's individual orientation is higher compared to market orientation. Due to such factors managers of public sector industries are less affected by the stress compared to private sector.

In the turbulent market oriented industrial environment, the toughest task of management is to remain exist and maintain organization towards growth and surplus. Members have to work under pressure, to compete with their counterparts. Member having different work skills and expertise also have to tune their work in accordance with the job demand. The incongruence between the organizational role demand and members orientation towards performance and contribution thus creates job stress. Managers feel conflict in the required skills and knowledge they have with them. It generates an imbalance between their role and skill. Here the chances of role conflict and its impact will be higher. McGrath (1970) rightfully pointed out in this context that stress is a substantial imbalance between the environmental demand and the response capability of the focal organism.

The finding of Lazarus and Folkman (1980) also substantiate the discussion above that stress will generate among human beings where a particular relationship between the person and the environment, that is appraised by the person as taxing or exceeding his/her resources and endangering his/her well being. The situation of private sector industrial organizations is similar to the above-mentioned findings of the past

researchers. Where there is high uncertainty about their nature of work, role, task, input and responsibilities in the advent of proactive changes, the coping effort develop high job stress among members especially recently promoted supervisory level managers. Since the public sector industrial organizations are having stipulated norms and regulations and the incorporation of new changes in accordance with the market condition will take time and it give enough space to the recently promoted managers to see it and fine tune with themselves to the requirement. The managers get enough time to clarify their roles and duties and take respective stand on the situation. Due to this, managers in the public sector industrial organizations are less affected by the role conflict compared to managers of private sector industrial organizations.

The study further indicates that the managers of private sector industrial organizations are having high role ambiguity compared to public sector industrial organizations. Role ambiguity is defined as a condition of job stress where employees are not provided necessary information to carry out the job and in which there is uncertainty surrounding the requirements of a particular role. Flow of information is one of the important factor that affect the decision making process. Members have to get in time, right information to take appropriate decision in the advent of organisational changes. Since market environment is dynamic the organisational positioning is depending on unambiguous information about the market changes and fluctuations. Many times, organisations will have to take decisions with less available information also. The top management cannot pour adequate information to the middle management in those situations. Working with ambiguous work climate develops anxiety and tension among members. Higher the ambiguity related to the work and work schedules, higher the occupational stress managers will have.

The role ambiguity also results when there is low congruity between the expected work behavior and the scheduled task. There is lack of clarity about what to do, when to do, where to do and how to do. Experimental and longitudinal studies of the effects of role ambiguity reveal that lack of clarity about behavioural expectations causes a great concern with own performance, lower actual and perceived group

productivity, less concern or involvement with the group, lower job satisfaction, unfavourable attitude towards role senders, and increased tension, anxiety, depression, and resentment (Caplan, 1975). The present research is in line with the above finding that the members of private sector industrial organizations are facing high role ambiguity at work place because of lack of clarity about behavioural expectations on work. Higher the level of ambiguity, higher the level of stress experienced by members at work will have. Lack of free flow information across all the hierarchical level, is the problem lead to expectational incongruence and role ambiguity at work. Role ambiguity exists when an individual has inadequate information about his roles and responsibilities at work. The findings of public sector are opposite to that. Since the work norms cannot be changed hastily in public sector, the managers are getting adequate opportunity to think over the situation and there by effectively cope with change. It reduces the stress impact on the managers of public sector.

The other sub variable of job stress, which found significant difference, is the feeling of inequality. The managers of private sector organizations is having high job stress related to feeling of inequality compared public sector managers. Feeling of inequality occurs when the managers feel that their counterparts within and outside their organization are receiving better compensation packages for the same contribution by way of efforts and performance. A promotion indicates enriched duties and responsibilities related to job. For higher the responsibilities, members always expect more compensation packages. If the managers have higher responsibilities and challenges at work and which doesn't associated with adequate compensation packages, develops high dissatisfaction and depression. The high stress of private sector managers may be related to their comparison made between the task and the compensation packages. The effort- reward imbalance model indicates that lack of adequate reward in response to the individual's achievement efforts is considered to contribute to high stress levels and elevated health risks. Reward could be obtained in terms of economic benefits, such as a higher income, but also in terms of appreciation and adequate support from colleagues and superiors or by obtaining a higher social rank at the job. While in public sector the members are having low feeling of inequality. The packages are based on seniority and government

stipulated scales. The managers cannot expect anything more on their reward for meeting the market demands. The more reality orientation based on their organizational system may be the factor related to low stress among members.

The study further pointed out the significance difference in public and private sector industrial organizations on lack of group cohesiveness. The private sector industrial organizations are having high stress related to lack of group cohesiveness compared to public sector. This indicates that the recently promoted managers in private sector industrial organizations are not getting congenial atmosphere from their co-managers and superiors. Adequate support from the co-workers and guidance from the superiors is very important in coping with new work patterns and responsibilities. Lack of cooperation and conflict between members can develop less congenial atmosphere for work performance. Caplan et al. (1975) rightly pointed out in this context that, feed back communication problem can create job stress among workers and managers. The poor communication is always produce poor relationship among the workers and managers. Many researchers shown that workplace interpersonal conflicts and negative interpersonal relations are a prevalent source of stress (Dewe, 1993; Israel, House, Schulman, and long et al., 1992). Work place interpersonal conflicts are associated with negative mood, depression, and symptoms of ill health (Israel et al., 1989; Karasek, Gardell and Lindell, 1987). Ross and Altamaier (1994) stated that informal communication that occurs between employees is most likely to alleviate job stress. While in public sector, since because work is getting only secondary preference and relationship is getting more importance the informal communication will be more compared to private sector. The informal climate of the organisation thus supports the managers to cope up with the work and work place.

The public sector organizations are bureaucratic in nature. The organizations follow stipulated norms and regulations on every segment of work. The finding indicates that the members of public sector industrial organizations are facing high stress related to constraints of rules and regulations of the organization compared to private sector. In private sector, the rules and regulations are not that

rigid to control human behavior at work since the employees are oriented towards work contribution and performance, compared to public sector. Rigid the rules and regulations curtail the opportunity for the managers to work together in an informal way and feel relaxed in between the work performance. Quinn (1973) has observed similar finding that that, Increased regulations in work environment produce increased dissatisfaction among employees. The less stress experienced by the managers in the private sector is related to less rules and regulations observed by the managers that curb their freedom and autonomy at work and work place.

The study further found that the public sector managers are having high stress related to the sub variable job requirement capability mismatch compared to private sector. It is very important in every organization that the capacities and abilities of people should be in tune with the job allotted for them. In public sector the promotions are based on seniority and meritocracy. The long years of service in the same department may not be sufficient enough to take up higher responsibilities with enriched job content. The managers may good enough to do the routine works compared to higher responsibilities. The incongruence happened between the required skill and expertise related to the position in which the managers are promoted and the individuals lack of capability to perform the enriched work results stress at work. French et. al., (1982) rightly pointed out in this context that stress develops when an individual feels he is not competent to undertake the role assigned to him effectively. The individual feels that he lacks knowledge, skill and training on performing the role. This indicates that promotion requires the congruence between positional responsibilities and skill of the individuals to do it. A mismatch of it results high stress among newly promoted managers.

The last sub variable of organisational stress, viz., job difficulty found high among private sector industrial managers compared to public sector. Since the job descriptions are well defined in each position in public sector the stress experienced by the managers found less compared to private sector. The private sector organisations have to tune themselves always to the market changes and changing organisational conditions. The job profile varies continuously based on the changing business

conditions. Due to which, managers in private sector has to cope with the changing functional arrangements specified by the superiors to meet the uncertain market conditions. Much time the superiors also cannot support their subordinates with adequate information on the uncertain business scenario. The high level of stress of private sector managers are related to their nature of work compared to public sector industrial organisations.

The findings related to stress sub variables other than role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload is only having relative importance in this research. In majority organizational stress sub variables the private sector managers are having high stress compared to public sector. The socio demographic variables like education, marital status and hobbies selected for the study found insignificant in this research. The overall finding indicates that stress is a major factor that affects human behavior at work.

Implications

Less importance that given to job stress variables may leads to:

1. Physical problems and health problems like heart diseases, ulcers, arthritis, increased frequency of drinking and smoking, cardiovascular, gastrointestinal, endocrine and other stress related disorders.
2. Psychological and behavioural problems: psychological problems like change of moods, inferiority complex, widespread resentment, reduced aspirations and self esteem, reduced motivation and job skills,
3. Organisational: job dissatisfaction, behavioural problems, production turn over, increased absenteeism, increased accidents, and lower productivity.

Recommendations

To alleviate the negative consequences of stress more effort on the part of policy makers, practitioners, and organizational management envisaged. The author, thus here by making a few efforts to suggest some effective measures that can alleviate the job stress that leads to their better

adjustment within the organization. It can be detailed as follows:

Action

"Stress Management Interventions"

Rationale

Many situational observations of employee employer interaction identified within the organization can lead to stress at work. These include:

- Poor relationships with co-workers
- unsupportive superiors
- Fear towards management and uncertainty
- Lack of consultation and communication
- Too much to do
- Too much pressure, unrealistic deadlines
- Work that is too difficult
- Lack of control over the way the work is done
- Poor working arrangements
- Being in the wrong job
- Feeling undervalued on compensation
- Feeling Job difficulty
- Insecurity and the threat of unemployment
- Skill and capability mismatch
- Inadequate authority

To reduce the job stress at work the research suggests a stress management programme at organisational level.

Objective

Organize Stress Management interventions that focus on newly promoted managers to alleviate the job stress.

Task

Organize ***Stress Management training programs*** with specific human resource development goals in consultation with Senior Management.

Prerequisites

Successful Stress Management training programs requires the involvement and support of top officials. It depends upon a clear plan, ongoing evaluations of progress, and clear goals for measuring success.

Stress management Strategies:

1. Take adequate steps to redesign jobs, which are taxing to employees' abilities and capacities.
2. To reduce the workload role slimming and role adjustment process should be resorted to.

3. Encourage the cross-functional and interdepartmental work arrangements to reduce work related stress among low performers and low achievers.
4. Facilitate role enlargement, role linkage and role enrichment to manage role isolation, self-role distance and role erosion.
5. Adequate role clarification to be made whenever necessary to eliminate role ambiguity.
6. Introduce more job oriented training programs, which improve manager's skill and their confidence to take up new work effectively.
7. Do concentrate on career planning to manage role stagnation.
8. Encourage open channel of communication to deal work related stress.
9. Let the employee clear about hard work related reward and smart work related reward.
10. Adequate resources i.e., material, technical and human, should be extended to make employee feel safe and secure to perform their work effectively.
11. Undertake stress audit at all levels in the organization to identify stress area improving conditions of job and alleviating job stress.
12. Ensure justified use of grievance handling procedures to win trust and confidence of employees and reduce their anxiety and tension related to job related problems.
13. Encourage involvement of leaders and personnel at various levels in all phases of strategic interventions to ensure successful and long-standing interventions.
14. Formulate HRD interventions and individual stress alleviation program.
15. Introduce 'Pranayam' (Brain Stilling and control of Vital Force) as a holistic managerial strategy to deal with occupational strategy.
16. Provide counseling on work related and personnel problems and support from a team of welfare health and counseling staff.
17. Attractive system of reward and recognition of good work.
18. Ensure an organizational climate with career planning and career growth to ensure further the retention of talented employees.
19. Effective follow up should be made to different leave category absentee employees.

20. Organization should organize regular check up and those found suffering from very high stress should be subjected to stress management process.
21. Cut back excessive hours, which directly affect the employee's physical fitness.
22. Develop realistic self-concept among employees that is neither inflated nor deflated.
23. Encourage management to practice proactive approaches rather than reactive approaches as a strategic step.

CONCLUSION

The productivity of the work force is the most decisive factor as far as the success of an organization is concerned. The productivity in turn is dependant on the psychosocial well being of the employees. In an age of highly dynamic and competitive world, man is exposed to all kinds of stressors that can affect him on all realms of life. The growing importance of interventional strategies is felt more at organisational level. This particular research was intended to study the impact of occupational stress on Public and private Sector industrial managers. Although certain limitations were met with the study, every effort has been made to make it much comprehensive. The author expects to draw attention from policy makers and men of eminence in the related fields to resume further research.

References and Bibliography

1. Beehr, T.A. and Newman, J.E. (1978). "Job Stress, employ Health and Organisational Effectiveness- A fact analysis model and literature reviews." *Personal Psychology*, 31, 665-669.
2. Brook (1973). 'A Mental Stress at Work.' *The Practitioner*, Vol210, Number 1258, 500-506.
3. Caplan RD, Cobbs S, French TRP, Van Harrison, R, Pinneau S R (1975). "Job Demand and Work Health." Cincinnati OH: National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, Publication, 75-168.
4. Caplan, R.D., & Jones, K.W. (1975). "Effects of work load, role ambiguity, and type A personality on anxiety, Depression, and heart rate." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 713-719.
5. Chermis, C. (1980). "Staff burnout: Job stress in human service." Beverly Hills: Sage.
6. Cooper C.L. (1981). *The Stress Check: Coping with the Stress of Life and Work*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
7. Dewe P.E. (1993). *The Transactional Model of Stress: Some Implications for stress management programme. Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resource*. 1903.
8. Dewe, P.J. (1989). "Examining the nature of work stress: Individual evaluations of stressful experiences and coping." *Journal of Human relations*, 42 (11, 993-1013.
9. French (1993). Cited in C.L. Cooper and J. Marshall (1977). "Understanding Executive Stress." PBI.
10. Ganster D.C., (1989). Worker Control and Well Being: A Review of Research in the Workplace. In *Job Control and Worker Health* Edn. S.L. Santer J.J. C.L Cooper, 3-23. New York: Wiley.
11. Hamner, W and Tusi., H. (1974). Relationship of Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity to Job Involvement Measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 497-499.
12. Homes, T.H. and Rahe R.H., (1967). The Social Readjustment Rating Scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 11, 213-218.
13. Israel, B A., Shurman S.J., and House J. S. (1989). Action Research on Occupational Stress: Involving Workers as Researchers. *International Journal of Health Services*, 19, 135-155.
14. Ivancevich, J.M. and Matteson, M.T. (1980). "Stress and Work: A Managerial Perspective." Scottforesman & Co., Glenview Illinois.
15. Ivancevich, J.M., Matteson, M.T. (1980). "Stress and Work," Glenov IL Scot Foresman.
16. Ivancevich, J.M., Matteson, M.T. and Preston. (1982). "Occupational Stress: Type A behaviour and physical well being." *A.M.J.*, 25, 2, 373-391.
17. Jick T D and Payne R (1980). "Stress at Work" *Exchange: The Organisational Behaviour Teaching Journal*. 5: 50-55.
18. Jick, T.D. and Payne, R. (1980) 'Stress at Work' *Exchange: The Organisational Behaviour Teaching Journal*. 5: 50-55.
19. Jones J.W. and Boye M.W. (1992) Job Stress and Employee Counter Productivity. In. J.
20. Kagan, A. R. and Levi, L. (1974) Health and Environment Psychological Stimuli: A Review. *Social Science Medicine*, 8 (5).

-
21. Kahn et.al. (1964). "Organisational Stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity." Wiley, New York.
 22. Karessek R.A., Gardell, B., Lindel J (1987). "Work and Non Work Correlates of illness and Behaviour in Male and Female Swedish White Scholar Workers," *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 8., 187-207.
 23. Karessek R.A., Theorell. T. (1990). *Healthy Work*. New York. Basic Books.
 24. Katz D and Kahn R.L (1978). *The Social Psychology of Organization*,
 25. Kawakami., N., Arakis S. and Kawashima M. (1990). Effect of Job Stress on Occurrence of Major Depression in Japanese Industry – A Case Control Study Nested in a Cohort Study. *Journal of Occupational Medicine*, 32, 722-725.
 26. Lazarus R S and S Folkman (1966) *Psychological Stress and the Coping Process*. NY, McGraw Hill.
 27. Lazarus R S and S Folkman (1984) "Stress Appraisal and Coping." New York, Springer.
 28. Levine S., Scrtch N.A (1970). "Social Stress," Aldine Chicago.IL.
 29. Miles Robert H. and W.D. Perreault (1976). "Organizational Role Conflict: Its Antecedents and Consequences," *Organisational, Behavioural and Human Performance*, 17, 25-35.
 30. McGrath J.E. (1976). "Stress and Behaviour in Organization." In *Hand Book of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Dunnet. MD (ed) Chicago: Rand and Mc Nally College Publishing.
 31. McGrath J.E. (1976). "Stress and Behaviour in Organization." In *Hand Book of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Dunnet. MD (ed) Chicago: Rand and Mc Nally College Publishing.
 32. Portello, J.Y. and Long, B.C. (2000). "Appraisals and Coping with work place interpersonal Stress: A model for women managers." *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, Vol.48, No.2, pp.144-56.
 33. Quick J., Murphy, L.L. Hurrell J., and Orman, D. (1999). *The Value of Work, The Risk of Distress, and the power of Prevention*. Quick J., Murphy, L.L. Hurrell J. jr (eds) *Stress and Well Being at Work*; Washington DC. *American Psychological Association*.
 34. Ross Rendall and Altamaier. (1984). "Intervention in Occupational Stress." Sage Publications, London.
 35. Schuler (1980). "Defenition and Conceptualisation of Stress in Organization, Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance, 25, 184-215.
 36. Schuler (1988). *Stress On The Job* "News Week" (April 25) 40-45.
 37. Selye, H. (1936). "A syndrome produced by diverse noxious agents." *Nature*, 138:32.
 38. Selye, H. (1974). "Stress without Distress." Harper and Row Publications, U.S.A.
 39. Selye, Hans. (1978). "The general adaptation syndrome and the disease of adaptation." *Journal of clinical endocrinology*.
 40. Shailendra Singh, (1990). "Executive under stress- Exploration in the Structure and Dynamics." Classical Publishing Co., New Delhi.
 41. Shailendra Singh. (1990). "Organisational Stress and Executive Behaviour." *Sreeram Centre for Industrial Relation and Human Resources*, New Delhi.
 42. Spector R. E. (1986). *Perceived Control By Employees: A Meta Analysis of Studies Concerning Anatomy and Participation at Work: Human Relations*, 39, 1005-1016.
 43. Sutherland V J and Cooper C L (1990). 'Understanding Stress: A Psychological perspective for Health Professionals.' Chapman and Hall London.
 44. Zubin J and Spring B (1977). *Vulnerability: A new Ways of Schizophrenia*. *Journal of Psychology* 86, p 103-123.