

Organizational Role Stress and Work Life Balance among Manufacturing and Service Sector Employees: A Comparative Study

Abstract

The purpose of the present study was to explore whether any relationship between Organizational Role Stress and work life balance and also to compare employees of manufacturing and employee of service sector in term of Organizational Role Stress and work life balance. The total sample of 210 comprised of 101 employees from manufacturing and 109 from service sector around Vadodara, Gujarat, India taken for present study. In today's world business environment is changing rapidly so that Employees have work life balance and Organizational Role Stress problems. On applying Product Movement Correlation to data, finds that there is significant negative correlation between Organizational Role Stress and work life balance that means employees who have higher Organizational Role Stress; they have lower work life balance. On applying t-test result shows that Employees of manufacturing sector have more work life balance than employees of service sector. Employees of service sector have more Organizational Role Stress problem than employees of manufacturing sector. Employees, who have more than five years experience, have more work life balance and less . Organizational Role Stress problem than employee who have one year and less than one year work experience.

Keywords: Organizational Role Stress, Wok life balance, Service sector and manufacturing sector

Introduction

Stress has become a very common phenomenon of routine life, and an unavoidable consequence of the ways in which society has changed. Stress is a natural and an unavoidable future of life experienced at one time or another. Though stress is therefore a common feature in everybody's life, it could be of different nature among the vast majority of those engaged in work .Stress can be defined "as a process in which environmental demands strain an organism's adaptive capacity, resulting in both psychological as well as biological changes that could place a person at risk for illness". Things that cause us stress are called stressors. Many events can be thought as stressors. These include disasters, life crises, life changes and daily hassles. This change has occurred in terms of science and technology, industrial growth, urbanization, modernization, and automation on one hand; and an expanding population, unemployment, and stress on the other. The term "stress" was first used by Selye (1936) in the literature on life sciences, describing 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." Stress can also be defined as an adverse reaction that people experience when external demands exceed their internal capabilities (Waters & Ussery, 2007).

Organizations are an important source of stress, and employees' workloads and professional deadlines have increased manifold. These advancements have created stress among employees in the form of occupational stress, Sauter, Lim, and Murphy (1996) define 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. 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). Different studies have classified occupational role stressors, organizational structure, job characteristics, professional relationships, career

**Rajput Kiransinh
Natwarsinh**
Teaching Assistant
Dept of Psychology,
Faculty of Education
and Psychology,
The M.S. University of
Baroda, Vadodara

development, and work-versus-family conflict (see Burke, 1993). Cooper and Marshall (1976) add to this list factors intrinsic to a job, the management's role, and professional achievements. Based on these complexities, stressors can be grouped into two main categories: (i) job-related stressors, and (ii) individual-related stressors.

Stress is measured using a number of instruments. Our focus, however, is Organizational Role Stress (ORS), which measures total role stress. We use Pareek's (1983) scale, which evaluates respondents' quantum of stress in terms of total ORS scores. It also measures the intensity of the following ten role stressors that contribute to the total ORS score:

1. Inter-role distance (IRD): Conflict between organizational and no organizational roles.
 2. Role stagnation (RS): The feeling of being "stuck" in the same role.
 3. Role expectation conflict (REC): Conflicting expectations and demands between different role senders.
 4. Role erosion (RE): The feeling that functions that should belong to the respondent's role are being transformed/performed or shared by others.
 5. Role overload (RO): The feeling that more is expected from the role than the respondent can cope with.
 6. Role isolation (RI): Lack of linkages between the respondent's role and that of other roles in the organization.
 7. Personal inadequacy (PI): Inadequate knowledge, skills, or preparation for a respondent to be effective in a particular role.
 8. Self-role distance (SRD): Conflict between the respondent's values/self-concepts and the requirements of his or her organizational role.
 9. Role ambiguity (RA): Lack of clarity about others' expectations of the respondent's role, or lack of feedback on how others perceive the respondent's performance.
 10. Resource inadequacy (RIn): No availability of resources needed for effective role performance.
- Work –Life Balance (WLB) is a term that refers to the desire on the part of both employees and employers to achieve a balance between workplace obligations and personal responsibilities. Work Life Conflict (WLC) occurs when the cumulative demands of work and non-work roles are incompatible in some respect so that participation in one role is made more difficult by participation in the other. Sometimes described as having too much to do and too little time to do it, role overload is a term that is sometimes used as a means of examining the conditions that give rise to WLC.

WLC has three components;

- Role overload.
- Work to family interference (i.e., long work hours limits an employee's ability to participate in family roles) ; and
- Family interferes with work (i.e., family demands prevent attendance at work).

Role overload is caused by a convergence of pressures and conditions found both in the work place and in a person's private life. At work, the combination of high job pressure and low control over the job causes workers to feel overloaded. When these conditions are combined with stressors from the home and Family situation (such as caring for children or aging relatives), this can create work family conflict, especially when the social supports are absent. Much early work in Canada, sponsored by Health Canada, has focused on understanding mental health, the origins of stress and the health consequences of unmanaged strain. The predominant model for understanding the sources of stress is the Demands/Control Model. This model shows that high pressure plus low control at work contribute to strain, particularly when Combined with home stress and the absence of social support.

Work-family conflict occurs when the responsibilities of work and family interfere with one another. For example, work –family conflict occurs when a parent must leave work to attend to sick child, or when an employee brings work home to complete during family time. Adapting work demands to family responsibilities has been referred to as accomodation. Individuals, who give the highest priority to family responsibilities, while work and other outside interests remain secondary, are said to be the most accommodative. Those who are the most non accommodative are those whose work and career interests are always a higher priority than family responsibilities. In the past, the most accommodative individuals were the wives and mothers in traditional families who assumed responsibility for the family needs; the most non accommodative were career-oriented male executives who focused their interests and attention almost exclusively on work. The trend toward greater accommodation in our society on the part of husbands is indicated by the number of successful managers who, at mid-career, reject advancement opportunities because their new responsibilities would interfere with family commitments. Employment gaps by women, especially for purposes of child rearing, are generally perceived as acceptable career definitions that do not seriously damage their career advancement. An investigation of employment gaps among masters of business administration graduates revealed that discontinuous employment histories were negatively associated with future income and satisfaction for men but not as much for women. While an employment gap for women who return to work reduces their income 9 percent below what it would have been with continuous employment, a corresponding gap for men reduces their income by 21 percent. Some of the innovative ways women become reincorporated in the work force include job sharing, permanent part –time employment, flexible work hours, work–at–home programs, relocation assistance for the spouse of a transferred employee, child care and day care assistance, time management and stress management workshops, and employee assistance programs.

Work –Family Conflict

Sharma et al. (2001) has reported that the Indian Society was characteristic by a dualistic family role system where the men and women had clearly defined but complementary roles. The male was the provider while the female was the homemaker. During the last five decades there has been a drastic change in the role status of the Indian Women. She has moved out of the restricted realms of her home and is now sharing the economic burden of the family. However, there has been no or only a marginal change in the role of the Indian male and his contributions to the household chores even if he has a working partner, is at the best only ritualistic. Further, as the women leave their traditional role and take up a man's job they have to face greater stress at the work place as they remain dependent on men's acceptance. As coping with stress whether physical or psychological does have a detrimental effect on health, the working women who have added the burden of a job to their household chores, are bound to suffer mentally as well as physical. It has been found that gender related unequal division of domestic duties when coupled with a job, may not result in more severe psychological or subjective health impairments.

Objectives

- 1) To study whether there is any significant correlation between Organizational Role Stress and work life balance.
- 2) To study the effect of organizational types (Manufacturing and service sector) on Organizational Role Stress.
- 3) To study the effect of work experience on Organizational Role Stress.
- 4) To study the effect of organizational types (Manufacturing and service sector) on work life balance.
- 5) To study the effect of work experience on organizational work life balance.

Hypotheses

- 1) There will be significant Negative correlation between Organizational Role Stress and work life balance.
- 2) There will be significant effect of organizational types (Manufacturing and service sector) on Organizational Role Stress.
- 3) There will be significant effect of work experience on Organizational Role Stress.
- 4) There will be significant effect of organizational types (Manufacturing and service sector) on organizational work life balance.
- 5) There will be significant effect of work experience on organizational work life balance.

Method**Samples**

The total sample of 210 comprised of 101 employees from manufacturing and 109 from service sector around Vadodara, Gujarat, India taken for present study. The sample consists of 72.7% males and 27.3% of females. Almost 85% of the employees reported that they work up to 8 hours when only 15% of them reported working more than eight hours.

Researcher has taken 80% male subjects and 20% female subjects.

Measures**Organizational Role Stress**

Pareek's (1983) developed the Organizational Role Stress Scale. ORS is measured on a five-point Likert scale with values ranging from 0 to 4. The scale is used to investigate the ORS arising from ten different role stressors. The Cronbach's alpha values of the ORS scale is 0.932, indicating that the scale are highly reliable for this particular study. The Cronbach's alpha values for the different dimensions of ORS, showing that all the stressors, apart from SRD, have a high Cronbach's alpha value.

Work / life balance (WLB)

Gen Fishers (2001) developed the work life balance index, and these measures are extending to which ones personal life is enhanced by work (or) vice versa. The scale consists of 16 items each having five alternatives such as Never, Rarely, sometimes, often, very often, out of total items 4 are "True keyed" and the remaining 12 are "false key" the responses were weighted from 5 to 1 for "Never" though "very often" for true keyed and in the reverse order for the false keyed items. The scale identifies work life balance such as work – Interference with personal life (WIPL), Persona life– Interference with work (PLIW), Work/personal life enhancement (WPLE). The reliability index ascertained by the authors using split half (odd– even items) method, and "Cronbach" alpha. Coefficient for the scale was found to be 0.89, 0.82 and 0.75 respectively. The scale was also found to be highly valid.

Procedure

At the outset, permission was taken from the organizations about collecting data from their employees. Then trained investigators contacted the respondents, explained the objective and personally administered the questionnaires.

Analysis Strategies

First of all researcher has coded the data. Later on the data was duplicated into the program called "Statistical Package for Social Science" (SPSS). The reverse items and the missing values were re-coded. After the coding has done specific commands were applied from the program. Pearson Product Moment correlation Method was used to study correlation between Organizational Role Stress and work life balance. T-Test also used to study effect of organizational types (Manufacturing and service sector) on Organizational Role Stress and work life balance. One- way ANOVA used to study effect of work experience on Organizational Role Stress and Work life Balance.

Results and Discussion

In order to study correlation among the entire dimension of Organizational Role Stress and citizenship behaviour, counterproductive work behaviour, and emotional labour and perceived illegitimate task product movement correlation test was done. The table is below:

Table-1
Correlation between Organizational stress and Work-Life Balance

Dimensions	Work-Interferes with personal life	Personal life interferes with work	Work / personal Life enhancement
Role stagnation (RS)	.459**	.359**	.091
Role expectation conflict (REC)	.446**	.343**	-.476**
Role erosion (RE)	.512**	-.377**	-.502**
Role overload (RO)	.766**	.369**	-.490**
Role isolation (RI)	.480**	-.386**	.487**
Personal inadequacy (PI)	-.088	-.142*	.082
Self-role distance (SRD)	.276**	.330**	-.263**
Role ambiguity (RA)	-.369**	.254**	.131
Resource inadequacy (RIn)	.257**	.281**	.231*
ORS	.361**	.371**	.287**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2 – tailed)

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2 – tailed)

The above table reveals the positive and negative coefficient values indicate that all the stressors are directly related to work life balance dimensions. As the professionals have more stress, their work interferes with personal life and personal life –interferes with work, tends to become more dominant. “Role over load” (.766) stresses highly but it is positively correlated to work interferes with personal life and the stressor Role erosion (.512) stresses highly but it is positively correlated to personal life –interferes with work to greater level. There is significant negative correlation between Organizational Role Stress (ORS) and Work – Interference with personal life (WIPL) ($r = .361$, $p > 0.01$). There is significant positive correlation between Organizational Role Stress (ORS) and Personal life– Interference with work (PLIW) ($r = .371$, $p > 0.01$) There is significant positive correlation between Organizational Role Stress (ORS) and Work/personal life enhancement (WPLE) ($r = -.287$, $p > 0.01$). The present investigation is also confirmed with the results of Williams and Alliger (1994). Work interferes with family could be achieved by family supportive policies. More flexible work schedules produce positive benefits for employees including a reduction in psychological strain. Pierce and New storm (1983). A stress management – training

program may provide individuals with some awareness of stressors, but some environmental stressors, may not be amenable to change by the individual and require a more systemizing management Peterson (1993). Thangarathinam et al. trainees who have not achieved work life balance reported higher amount of stress. Nonwork pressure includes pressures on the home front due to job stress. Another commonly seen effect is that due to careers especially for women. The dual career family model may be a source of stress for men as well. The amount of time they are able to devote to their jobs. The degree of mobility they have the acceptance of transefer changes if the wife is also working. (Cart wright and Cooper, 1997). The latest European Surveys, due in large part to its negative consequences, both physical and mental in the area of work (Paolie & Merllie, 2001). There is some research evidence that a net working strategy may be able to people cope better with job stress (Mclean) and be more effective (Kotter.1982) and successful (Luthans et al 1985). In order to see difference in Organizational Role Stress and Work Life Balance across different organizations namely Service and Manufacture sector t-Test was done and result are below.

Table-2
Study effect of Organizational types on Organizational stress and Work-Life Balance.

Variable	Manufacturing (Mean & SD)	Service (Mean & SD)	t- value	Sig.
Role stagnation (RS)	1.14 (0.91)	3.17 (1.16)	3.10	0.00
Role expectation conflict (REC)	1.54 (0.43)	2.94 (0.56)	2.89	0.00
Role erosion (RE)	1.73 (0.72)	2.30 (0.46)	2.90	0.00
Role overload (RO)	2.82 (0.83)	5.51 (0.04)	4.10	0.00
Role isolation (RI)	1.16 (0.21)	1.98 (0.04)	0.87	0.78
Personal inadequacy (PI)	1.43 (0.96)	3.92 (0.88)	3.45	0.00
Self-role distance (SRD)	1.08 (0.94)	2.84 (0.25)	2.91	0.00
Role ambiguity (RA)	1.09 (0.00)	1.00 (0.16)	0.14	0.90

Resource inadequacy (RIn)	1.79 (0.94)	3.55 (0.29)	2.98	0.00
Work-Interferes with personal life	11.05 (2.11)	13.87 (2.19)	4.71	0.00
Work / personal Life	10.81 (1.19)	12.84 (1.79)	3.05	0.00
Work / personal Life enhancement	14.36 (2.11)	11.11 (1.23)	3.14	0.00

t-test of all dimension of organization role stress indicating a significant difference between service and Manufacture sector expected Role ambiguity (RA) and Role isolation (RI). t-test of Role overload (RO) indicating a significantly difference between service and Manufacture sector($t=4.10$, $p>0.01$). t-Test of Work-Interferes with personal life indicating a significantly difference between service and Manufacture sector($t=4.71$, $p>0.01$). t-Test of Personal life Interferes with work indicating a significantly difference between service and Manufacture sector($t=3.05$, $p>0.01$). t-Test of Work / personal Life enhancement indicating a significantly difference between service and Manufacture sector($t=3.14$, $p>0.01$). t-Test of Role stagnation (RS) indicating a significantly difference between service and Manufacture sector($t=3.10$, $p>0.01$). t-Test value of Personal inadequacy (PI) significantly difference

between service and Manufacture sector($t=3.45$, $p>0.01$). There is significant deference between employees of manufacture and Employees of service sector in term of Work Life Balance. There is significant deference between employees of manufacture and Employees of service sector in term of Organizational Role Stress expected two dimension of ORS namely Role ambiguity (RA) and Role isolation (RI).

In order to study the effect of years of experience in organization one-way ANOVA was used. In order to know the degree to which three types of experience difference further analysis can be done. This will give a special idea about three types of experience which differ or do not differ with each in terms of Organizational Role Stress and Work Life Balance. For this purpose Tucky HSD test was used. The result is given below:

Table-3
Study effect of employee experiences on Organizational stress and Work-Life Balance.

Variable	0 To 1 Year Mean(Sd)	1 To 5 Years Mean(Sd)	5 And More Than 5 years Mean(Sd)	F Value	Sig.
Role stagnation (RS)	2.03a (0.17)	1.04b (0.79)	1.37b (0.41)	3.90	0.00
Role expectation conflict (REC)	3.12a (0.32)	2.14ab (0.62)	1.51b (0.61)	3.96	0.00
Role erosion (RE)	2.63a (0.39)	1.93ab (0.45)	1.40b (0.28)	4.02	0.00
Role overload (RO)	3.88a (0.70)	2.06b (0.80)	2.00b (0.38)	3.60	0.00
Role isolation (RI)	2.78a (1.31)	1.85ab (1.66)	1.16b (0.95)	3.71	0.00
Personal inadequacy (PI)	3.63a (1.08)	2.42b (1.39)	1.14c (0.45)	3.73	0.00
Self-role distance (SRD)	3.43a (1.24)	1.81ab (0.50)	1.15b (0.87)	4.14	0.00
Role ambiguity (RA)	3.63a (0.87)	2.84ab (0.49)	2.11b (0.41)	3.61	0.00
Resource inadequacy (RIn)	3.55a (0.43)	1.96b (0.19)	1.10b (0.40)	4.67	0.00
Work-Interferes with personal life	15.18a (1.98)	12.96b (1.39)	10.07b (1.22)	5.16	0.00
Personal life interferes with work	13.18a (2.18)	11.78b (2.01)	11.88b (1.31)	3.69	0.00
Work / personal Life enhancement	11.78a (2.38)	12.98b (1.66)	13.77b (1.52)	5.04	0.00

The F- ratio of Organizational Role Stress and Work Life Balance indicating a significant difference among 0 to 1 year, 1 to 5 years and 5 and more than 5 years ($P<0.00$). Thus, it can be said that employees of three types of experience (0 to 1 year, 1 to 5 years, and 5 and more than 5 years) differ significantly in term of Organizational Role Stress and Work Life

Balance. Employees with 0 to 1 year experience have more problem of work life balance than employees with 5 and more than 5 years. Employees with 0 to 1 year experience have more Organizational Role Stress than employees with 5 and more than 5 years.

Anthology : The Research**Conclusion**

Employees of service sector have more Organizational Role Stress problem than employees of manufacturing sector. Employees, who have more than five years experience, have more work life balance and less Organizational Role Stress problem than employee who have one year and less than one year work experience. There is significant negative correlation between Organizational Role Stress and work life balance that means employees who have higher Organizational Role Stress; they have lower work life balance. Employees of manufacturing sector have more Work Life Balance than employees of Service sector.

Implication of the Study

This study, to some extent has created awareness about the problem of Organizational Role Stress. It is obvious from the present investigation that Organizational Role Stress is significantly explained by work life balance dimensions and demographic factors. This study applies on Service sector to reduce Organizational Role Stress and enhance more Work life Balance.

References

1. 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.*
2. Burke, R. J. (1993). *Toward an understanding of psychological burnout among police officers. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 8(3), 425–438.*
3. Cart Wright and Cooper (1997). *Organizational Stress; A Review and Critique of Theory, Research and applications, Sage Publications. Inc.*
4. 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.*
5. Fisher, G. (2001). *Work/personal life balance: A construct development study. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Bowling Green State University, Ohio.*
6. Pareek, U. (1983). *Role stress scale: ORS scales booklet, answer sheet, and manual. Ahmadabad: Naveen Publications.*
7. Peterson D. (1993). *Measuring Change, a Psychometric Approach to Evaluating Training Outcomes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Francisco.*
8. 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.*
9. Selye, H. (1936). *A syndrome produced by diverse noxious agents. Nature, 138, 32–35.*
10. Sharma, N., Yadava A. (2001). *Mental Health of women in relation to job stress. Journal of personality & clinical studies. Vol.17, No.1, pp.41-44.*
11. Waters, J. A., & Ussery, W. (2007). *Police stress: History, contributing factors, symptoms, and interventions. Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, 30(2), 169–188.*