



A Study on Organisational Role Stress of Teachers of Different Age Groups in Management Education Institutions of Saurashtra Region

Dr. K. J. Thankachan

Principal

Christ Institute of Management, Rajkot

Abstract

The life in 21st century is radically different from the lives experienced by our parents and grandparents in many respects. For instance, the rapid advances in technology have made it convenient for us for maintaining constant connection with our jobs and work; courtesy of the prompt communication offered by various devices. The roles which people play in an organisation are also changing with these changes in the environment. No individual is found to be stress-free. Employees on a regular basis face problems like depression, anxiety and issues of work-life balance. Education sector is no different from other corporates in 21st century. The changes in roles of academicians have brought a lot of stress for them. An academician needs to do a lot in addition to imparting knowledge to the students in the current era.

In view of all these factors, the present research strives to study organisational role stress of academicians in management institutions from various angles. The area of this study is restricted to Saurashtra Region only.

Keywords: Organisational Role Stress, Academicians, Management Education, Age Groups

Introduction

Management education has been now seen as a must have for almost all the executives as the roles are enlarged. Every employee is supposed to apply management concepts in their day today working. Management training is one amongst those which got a new facet with this shifting time; nevertheless the antiquity of management schooling is not too new in this part of the world. There are numerous management colleges in India. The demand for management education resulted in mushrooming growth of management education sector. The increase in number of institutes created demanded for qualified faculties, which were not growing as the number of institutes was growing; resulting in less experienced faculties in most of the colleges. Since past few years the situation has turned around, now the management colleges are filing for closing, thus creating unemployment for faculties who were hired at peak times. And even those which are running their institutes are working on cost cutting measures because the numbers of students enrolled are going down year on year. Overall trend towards post graduate management education is going down. The demands on MBA courses have taken them to a crossroads at which they have to reconsider their value proposition. Becket and Brookes (2005) point to a group of factors which require concerns over quality:

- Students have become more demanding
- Greater pressure to work with lesser resources
- Added flexibility for educational provision at both UG and PG levels
- Increased collective provision between institutions

In addition to facilitating increased financial resources, ensuring quality education demands structural and institutional reforms.

So many changes in the industry have made it difficult for the institutes to sustain in market. These changes in the industry have made the situations worse for faculties. For quality education an institute needs adequate number of faculties, good quality of faculties who have a research orientation. These faculties also need to be developed by regular faculty development programs. Faculties need to be encouraged for consultancy and extension work. All these features are missing in most of the management institutes these days. Faculties in these institutes are all in one employees; teaching, marketing, administrative work, research work, event management to name a few are all a part of role of faculties in any management institute. This scenario is not limited to few states of India, it can be seen almost everywhere. This multitasking has contributed to the increased level of stress faced by faculties.

Role stress is defined as the stress felt or caused due to one's role in the organisation. It can be easily seen and heard by people in general that the person feels stressed because of his role in the organisation. It may be because of the conflicting demands of one's role or lack of growth opportunities in one's role or unclear expectations of others from one's role or may be too much work to do in one's role. All these stresses originate from the role which one plays in organisation. Sometimes personal values may be in contradiction with the demands of role resulting in inter-role distance. One may feel stressed if enough opportunities to use one's knowledge and skills are not available in one's role. Reason may be anyone but the result is role stress which has a negative effect on a person's personal as well as professional life.

A role is defined as a set of purposes, that a person performs according to the demands of the major members of a social system, and his own anticipations about the position that he occupies in it. Role space and role set are the two important role systems related to an individual.

Role Space: Each individual reside in and plays many roles. Role space is created by different status or roles played by an individual during his/her life time like son/daughter, husband/wife, father/mother, member of various social institutions, a designated person in his/her work place etc. 'Self' is at the centre of the role space. Role space, thus, can be explained as "the dynamic interrelationship both between the self and the numerous roles that an individual occupies, and amongst these roles." It is the dynamic relationship between the various roles a person occupies and his self. It had three main variables: self, the role under question, and the other roles he occupies (Pareek, Purohit, 2011). Any conflict among these is referred to as role space conflict and stress. These conflicts may take several forms:

- i. **Self-Role Distance (SRD):** A person feels self-role distance when his/her role goes against self-concept. The incongruity between the person and his/her job is the main cause of this conflict.
- ii. **Intra-role Conflict:** The socialisation and identification with other important stakeholders of the society where he/she lives in teach him/her that how to develop expectations(functions). There are chances that likely that he/she finds a definite incompatibility between the diverse expectations (functions) of his role.
- iii. **Role Stagnation (RS):** This is a situation resulted out of the consequence of the space between the expectation to grow big out the previous role and to engage a new role successfully. Thus role stagnation is a feeling of being jammed in the same role.
- iv. **Inter-Role Distance (IRD):** When there is a conflict between organisational and non-organizational roles IRD experience will be experienced.

Role Set: The role set consists of important persons who have varying expectations from the role that an individual occupies (Pareek, Purohit, 2011). The individual's role in the organization is defined by the outlooks of others, noteworthy roles, and those of the individual himself/herself. The role set is "the pattern of relationship between the role being considered and other roles".

- v. **Role Ambiguity (RA):** It refers to the lack of clarity about the expectations of the role which may rise out of insufficiency of information available to a role occupant or his non-understanding of the facts available to him. It may exist with respect to relation to activities, accountabilities, personal styles, and norms.
- vi. **Role Expectation Conflict (REC):** This type of stress is generated by different expectations or demands by different role senders about the same role and occupant's doubt as to whom to please.
- vii. **Role Overload (RO):** The role overload is experienced when the role occupant realises that there are a large number of demands from the important roles in his/her role set.
- viii. **Role Erosion (RE):** This stress happens when the role occupant feels that some functions which should properly belong to his / her role are reassigned to / or performed by some other role.
- ix. **Resource Inadequacy (RI):** This stress is experienced when the resources required by the role occupant for performing his role effectively are not available. Resources may include finances, information, material or facilities.
- x. **Personal Inadequacy (PI):** This type of role stress arises when the role occupant feels that he/she does not have the important skills and training for successfully performing the purposes expected from his/her role.
- xi. **Role Isolation (RI):** This type of role stress refers to the mental detachment of the occupant's role from other roles in the same role set. Role isolation (RI) is characterized

by the feelings that others do not reach out easily, indicative of the absence of strong relations of one's role with other roles. This can be geographical or systematic.

Review of Literature

Rashid & Talib (2013) tried to Model a Relationship between Role Stress & Locus of Control. The correlation (r) between ORS and Internal locus of control was -0.367 and it was significant at 0.05 level. For externality (O), $r = -0.139$. This correlation was not significant. In the case of externality (C), $r = 0.246$ and this correlation is positive and significant at 0.09 level. This indicated that as externality increased, stress also increased. Sen (2013) studied Occupational role stress to evaluate occupational role stress and identify the major stressors in Indian Public Sector banks. Research revealed moderately high level of ORS. Inter-role distance was found to be highest factor among all followed by role stagnation and role erosion. Kavitha (2012) conducted an empirical study on organisational role stress among college faculties. The most important role stress factor was found to be self-role distance followed by role stagnation and role ambiguity. The male faculties were highly stressful than the female faculties. Kavitha, Kavitha & Arulmurugan (2012) in their study found that resource inadequacy was the most potent stressor followed by role overload and personal inadequacy. The analyses on the basis of marital status of the respondents reported significant difference between the married and unmarried groups on organisational role stress. Analysis of data on the basis of the educational standard of the respondents reported significant difference only on the count of personal inadequacy. Rajarajeswari (2010) studied Role Stress among the Aided and Self-financing College Teachers. Results revealed that role stress among self-financing teachers was higher as compared to aided college teachers. The important discriminant role stress factors among the two group of teachers were role conflict and role overload. This implied that self-financing institutions were imposing more work load on the teaching faculties at a minimum pay. Santora (2010) in a research brief on "Dual Family Earners: Do Role Overload and Stress Treat Them as Equals?" said that family demands were a stronger predictor of role overload for women than men. Conversely, work demands were a stronger predictor of role overload for men than women. Ongori & Agolla (2008) found that most of the employees feel that the major sources of stress are: PMS implementation, work overload, low/inadequate salary, inadequate resources, high responsibility, and rigid/authoritative system. Tarafdar (2007) studied The Impact of Techno stress on Role Stress and Productivity. They found that techno stress is positively correlated to role stress. The paper also demonstrated that productivity and techno stress are inversely related.

Objectives

- To study the various dimensions of organisational role stress i.e. Inter role distance (IRD), Role stagnation (RS), Role expectation conflict (REC), Role erosion (RE), Role overload (RO), Role isolation (RI), Personal inadequacy (PI), Self-role distance (SRD), Role ambiguity (RA), Resource inadequacy (RI_n) of faculty members in Management Education Institutions of Saurashtra Region.
- To compare the various dimensions of organisational role stress between faculty members of different age groups in Management Education Institutions of Saurashtra Region.

Research Methodology

Field of Study

Saurashtra Region of the state of Gujarat is the field of study. 310 out of 325 Questionnaires distributed faculties of management institutions are found useful for the current study.

Data Collection

The data on subject matter have been collected from the faculty members with the help of structured questionnaire which has two important parts. The first part covers the demographic details about the faculties whereas the second part of the questionnaire covers the organisational role stress dimensions. The scale used is Organisational Role Stress scale taken from Training Instruments in HRD and OD authored by Pareek & Purohit (2011), Tata McGraw Hill Publications. The scale consists of 50 items. The respondents are required to rate all the items on a five point Likert scale from 0 to 4. The reliability of the scale was tested with the help of SPSS version 17. Cronbach's alpha was calculated. It was, so we can conclude that the instrument used is highly reliable.

Hypotheses

Following are the hypotheses to be tested to fulfil the objectives:

1. There is no significant difference among the organisational role stress of academicians of different age groups (22-35, 35-45, >45 yrs.)
2. There is no significant difference among the Inter role distance (IRD) of academicians of different age groups.
3. There is no significant difference among the Role stagnation (RS) of academicians of different age groups.
4. There is no significant difference among the Role expectation conflict (REC) of academicians of different age groups.
5. There is no significant difference among the Role erosion (RE) of academicians of different age groups.
6. There is no significant difference among the Role overload (RO) of academicians of different age groups.
7. There is no significant difference among the Role isolation (RI) of academicians of different age groups.
8. There is no significant difference among the Personal inadequacy (PI) of academicians of different age groups.
9. There is no significant difference among the Self-role distance (SRD) of academicians of different age groups.
10. There is no significant difference among the Role ambiguity (RA) of academicians of different age groups.
11. There is no significant difference among the Resource inadequacy (RIn) of academicians of different age groups.

Data Analysis

The data was analysed using comparison of means and one way ANOVA. The analysis was done by using SPSS version 17.

Demographic Details

Out of the total 310 respondents 265 (85.5%) belonged to age group of 22-35 yrs.; 33 (10.6%) respondent were from the age group of 35-45 yrs. and only 12 (3.9%) respondents were of more than of 45 yrs. of age.

Testing of Hypotheses

To test all the hypotheses framed comparison of means has been done in SPSS with Anova table. The tables are as shown below:

H₀₁: There is no significant difference among the organisational role stress of academicians of different age groups (22-35, 35-45, >45 yrs.)

Table 1: ANOVA for Comparison of Organisational Role Stress of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3546.608	2	1773.304	1.620	.199
Within Groups	335956.002	307	1094.319		
Total	339502.610	309			

Table 1 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(2,307) = 1.620, p = .199$). Thus we interpret that the perceived organisational role stress is not different among various age groups.

Null hypothesis is accepted.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference among the Inter role distance (IRD) of academicians of different age groups.

Table 2: ANOVA for Comparison of IRD of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	9.526	2	4.763	.276	.759
Within Groups	5291.493	307	17.236		
Total	5301.019	309			

Table 2 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(2,307) = .276, p = .759$).

Null hypothesis is accepted.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference among the Role stagnation (RS) of academicians of different age groups.

Table 3: ANOVA for Comparison of RS of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	92.865	2	46.432	2.841	.060
Within Groups	5017.810	307	16.345		
Total	5110.674	309			

There was no statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(2,307) = 2.841, p = .060$) as shown in Table 3.

Null hypothesis is accepted.

H_{04} : There is no significant difference among the Role expectation conflict (REC) of academicians of different age groups.

Table 4: ANOVA for Comparison of REC of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	37.850	2	18.925	1.360	.258
Within Groups	4272.085	307	13.916		
Total	4309.935	309			

There was no statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(2,307) = 1.360, p = .258$) as shown in Table 4.

Null hypothesis is accepted.

H_{05} : There is no significant difference among the Role erosion (RE) of academicians of different age groups.

Table 5: ANOVA for Comparison of RE of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	81.659	2	40.830	2.279	.104
Within Groups	5499.876	307	17.915		
Total	5581.535	309			

There was no-statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(2,307) = 2.279, p = .104$) as shown in Table 5.

Null hypothesis is accepted.

H_{06} : There is no significant difference among the Role overload (RO) of academicians of different age groups.

Table 6: ANOVA for Comparison of RO of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	12.883	2	6.442	.378	.686
Within Groups	5237.452	307	17.060		
Total	5250.335	309			

As shown in Table 6 there is no-statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(2,307) = .378, p = .686$).

Null hypothesis is accepted.

H_{07} : There is no significant difference among the Role isolation (RI) of academicians of different age groups.

Table 7: ANOVA for Comparison of RI of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	44.536	2	22.268	1.378	.254
Within Groups	4961.799	307	16.162		
Total	5006.335	309			

There was no-statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(2,307) = 1.378, p = .254$) as shown in table 7.

Null hypothesis is accepted.

H_{08} : There is no significant difference among the Personal inadequacy (PI) of academicians of different age groups.

Table 8: ANOVA for Comparison of PI of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.231	2	.116	.008	.992
Within Groups	4575.717	307	14.905		
Total	4575.948	309			

There was no-statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(2,307) = 0.008, p = .992$) as mentioned in Table 8.

Null hypothesis is accepted.

H_{09} : There is no significant difference among the Self-role distance (SRD) of academicians of different age groups.

Table 9: ANOVA for Comparison of SRD of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	97.756	2	48.878	3.221	.041
Within Groups	4658.854	307	15.175		
Total	4756.610	309			

There was a statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(2,307) = 3.221, p = .041$) as shown in Table 9.

Null hypothesis is rejected.

H_{010} : There is no significant difference among the Role ambiguity (RA) of academicians of different age groups.

Table 10: ANOVA for Comparison of RA of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	87.110	2	43.555	1.977	.140
Within Groups	6763.909	307	22.032		
Total	6851.019	309			

There was no statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(2,307) = 1.977, p = .140$) as shown in Table 10.

Null hypothesis is accepted.

H_{011} : There is no significant difference among the Resource inadequacy (RIn) of academicians of different age groups.

Table 11: ANOVA for Comparison of RIn of Three Age Groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	39.033	2	19.517	1.216	.298
Within Groups	4927.254	307	16.050		
Total	4966.287	309			

There was no statistically significant difference between groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(2,307) = 1.216, p = .298$) as shown in Table 11.

Null hypothesis is accepted.

Findings & Conclusion

Analysis revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between overall role stresses of the respondents belonging to three age groups ($F(2, 307) = 1.620, p = .199$). Oke & Dawson (2012) in their study on bank employees in Nigeria found that role stress increased with increase in age which is in contradiction to the present study. But when individual dimensions were tested for differences between age groups it revealed that SRD (Self-role Distance) was found to vary between academicians belonging to three age groups ($F(2, 307) = 3.221, p = .041$). Self-role distance was found to be highest for respondents belonging to age group of 35-45 yrs. In contradiction to general thought that experienced people face less stress at workplace, the current study found that all the academicians are facing similar levels of organisational role stress. It may be attributed to the pace of change in roles of all the academicians. The findings revealed that academicians in the middle age group find that what they are supposed to do as a part of their role does not matches with their self-concept. For this the managements needs to inform the academicians about the need for changed roles. They also need to be provided with training to match their self-concept with the role they are occupying in the organisation.

References

- Kavitha, P. (2012). Organisational role stress among college faculties: an empirical study. *Sona Global Management Review*, 6 (4), 36-50.
- Kavitha, P., Kavitha, V. & Arulmurugan, P. (2012). Role of stress among women employees forming majority workforce at it sector in Chennai and Coimbatore, tier-I & tier-II centres. *Sona Global Management Review*, 6 (3), 1-11.
- Oke, A. & Dawson, P. (2012). The Role of Socio-Cultural Norms in Workplace Stress: An Empirical Study of Bank Employees in Nigeria. *International Journal of Management*, 29 (1), 314-331.
- Ongori H. & Agolla J. (2008). Occupational Stress in Organizations and Its Effects on Organizational Performance. *Journal of Management Research*, 8 (3), 124-135.

Pareek, U. & Purohit, S. (2011). Training Instruments in HRD and OD. 3rd edition. Tata McGraw Hill.

Rajarajeswari, S. (2010). Role Stress among the Aided and Self-financing College Teachers: A Discriminant Analysis. *Global Management Review*, 4 (4), 73-82.

Rashid, I. & Talib, P. (2013). Modelling a Relationship between Role Stress & Locus of Control. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48 (4), 726-738.

Santora, J. (2010). Dual Family Earners: Do Role Overload and Stress Treat Them as Equals? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 92-93.

Sen, K. (2013). Occupational role stress – an exploratory study in the Indian public sector banks. *Journal of Services Research*, 12 (2), 173-192.

Tarafdar, M., Tu Q., Ragu-nathan, B., & Ragu-nathan, T. (2007). The Impact of Techno stress on Role Stress and Productivity. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 24 (1), 301–328.