

SOUTH ASIAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT RESEARCH (SAJMR)

Volume 3 Number 1

January 2011

Contents

Editorial

- Personality Mapping: Tool to understand interpersonal need and enhance performance: Dr. Ekta Sharma** 138
- Effect of future trading on spot price volatility for NSE Nifty using time series regression and GARCH model: Dr. Neha Parashar, Amey Karambelkar, Tarang Jibhake, Manit Goyal, Aditi Kulkarni, Puneet S. Deshpande** 148
- Impact of Irrigation on Cotton Cultivation in Kurnool District (A.P.): Dr. K. Visweswara Reddy and Prof. K. Satyanarayana Reddy** 160
- Satisfaction of ATM card users with reference to Gujarat : Dr. J. M. Badiyani** 168
- A STUDY OF JOB STRESS AND ITS IMPACT ON JOB ATTITUDE : Dr. V. S. Dhekale** 180
- CASE STUDY**
- The Landscape Resorts Limited (A), Barnabas N. and Nandakumar Mekoth** 196
- BOOK REVIEW**
- Never Stop Learning : Straight Talk from the World's Top Business Leaders (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2010)** 199



**Chh. Shahu Institute of Business
Education and Research (SIBER)**

(An Autonomous Institute)

Kolhapur - 416 004, Maharashtra State, INDIA

SOUTH ASIAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT RESEARCH (SAJMR)

ISSN 0974-763X

(An International Peer Reviewed Research Journal)



Published by

Chh. Shahu Institute of Business Education & Research (SIBER)
University Road, Kolhapur - 416 004, Maharashtra, India

Contact: 91-231-2535706 / 07 Fax: 91-231-2535708 Website: www.siberindia.co.in, Email: sajmr@siberindia.co.in, sibersajmr@gmail.com

■ **Patron**

Late Dr. A.D. Shinde

■ **Editor**

Dr. Babu Thomas
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

■ **Editorial Board**

Dr. Francisco J.L.S. Diniz
CETRAD, Portugal

Dr. R.V. Kulkarni
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

Dr. R.A. Shinde
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

Dr. Paul B. Carr
Regent University, USA

Dr. M.M. Ali
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

Dr. Lal Das
RSSW, Hyderabad, India

Dr. M. Nand Kumar
Goa University, Goa, India

Dr. Babu Zachariah
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

Dr. Gary Owens
CERAR, Australia

Dr. K. Pradeepkumar
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

Dr. R.M. Bhajracharya
Kathmandu University, Nepal

Dr. P.R. Puranik
NMU, Jalgaon, India

Prof. K.R.R. Mahanama
Colombo University, Sri Lanka

Dr. Yogesh B. Patil
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

Dr. Rajendra Naragundkar
IFIM, Bangalore, India

Dr. K.V.M. Varambally
Manipal Institute of Management, India

Dr. R.L. Hyderabad
Karnataka University, India

Dr. B.U. Dhandra
Gulbarga University, India

Dr. T.V.G. Sarma
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

Academic Assistance

Mr. V. Ravi Kishore Kumar
SIBER, Kolhapur, India

In the last issue of South Asian Journal of Management Research, in the editorial note I mentioned about humor. Humor can increase the happiness and reduce the stress.

Stress is most vulnerable condition in the organization because experts as well as non-experts are handling the stress situation of the employees. Some scientists still argue that they know little about stress whereas many people claim that they know everything about stress. And the result is handling the stress improperly.

Job stress has several impacts on individual employee and organization. Most of the employees in modern organization experience stress. It can have a damaging effect on employee, especially managers. It can affect the effectiveness of the organization as well as employees. The problem of stress is very much relevant of change that is spreading across the globe in all the fields. The employees are unable to cope of with changes. Organizations are doing little to handle the change process. For any organizational process the change must be helping the employees in improving the ability of organization to cope up with the change in its environment.

Lazarus's view on stress is that an individual perception of the psychological situation is the critical factors for stress. It includes potential harms, threats, and challenges on one hand, and on another an individuals ability to cope with them. The ability or inability to cope with stress is the perceived ability of an individual. Coping strategy differs from individual to individual in a different manner.

Less research is available on coping strategies of stress. Readers can contribute research articles on coping strategies of stress.

Dr. Babu Thomas
Editor

A Study of Job Stress and Its Impact on Job Attitude

Dr. V. S. Dhekale^{1*}

^{1*} Vivekanand College, Kolhapur, Maharashtra (India)

* Email : vsdhekale@rediffmail.com

1. Introduction

The life of people in the modern world is full of stress and anxiety, in spite of technological and scientific developments. Many people experience high or moderate degree of stress in their daily life. A feeling of frustration, dissatisfaction, psychosomatic and psychological disorders in the life of individuals reflect in high stress. Even psycho-social stress has been increasing due to change in the life style of people. Life has become mechanical, demands of new life style have been increased, time constraints, deadlines in work, future uncertainties have weakened social support. As a result, the life of majority of the people has become highly stressful in modern society.

Hans Selye (1956) defined stress as, non-specific responses of the body to any demand made upon it. Walter Cannon (1914) had used the term stress in his work on homeostasis that stress is emotional status that had possible, detrimental, and physical, impact on the focal organism.

Job Stress is the result of interaction of work conditions with characteristics of the worker such that a demand of the work exceeds the ability or the worker to cope with them.

Job stress and occupational stress are the two terms used interchangeably. Stress at work resulting from increasing complexities of work and its divergent demand, has become important characteristics of the modern organization associated with constraints and demands.

Stress is an interaction of individual with environment (Ivancevich and Matteson 1994).

Growing evidence suggests that high levels of stress adversely affect physical health, psychological well being, and many aspects of task performance (Quick J.C. 1992). A nationwide survey conducted in USA by a large life insurance company showed that nearly 46 percent of American workers believe their jobs are highly stressful. (Northwestern National LIC, 1999).

J.R. Schermerhorn Jr., Hunt J.R. and Richard N. Oshorn have identified task demands, role ambiguities, role conflicts, ethical demands, interpersonal problems, career developments and physical setting as common stressors.

Srivastav A.K. and Sing A.P. (1981) stated that in their study; role overload, role ambiguity, role conflict, group pressures, low profitability, under participation, low status, responsibility for people, intrinsic impoverishment, strenuous working conditions, poor peer relations and powerlessness are the reasons for stress.

DeFrank and Ivancevich (1998) pointed out those specific physical health concerns that have been linked to stress. These includes the – (i) immune system problems, where there is lessened ability to fight off illness and infection, (ii) cardiovascular system problems such as high blood pressure and heart disease, (iii) musculoskeletal system problems, such as headaches and back pain, (iv) gastrointestinal system

problems such as diarrhoea and constipation.

Peter Y. Chen and Paul E. Spector (1992) in an exploratory study found that stress had the strongest impact on aggressive actions, such as sabotage, interpersonal aggression, hostility and complaints.

Stress is produced by several happenings in life. Modern life is full of stress. It is a general observation that job stress is dysfunctional and it harms an individual. However, stress is not always undesirable and harmful. It has also positive side. This stress is called 'eustress'. Some researchers have contended that some sorts of job stress have functional qualities and others have reported that partial degree of stress is desirable to motivate the individual and at which his effectiveness is maximized. Kets de Vries (1979) pointed out that individuals need a moderate amount of stress to be alert and capable of functioning effectively. However when stress exceeds its limits and it can cause many problems.

2. Job Attitude

Job attitude means employee attitude towards the job. Attitudes are the feelings and beliefs that largely determine how employees will perceive their environment, commit themselves to intended actions and ultimately behave.

An extensive research by Smith (1969) suggested that there are five dimensions to the attitude, all of which reflect affective responses to particular aspects of a job. These dimensions are – the work itself, pay promotion, supervision and co-workers. Most of the research in Organizational Behaviour has been concerned with three attitudes, i. e. job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment (Brooke Jr., Russell and Prince, 1988). Attitudes have three components viz.

emotional, informational and behavioural. All these components helps together to form an attitude.

3. Objectives

1. To study the job stress and job attitude between different occupations.
2. To study the impact of job stress on job attitude.
3. To determine whether the age is related with job stress and job attitude.

4. Methodology

The theoretical model suggests that job stress has got many consequences. It can also influence job attitude, consequently it can influence job performance. Based on this assumption the present study is undertaken to study the impact of job stress on job attitude. Further the study focuses on job stress between different occupations and its impact on job attitude.

5. Hypothesis

- There is relation between job stress and job attitude.
- Stress has impact on job attitude.

6. Tools for Data Collection

6.1 Job Stress Scale

To assess the stress, the occupational stress scale (Shrivastav and Singh, 1986) is used. The stress scale is administered in Likert-type five point scales in the manner of strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree and strongly agree. The job stress scale consists of items related to components of job life such as role overload, role ambiguity, role conflict, unreasonable group, responsibility for persons, under participation, powerlessness, poor peer relations, intrinsic impoverishment, low status, strenuous working conditions and unprofitability.

The reliability and validity of occupational stress scale is computed by spilt-half method and Cronbach's alpha-coefficient for the scale and as a whole it found to be

0.935 and 0.90 respectively.

6.2 Job Attitude Scale

Attitude cannot be capture in single concept. It has various components. In the present study the focus is given on capturing the attitude in a set of variables mainly on job (work), promotions, supervision, coworkers and working conditions.

6.3 Item Judgment

After the item judgment fifteen questions were retained. On the basis of theoretical model the job attitude scale was prepared and developed. Thirty statements were prepared reflecting the job attitude in a five point scale.

On the basis of these six dimensions, thirty true-keyed items were formulated. A five point rating scale ranging from – 1. (strongly disagree) to 5(strongly agree), with '3' as moderate, were used with the item statement.

The job attitude scale was administered in Likert-type Five point scale. The scores are categorized on the basis of percentile values. The score below P_{25} categorized negative job attitude between P_{25} to P_{75} moderate job attitude and

above P_{75} positive job attitude.

7. Sample

Eight occupations have been considered for the present study namely Principal, Lecturers, Bank Managers, Doctors, Managers in manufacturing organizations, Policemen, System Managers and Journalists. From every occupation 50 samples were collected. The sample of system managers is collected from Pune Districts and for rest occupations it is collected from Kolhapur district. The samples have been identified at random on the basis of convenience. Fifty samples from each occupation have been selected for the study.

8. Statistical Analysis

Mean, standard deviation, regression and correlation were applied for the study the job stress and job attitude in different occupations. The correlation model is used to study the relation between job stress and job attitude.

8.1 Findings

The present study is related to understand the stress level among the different job holders and their attitude towards their job.

Table No.1 : Job Stress and Job Attitude for different Occupations (N=50 for each occupation)

Occupations/Job	Job Stress		Job Attitude	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Principals	115.20	16.84	54.82	6.97
Lecturers	112.94	19.26	56.10	7.96
Bank Managers	125.02	18.06	52.52	5.89
Doctors	125.78	16.24	54.28	6.37
Managers (Mfg. Org.)	127.56	17.65	53.68	7.06
Policemen	146.00	17.06	48.24	10.39
System Managers	124.16	13.12	53.40	5.65
Journalists	124.32	16.84	56.34	8.76

The table reflects the mean and S.D. of job stress and job attitude of eight occupations. The policemen have the highest stress (mean 146.00) followed by managers in manufacturing organizations (mean 157.56) and the lowest job stress is in the occupation of lecturers (mean 112.94).

8.2 Impact of Job Stress on Job attitude

To study the impact of job stress on job attitude, the data collected is analyzed as per job stress dimension

with job attitude. For which regression tool has been used. The object of the present study is to study the predictive relation between job stress dimensions and job attitude. To analyze the data the job stress variable is considered as independent variable and job attitude variable is considered as dependent variable. The following table gives regression coefficient and their significance.

Table No.2 Regression Coefficients – For the Occupation of Principals.

Dependent variable - Job Attitude.

Independent variable (Job Stress dimensions)	Un standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constants)	70.149	8.451		8.301	.000
Role overload	-.232	.262	-.115	-.885	.382
Role Ambiguity	-.158	.455	-.050	-.348	.730
Role Conflict	-.219	.475	-.074	-.462	.647
Unreasonable group	.233	.525	.080	.444	.660
Responsibility for persons	.701	.511	.212	1.372	.178
Under participation	7.883E-02	.587	.032	.134	.894
Powerlessness	-1.729	.719	-.499	-2.406*	.021
Poor Peer Relations	-.331	.480	-.109	-.689	.495
Intrinsic Impoverishment	-.516	.624	-.158	-.828	.413
Low Status	-.232	.775	-.058	-.299	.767
Strenuous Working Conditions	2.856E-02	.423	.012	.068	.947
Un profitability	7.186E-02	.493	.018	.146	.885

* $P \leq 0.05$

The 't' score between powerlessness dimension of job stress and job attitude is 2.406, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. Among the various dimensions of job stress, the powerlessness component is negatively correlated with job

attitude. It indicates that due to powerlessness principals experiences more job stress, which leads to negative job attitude. It reflects that stress has impact on job attitude.

Table No. 3 ANOVA – Job Attitude and Job Stress for the Occupation of Principals.

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig	R. ²
Regression	1632.885	12	136.074	6.726*	0.000	0.686
Residual	748.495	37	20.230			
Total	2381.380	49				

* $P < 0.01$

Table No. 4 : Regression Coefficients – For the Occupation of Lecturers.

Dependent variable – Job Attitude.

Independent variable (Job Stress dimensions)	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constants)	76.808	7.320		10.493	.000
Role overload	-.249	.262	-.126	-.951	.348
Role Ambiguity	.982	.480	.302	2.047*	.048
Role Conflict	-.216	.418	-.078	-.518	.608
Unreasonable group	.552	.418	.179	1.321	.195
Responsibility for persons	.330	.468	.084	.706	.485
Under participation	-1.12E-02	.377	-.004	-.030	.976
Powerlessness	-.302	.412	-.094	-.733	.468
Poor Peer Relations	-.281	.378	-.102	-.744	.462
Intrinsic Impoverishment	-.800	.436	-.255	-.834***	.075
Low Status	-2.227	.567	-.565	-3.931*	.000
Strenuous Working Conditions	-.873	.411	-.256	-2.122**	.041
Un profitability	.288	.502	.063	.573	.570

* P < 0.01

** P < 0.05

*** P < 0.1

Further analysis reveals that intrinsic impoverishment, low status and strenuous working conditions these three components of job stress are significant and negatively correlated. It shows that there is job stress

due to these components which interns to the negative job attitude in case of lecturers. It reflects that job stress has an impact on job attitude.

Table No. 5 : ANOVA – Job Attitude and Job Stress for the Occupation of Lecturers

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	R. ²
Regression	2267.667	12	188.972	8.276*	0.000	.729
Residual	844.833	37	22.833			
Total	3112.500	49				

* P < 0.01

The 'F' score in the table is 8.276, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. It shows that there is significant relation between job stress and job attitude in the occupation of lecturers.

Table No. 6 : Regression Coefficients – For the Occupation of Bank managers.

Dependent variable – Job Attitude.

Independent variable (Job Stress dimensions)	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constants)	85.962	6.507		13.212	0.000
Role overload	3.751E-02	0.234	0.032	0.160	0.873
Role Ambiguity	-0.290	0.387	-0.101	-0.749	0.458
Role Conflict	-9.92E-02	0.396	-0.041	-0.250	0.804
Unreasonable group	-0.360	0.470	-0.147	-0.766	0.448
Responsibility for persons	0.366	0.406	0.119	0.903	0.372
Under participation	1.899E-02	0.351	0.009	0.054	0.957
Powerlessness	-1.040	0.503	-0.328	-2.067**	0.046
Poor Peer Relations	-1.400	0.404	-0.402	-3.468*	0.001
Intrinsic Impoverishment	0.195	0.410	0.067	0.477	0.636
Low Status	-8.28E-02	0.438	-0.027	-0.189	0.851
Strenuous Working Conditions	-0.468	0.390	-0.223	-1.201	0.238
Un profitability	-0.641	0.422	-0.191	-1.517	0.138

* P < 0.01

** P < 0.05

*** P < 0.1

The further analysis reveals that the 't' score of powerlessness and poor peer relations of job stress dimension are significant and negatively correlated with job attitude. It indicates that due to these two

dimensions bank managers' experiences more job stress, which leads to negative job attitude. It shows that there is impact of job stress on job attitude.

Table No.7 : ANOVA – Job Attitude and Job Stress for the Occupation of bank managers

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	R. ²
Regression	1114.454	12	92.871	5.864*	0.000	0655
Residual	586.026	37	15.839			
Total	1700.480	49				

* P < 0.01

The 'F' value in the table is 5.864, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It indicates that there is significant relation between job stress dimension and job attitude

in case of bank managers. The following table shows regression coefficient between job stress dimension and job attitude.

Table No. 8 : Regression Coefficients – For the Occupation of Doctors

Dependent variable – Job Attitude.

Independent variable (Job Stress dimensions)	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constants)	76.231	5.871		12.985	0.000
Role overload	3.235E-02	0.199	0.021	0.163	0.871
Role Ambiguity	0.251	0.297	0.107	0.843	0.405
Role Conflict	-6.23E-02	0.427	-0.023	-0.146	0.885
Unreasonable group	-0.419	0.260	-0.204	-1.612	0.115
Responsibility for persons	0.619	0.346	0.215	1.788***	0.082
Under participation	0.324	0.354	0.149	0.914	0.367
Powerlessness	-0.551	0.476	-0.172	-1.157	0.255
Poor Peer Relations	-0.869	0.332	-0.341	-2.616**	0.013
Intrinsic Impoverishment	-0.505	0.404	-0.169	-1.251	0.219
Low Status	-0.809	0.614	-0.203	-1.317	0.196
Strenuous Working Conditions	-0.871	0.330	-0.340	-2.642**	0.012
Un profitability	0.585	0.507	0.138	1.154	0.256

** P < 0.05

*** P < 0.1

The further analysis reveals that poor peer relations and strenuous working conditions component of job stress are significant and negatively correlated with job attitude. It indicates that poor peer

relations and strenuous working condition results in more job stress, which leads to negative job attitude among the doctors. It reflects that job stress has an impact on job attitude.

Table No. 9 : ANOVA – Job Attitude and Job Stress for the Occupation of Doctors

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	R. ²
Regression	1336.244	12	111.354	6.263*	0.000	0.670
Residual	657.836	37	17.779			
Total	1994.080	49				

* P < 0.01

The 'F' score in the table is 6.263, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It reflects that there is significant relation between job stress dimension and job attitude in case of

doctors. The following table shows regression coefficient between job stress dimension and job attitude.

Table No. 10 : Regression Coefficients – For the Occupation of Managers in manufacturing organizations
Dependent variable– Job Attitude.

Independent variable (Job Stress dimensions)	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constants)	74.043	8.414		8.800	0.000
Role overload	-0.122	0.273	-0.073	-0.448	0.657
Role Ambiguity	-7.30E-02	0.496	-0.025	-0.147	0.884
Role Conflict	0.170	0.365	0.065	0.465	0.644
Unreasonable group	0.559	0.474	0.167	1.179	0.246
Responsibility for persons	-0.103	0.534	-0.027	-0.192	0.849
Under participation	-0.611	0.596	-0.223	-1.025	0.312
Powerlessness	1.063E-02	0.618	0.003	0.017	0.986
Poor Peer Relations	-0.213	0.443	-0.067	-0.480	0.634
Intrinsic Impoverishment	01.333	0.553	-0.405	-2.547*	0.010
Low Status	-0.475	0.776	-0.123	-0.612	0.545
Strenuous Working Conditions	-0.669	0.539	-0.226	-1.242	0.222
Un profitability	0.704	0.580	0.150	1.213	0.223

* P < 0.01

The further analysis of job stress dimensions with job attitude shows that intrinsic impoverishment dimension of job stress is significant and negatively correlated with job attitude. It shows that

intrinsic impoverishment component of job stress leads more stress to the managers, which results in negative job attitude. It indicates that job stress has an impact on job attitude.

Table No. 11 : ANOVA – Job Attitude and Job Stress for the Occupation of Managers in manufacturing organizations

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	R.²
Regression	1567.505	12	130.625	5.484	0.000	0.640
Residual	881.375	37	23.821			
Total	2448.880	49				

* $P < 0.01$

the 'F' score in the table is 5.484, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It indicates that there is significant relation between job stress dimensions and job attitude

among the managers in manufacturing organization. The following table shows the regression coefficient between job stress dimensions and job attitude.

Table No. 12 : Regression Coefficients – For the Occupation of Policemen

Dependent variable – Job Attitude.

Independent variable (Job Stress dimensions)	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constants)	116.026	18.993		6.109	0.000
Role overload	0.340	0.434	0.125	0.783	0.439
Role Ambiguity	0.531	0.171	0.131	0.740	0.464
Role Conflict	-1.226	0.522	-0.355	-2.347**	0.024
Unreasonable group	-0.917	0.423	-0.303	-2.168**	0.037
Responsibility for persons	-0.451	0.647	-0.081	-0.697	0.490
Under participation	-0.445	0.845	-0.099	-0.526	0.602
Powerlessness	-1.061	0.791	-0.180	-1.342	0.188
Poor Peer Relations	-1.120	0.519	-0.321	-2.158**	0.037
Intrinsic Impoverishment	-0.787	0.702	-0.203	-1.121	0.270
Low Status	0.377	0.939	0.082	0.402	0.690
Strenuous Working Conditions	-0.232	0.602	-0.066	-0.386	0.702
Un profitability	-0.892	0.925	-0.131	-0.965	0.341

** $P < 0.05$

The analysis in the table shows that role conflict, unreasonable group and poor peer relations these components of job stress are significant. These are negatively correlated with job attitude. It reveals that policemen

experiences more job stress due to role conflict, unreasonable group and poor peer relations dimension of job stress. It results in negative job attitude among policemen. It reflects that job stress has an impact on job attitude.

Table No. 13 : ANOVA – Job Attitude and Job Stress for the Occupation of Policemen

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	R. ²
Regression	3224.603	12	268.717	4.802	0.000	0.609
Residual	2070.517	37	55.960			
Total	5295.120	49				

* $P < 0.01$

The obtained 'F' value in the table is 4.802, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It indicates that there is

significant relation between job attitude and job stress in case of policemen.

Table No. 14Regression Coefficients – For the Occupation of System Managers

Dependent variable – Job Attitude.

Independent variable (Job Stress dimensions)	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constants)	85.907	6.908		12.436	0.000
Role overload	0.125	0.197	0.083	0.637	0.528
Role Ambiguity	-0.544	0.327	-0.229	-1.663	0.105
Role Conflict	-0.517	0.324	-0.238	-1.596	0.119
Unreasonable group	0.208	0.359	0.071	0.579	0.566
Responsibility for persons	0.142	0.363	0.050	0.391	0.698
Under participation	-0.700	0.296	-0.347	-2.365**	0.023
Powerlessness	-0.542	0.367	-0.192	-1.477	0.148
Poor Peer Relations	-1.059	0.348	-0.443	-3.043*	0.004
Intrinsic Impoverishment	-4.74E-02	0.346	-0.020	-0.137	0.892
Low Status	0.721	0.479	0.193	1.505	0.141
Strenuous Working Conditions	-0.950	0.308	-0.409	-3.089*	0.004
Un profitability	0.397	0.409	0.111	0.971	0.338

* $P < 0.01$

** $P < 0.05$

The regression coefficient analysis reveals that under participation, poor peer relations and strenuous working conditions; these dimensions of job stress are significant. These dimensions are negatively correlated with job

attitude. Due to these dimension of job stress system managers' experiences more job stress, which interns in negative job attitude. It shows that job stress has an impact on job attitude.

Table No. 15 : ANOVA – Job Attitude and Job Stress for the Occupation of System Managers

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	R. ²
Regression	114.716	12	92.893	7.583	0.000	0.711
Residual	453.284	37	12.251			
Total	1568.000	49				

* P < 0.01

The 'F' value in the table is 7.583, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. It

reveals that there is significant relation between job stress and job attitude in case of system managers.

Table No. 16 : Regression Coefficients – For the Occupation of Journalists

Dependent variable – Job Attitude.

Independent variable (Job Stress dimensions)	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constants)	87.621	11.755		7.454	0.000
Role overload	-0.147	0.257	-0.072	-0.574	0.569
Role Ambiguity	-0.321	0.545	-0.109	-0.588	0.560
Role Conflict	-0.302	0.340	-0.127	-0.887	0.381
Unreasonable group	0.567	0.359	0.221	1.581	0.122
Responsibility for persons	0.211	0.501	0.058	0.421	0.676
Under participation	-1.156	0.381	-0.408	-3.032*	0.004
Powerlessness	-0.110	0.668	-0.024	-0.165	0.870
Poor Peer Relations	-0.644	0.365	-0.254	-1.765***	0.086
Intrinsic Impoverishment	-0.575	0.612	-0.151	-0.940	0.353
Low Status	-0.414	0.623	-0.090	-0.665	0.510
Strenuous Working Conditions	-0.147	0.597	-0.028	-0.245	0.808
Un profitability	-4.00E-02	0.598	-0.010	-0.067	0.947

* P < 0.01

*** P < 0.1

The further analysis reveals that under participation and poor peer relations components of job stress are significant and negatively correlated with job attitude. These

dimensions of job stress causes more stress to the journalists, which results in negative job attitude. It indicates that job stress has an impact on job attitude.

Table No. 17 : ANOVA – Job Attitude and Job Stress for the Occupation of Journalists

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	R. ²
Regression	2371.774	12	197.648	5.256*	0.000	0.630
Residual	1391.446	37	37.607			
Total	3763.220	49				

* P < 0.01

The 'F' score in the table is 5.256, which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It shows that there is significant relation between job stress and job attitude

among the journalists. The following table shows the regression coefficient between job stress and job attitude.

Table No. 18 : Age- wise analysis of job stress and job attitude (N=400)

AGE GROUP	N	Job Stress		Job Attitude	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Up to 35 years	263	129.06	16.64	53.36	7.85
Between 35 years and 50 years	268	123.02	19.56	53.48	7.82
Above 50 years	138	117.40	18.33	54.45	7.14

The job stresses of the employees, who are in the age group of up to 35 years, have the mean value 129.06. The employees between the age 35 years and 50 years have the mean value 123.02. The employees who are above 50 years age have the mean value 117.40. Thus the age increases stress comes down.

The mean value of job stress of the employees decreases as the age of employees' increases. It reveals that as age increases the level of job stress comes down. It may be because of the experience in the job and psychological settlement in the job.

Employees take some time to settle psychologically in the job. The job

characteristics, situational variables at work place, relation with staff members may cause stress to the employees in the years of initial employment. The affectivity and cognitivity may be the cause for low job attitude in the first age group

As the stress comes down in the second and third age range it may be the signal of psychological settlement in the job, coping and / or managing with the job characteristics and situational variables. It ultimately increases job attitude. The job attitudes of the employees, which are in the age group up to 35 years, have mean value 53.36. The employees, who are in the age group of 35 years to 50 years, have mean

value 53.48. The age groups of the employees above 50 years have mean value 54.45.

The mean values of different age group of employees regarding job attitude shows increasing trend. It indicates that as the age of employees' increases the attitude of the employees towards their job turns in positive direction.

The age- wise analysis of job attitude projected a change in attitude towards positive direction as the age increases as well as stress comes down.

9. Correlation between Job Stress and Job Attitude

Further analysis related to finding out job stress and job attitude correlations. The coefficient of correlation is a measure that describes the relationship of one variable with another. Therefore, an attempt has been made to study the relation between job stress and job attitude with the help of correlation. The following table shows the correlation between job stress and job attitude.

Table No.19 : Correlation between job stress and job attitude

VARIABLES	JOB ATTITUDE	JOB STRESS
Job attitude	1.000	
Pearson correlation	669	
Sig.(2-tailed)		
N		
Job stress	- 0.617**	1.000
Pearson correlation	0.000	--
Sig.(2-tailed)	669	669
N		

** P<0.01

All the correlations between job stress and job are significant. The obtained values are significant at 0.01 level of confidence. It reveals that there is a relation between job stress and job attitude

It shows that there is a significant relation between job stress and job attitude. The coefficient of correlation between job stress and job attitude is – 0.617, which is significant at 0.01 level of significance. It indicates that there is a correlation between job stress and job attitude. It confirms that higher the job stress level, negative the job attitude of the employee. Lower the job stress level positive the job attitude of the employee.

Thus from the above analysis the hypothesis that, there is a relation between

job stress and job attitude accepted.

Second hypothesis is that there is an impact of job stress on job attitude. The regression between job stress and job attitude for different occupations shows that there is impact of job stress on job attitude. Higher the stress, negative the job attitude and lower the stress positive the job attitude.

10. Conclusion and Job Implications

Job stress is widely accepted phenomenon and it differs from job to job. According to the present study policemen and managers in manufacturing organizations have more stress as compared to the other occupations in the study. The result reflects basic assumption of the study reflecting stress variation among different

occupations. The result reflects basic assumption that certain jobs have more stress.

Similarly job attitude also differs among different occupations. Job stress has got an impact on job attitude and it has been reflected in all the eight occupations considered for the study. It means that job stress will influence job attitude reflecting poor performance. The study agrees with the study conducted earlier researcher

George (1990), Bruke, Brief and George (1993).

Thus Stress variation found between different jobs. The study also attributes the relation between job stress and job attitude. This factor should be considered especially by the HR managers while practicing in their organizations. Therefore, HR managers should take utmost care in reducing stress environment

References

- A.J.Kinicki, F.M. McKee and K.J.Wade (1996). "Annual Review, 1991-95; Occupational Health, Journal of Vocational Behaviour, October, pp.190-220
- Abel-Halim and Ahmed, A. (1982) Social support and managerial effective responses to job stress. Journal of Occupational Behaviour, 3: pp.281-295.
- Aggarwal U. N.(1980) A step of developing job involvement scale. Indian Journal of Psychology, 55, pp. 38-42.
- Beehr T.A., Walsh J.T. and Taber T.D., (1976). Relationship of Stress to individually organizationally valued stress: Higher order needs as moderators. Journal of Applied Psychology. 61. pp. 41-47.
- Beer T. A. & Bhagat R. S. (1985) Introduction to Human Stress and Cognition in Organizations. In T. A. Beehr and R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), Human Stress and Cognition in Organizations: An Integrated Perspective. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Blau G.J. and Boal K.R., (1987). "Conceptualizing How Job Involvement and Organisational Commitment Affect Turnover and Absenteeism", Academy of Management Review, April, p.290
- Blau G.J.,(1986). "Job Involvement and Organisational Commitment as Interactive Predictors of Tardiness and Absenteeism", Journal of Management, winter. pp. 571-584.
- Bogg, J. and C. L. Coper (1995). Job Satisfaction: Mental health and occupational stress among senior civil servants, Human Relations, 48 (4); pp. 327-341.
- Brooke (Jr.), P.P., Russell, D.W., Price, J.L.,(1998), "Discriminant Validation of Measures of Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment, "Journal of Applied Psychology, May pp. 139-145.
- Cannon, W. B., (1914) The Interrelations of emotions as suggested by recent psychological researchers. American Journal of Psychology, 25: pp.256-82.
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S. and French, J. R. P., (1975) Relationships of Cessation of Smoking with job Stress, Personality and Social Support. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60:pp. 211-219.
- Colquhoun, W.P., (1976). Accidents, Injuries, and Shift Work, in P.G. Rentos and R. D. Shepard (Eds.), Shift Work and Health, Washington, D.C.: W.S. Govt. Printing Office.
- Cox, T. (1978) Stress, McMillan Press Ltd., London.
- Daniel C. Ganster and John Schubroeck, (1991). "Work Stress and Employee Health", Personnel of Management, Vol. 17, pp.235-271.
- DeFrank R.S. and Ivancevich J.M. (1998). "Stress in the Job: An Executive Update", Academy of management Executive, August, pp.55-56.
- DeFrank, R. S., and Ivancevich, J. M. (1998). Stress On the Job: An executive update. Academy of Management Executive, August. 59.
- Derek Rollinson, Aysen Broadfield, David Edwards, (1998). Organisational Behaviour and Analysis, Addison Wesley Longman Inc., New York.
- Don Hellriegel, Slocum J.W. (Jr.), Woodman, R.W., (2001). Organisational Behaviour, Western College Publishing Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.

- Dunbar, H. F., (1914) *Mind and Body*, New York: Random House.
- Fred Luthans, (2002). *Organizational Behavior*, McGraw Hill, Irwin.
- George J.M., (1989). "Mood and Absence", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 74, pp.287-324.
- George Jennifer M., (1990). "Personality Affect, and Behaviour in Groups", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.75, No.2, p.108.
- Gilbert Sand and Anthony D. Miyazaki, (2000). "The Impact of Social Support in Sales Person Burnout and Burnout Components", *Psychology and Marketing*, vol. 1, pp. 13-26.
- Ivancevich J.M. Matteson M.T., Freedman S.M. and Phillips J.S., (1990). *Worksite Stress Management* Inventions, *American Psychologists*, 1990, 45, pp. 252-261.
- J.E. Macgrath, (1976) "Stress and Behavior in Organisations", in M.D. Dunnette(Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, Rand McNally, Chicago.
- Jack Wood, Joseph Wallace, Richard M. Zeffane, Judith Champman, Michele Fromholtz, Vol Morrison; *Organisational Behaviour – A Global Perspective*, (3rd eds.), John Wiley and Sons, Australia, Ltd. Milton (2004).
- Ken Black, (2004). *Business Statistics*, John Wiley and Sons. (Asia) Pte., Ltd. Singapore.
- Ketz de Vries, M. F.R., (1984) *Organisational Stress Management Audit*: in A.S.Sethi and R.S.Schuler (Eds.), *Hand book of Organisational stress and coping strategies*, Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Leo Goldberger and Shlomo Breznitz (eds.), *Hand Book of Stress – Theoretical and Clinical Aspects*, (1993). The Free Press, A Division of McMillian, Inc., New York.
- Lin Gensing-Popbal (1999). "Commuting HR Ease the Pain", *HR Magazine*, March, P.84.
- Lodhal, T.M. and Kejner M., (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49: pp.24-33.
- Madhu K. and Hargopal K. (1980) Role conflict and role ambiguity in relation to job, job involvement, job performance, age and job tenure. *Indian Journal of Applied Psychology*. 17. pp.1-6.
- Meyer Friedman and Ray Roseman, (1974). *Type A Behaviour and Your Heart*, (New York: Alfred A Knopf).
- Northwestern National Life Insurance Co., (1999). *Employee Burnout: American's newest epidemic*, Minneapolis, MN: Author.
- Orlando Behling and Arthur L. Darrow, (1984). *Managing Work-Related Stress*, (Chicago; Science Research Associates).
- Pestonjee D. M., (1992). *Stress and Coping*, New Delhi: Sage Publications India Ltd.
- Pestonjee D.M. (1992) *Stress and Coping*, New Delhi: Sage Publications India Ltd.
- Pestonjee, D.M. and Sing G.P., (1987). *Organisational behaviour: issues for managers and system analysts*. Working Paper. Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad
- Quick J. C., Murphy L. R. and Hurrell J. J., Jr. (1992). *Stress and Well Being at Work*, Washington, DC. American Psychological Association.
- Random House Unabridged Dictionary, (1993). Random House, New York.
- Rita Agrawal, (2001) *Stress in life and at work*; Response Books. A division of Sage Publications, New Delhi.
- Robert A Baron and Donn Byrne, (2004). *Social Psychology*, Person Education (Singapore) Pte. Ltd. Indian Branch – 482 F.I.E. Patparganj, New Delhi.
- Ross R. R., and Altmair E. M., (1994). *Intervention in Occupational Stress*. Sage. New York.
- Salve Hans (1993). *History of Stress Concept: Hand Book of Stress-Theoretical and clinical aspects*; Edited by Leo Goldbeger and Shlomo Breznitz. The Free Press, a division of Macmillan, Inc., 866, Third Avenue, New York.
- Salve Hans, (1956) *The Stress of Life*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Srivastav A. K. & Sing A. P., (1981). Construction and Standardization of an Occupational Stress Index: A pilot study. *Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 8: 133-36.
- Srivastav A.K, (1999). *Management of Occupational Stress Theories and Practice*, Gyan Publishing House, New Delhi.
- Srivastava A.K. and Sinha M.M., (1983). Perceived role stress as a function of ego-strength and job involvement of managerial personnel. *Psychological Studies*. 28: pp. 8-12.

Stephen Robbins, (2004). Organization Behaviour Prentice Hall of India Ltd., New Delhi.

Tosi H., and Tosi D. (1974). Some correlates of role conflict and ambiguity among public school teachers. *Journal of Human Relations*. 18, pp. 1063-1075.

Udai Pareek, 956)004). Understanding Organizational Behavior, Oxford University Press, YMCA Library Building, Jaising Road, New Delhi-110001.

Wingate, P.(1972). The Penguin Medical Encyclopedia Middlesex: Penguin Books, Harmondsworth.

****This paper is part of Ph. D. research work under F. I. P. of UGC. I thank my research guide Dr. Babu Thomas, Professor and Head Dept. of HR., SIBIER, Kolhapur.**