Effect of Organizational Role Stress on Job Satisfaction of Commercial Banking Executives in Sri Lanka
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Abstract: Role of executives in the commercial banking sector is a key to success and survival of the bank in any context. Success of their working life depends on the maintenance of the high level job satisfaction. Risky and stressfulness are common in their job. Therefore, this study is aimed to find out the effect of organizational role stress on job satisfaction of the executives in the banking sector using 490 executives. Two standard questionnaires were used to gather the primary data and correlation and regression analysis were used to analyses the data. The major finding of the study is that there is moderately negative relationship and impact of role stressors on the job satisfaction of banking executives.
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1. Introduction

Stress becomes a ubiquitous problem in modern life (Smith, 2000; Chang & Lu, 2007) and it is a very common phenomenon of the day to day life of human beings (Bano & Jho, 2012). It is a serious issue in many organizations as the views of researchers in occupational field (Cooper & Cartwright, 1994; Varca, 1999; Ornelas & Kleiner, 2003). The term stress, introduced by Selye (1936) is one of the most imperative health risks in the workplace and it is common in developed as well as developing countries (Paul, 2002; Danna & Griffin, 2002). Therefore, stress is still a popular topic (Vokić & Bogdanić, 2007). As Vokić and Bogdanić (2007), psychological, sociological and medical perspectives were the primary focus of stress and issues of occupational stress which are dealt in the business perspective (Vokić & Bogdanić, 2007). One of the most popular theme for applied research in psychology and wider areas of social and medical sciences is the occupational stress (Cooper & Payne, 1988). Therefore, there are various topics of stress discussed in the literature to show the importance of occupational stress such as gender (Dua, 1994; Sharpley et al., 1996; Kirkcaldy & Furnham, 1999; Antoniou et al., 2006; Fotinatos-Ventouratos & Cooper, 2005; Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005), age (Sager, 1990; Dua, 1994; Ben-Bakr et al., 1995; Sharpley et al., 1996; Kirkcaldy & Furnham, 1999; Antoniou et al., 2006; Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005), educational level (Dua, 1994; Ben-Bakr et al., 1995; Kirkcaldy & Furnham, 1999; Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005), nationality/ethnic background (Dua, 1994; Ben-Bakr et al., 1995; Lu et al., 2003), marital status (Kirkcaldy & Furnham, 1999), social class (Fotinatos-Ventouratos & Cooper, 2005), hierarchical level (Dua, 1994; Kirkcaldy & Furnham, 1999), tenure and experience (Ben-Bakr et al., 1995; Moran, 1998; Kirkcaldy & Furnham, 1999), performance (Varca, 1999), management style of superiors (Lind & Otte, 1994), organization size and type of organization (Ben-Bakr et al., 1995), supervisor’s power (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2006), and personality traits (Sager, 1990; Lind & Otte, 1994; Montgomery et al., 1996; Frei et al., 1999).

Different sources of occupational stress can be found through different models of stress. Cooper and Marshall (1978) explained 7 major categories of stress under the managerial stress model. The stressors explained by Cooper and Marshall are intrinsic to job, role in organization, career development, organizational structure and climate, relationship within organization, and organizational interface with outside. Occupational stress model developed by Cooper et al. (1988) gave several sources of stress such as job itself, managerial role, interpersonal relationship, career and achievement, organizational structure and climate and home/work interface. As Murphy (1995), sources of stress may be; Factors unique to the job (Workload, Pace/variety/meaningfulness of work, Autonomy, Shift work/hours of work, Physical environment, Isolation at the workplace), Role in the organization (Role conflict, Role ambiguity, Level of responsibility), Career development (Under/overpromotion, Job security, Career development opportunities, Overall job satisfaction), Relationships at work
Role stressors, career development, relationship with each other, physical environment, work-family conflict, organizational structure and job characteristics were reported as sources of stress by Lu et al. (2003) and exogenous stresses and endogenous stresses are the categories given by Antoniou et al. at 2006. As Antoniou et al. (2006), working condition, workload, lack of teamwork are the exogenous stresses and individual’s personality traits are the endogenous stresses. From the business perspective, researchers dealt with role stress of employees. There are ten measures of role stressors such as inter role distance, role stagnation, role expectation conflict, role erosion, role overload, role isolation, personal inadequacy, self role distance, role ambiguity and resource inadequacy. Role stress can be defined as Stress generated as a result of occupying a role (Dhawan, 2013, p. 3). As Beehr et al. (1976), dissatisfaction with work, dissatisfaction with life, low self-esteem, depressed mood, self-reported fatigue, tension or anxiety, and several risk factors in coronary heart disease are the negative outcomes of role stress. Among these outcomes of stress, impact of job stress on overall job satisfaction becomes most predictable outcome. As Mansoor et al. (2011), job stress and job satisfaction are one of the two imperative focuses in the HRM research. Stamps and Piedmonte (1986) reported that job stress has significant relationship with job satisfaction and greater job dissatisfaction might be generated through individual’s job stress (Jick & Payne, 1980). Fletcher and Payne (1980 agreed to the point given by Jick and Payne in 1980. As Fletcher and Payne (1980), job satisfaction and job stress are interrelated and Caplan in 1991 and Keller in 1975 reported that excessive stress tend to discover less satisfying of employees (cited by Mansoor et al. 2011). As Orgambide-Romos, Borrego-Ales and Mendoza-Sierra (2014), in the literature, one of the most studied areas in job demand is role stress. Therefore, this study is aimed to discuss how do organizational role stressors affect job satisfaction of banking executives in Sri Lankan commercial banking sector.

2. Literature Review
2.1. Job satisfaction

As Arshar (2014), job satisfaction is one of the job attitudes, which has widespread amount of literature available in the world and it is very hard to define because of the extremely subjective nature from individual to individual (Panday & Kavitha, 2015). Job satisfaction concept was introduced by Hoppock (1935) in the book of Job satisfaction and he opined that physiological and psychological feeling of the worker is the job satisfaction. It can be defined as the degree of happiness or positive emotional state/feeling that originates from one’s job experiences (Locke, 1976). As Cormic et al. in 2007 (as in Bilge & Kelecioglu, 2007), job satisfaction can be examined through the amount of employees’ expectations on job characteristics. Job satisfaction of workers is related to different human behaviours such as absenteeism (D Roznowski & Hulin, 1992; Steel & Rentsch, 1995 D), physical and psychological well-being (Oshagbemi, 1999 D), trade union activities (Roznowski & Hulin, 1992 D), illness (Visser, 1990), psychological withdrawal (Roznowski & Hulin, 1992), employee turnover (Steel & Rentsch, 1995 D), higher propensity to quit (Day, Bedeian & Conte, 1998 D), organizational commitment (Brown & Petersen, 1993 D), and job performance (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985 D).

2.2. Job stress and Role Stress

World Health Organization (WHO) defined occupational stress as ‘occupation or work related stress is the response people may have when presented with work demands and pressures that are not matched to their knowledge and abilities and which challenge their ability to cope’ (Khudaniya & Kaji, 2014, p. 150). Saute, Lim and Murphy (1996) defined occupational stress as the harmful physical and emotional responses that arise when the demands of a job do not match the worker’s abilities, resources or needs. As Rees (1997), occupational stress is the inability to cope with job pressures and it illustrates the poor fit between ability of individual and work requirements and conditions where he or she works (Holmlund-Rytkönen & Strandvik, 2005).

As Dhawan (2013, p. 3) role stressor can be defined as Stress generated as a result of occupying a role and the literature reveals ten role stressors such as inter role distance, role stagnation, role expectation conflict, role erosion, role overload, role isolation, personal inadequacy, self role distance, role ambiguity and resource inadequacy. Pareek (2003) categorized all ten role stressors into two role systems as role space and role set. Narrow definitions for the all ten stressors under role space and role set are given in Table 01.
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Table 01: Definitions for Role Stress

1. Role Space - This represents all the roles performed by an individual.
   i. Inter Role Distance (IRD) - Role stress arises due to conflict between organizational and non-organizational roles.
   ii. Role Stagnation (RS) - Role stagnation stress due to the feeling of being stuck in the same role and not to grow for future roles.
   iii. Self-Role Distance (SRD) - SRD stress arises due to disliking of the role given or mismatch between the person and his/her job.

2. Role Set - This represents all the roles with whom a role occupant is required to interact for the performance of his role.
   i. Role Expectation Conflict (REC) - REC stress arises due to conflicting demands from superior, subordinate and peers in the organization.
   ii. Role Erosion (RE) - This stress arises when role has become less important than it used to be.
   iii. Role Overload (RO) - Role Overload is experienced when there are too many or too high expectations from a role and the role given are overburdened.
   iv. Role Isolation (RI) - Role Isolation stress is experienced due to the feeling of not being able to communicate with others.
   v. Personal Inadequacy (PI) - This stress arises due to the lack of required skills, knowledge, and training to meet the demands of one’s role.
   vi. Role Ambiguity (RA) - Role Ambiguity is experienced when the role occupant is not clear about expectations from his/her role.
   vii. Resource Inadequacy (Rn) - This stress arises due to the lack of resources (human or material) to meet the demands of the role.

Adopted from Dhawan, 2013, pp. 3-4

2.3. Role Stress and Job Satisfaction

Bano and Jho (2012) found that there is no significant difference in the role stress level of employees of different age groups, different marital status, different level of work experiences and different qualifications. Aziz (2004) reported that resource inadequacy has come out as the most strong role stressor, afterward role overload and personal inadequacy in the women informational technology professionals in the Indian private sector. Chandraiah et al. (2003) found that more stress in the form of role overload, role ambiguity and role conflict experienced the lower job satisfaction and Steven pointed out that to increase the job satisfaction, role stressors should be reduced. As finding of Gahlan (2014), ten role stressors jointly account for only 4% of total variance in job satisfaction of IT professionals. Vandenberghe et al. (2011) found that role ambiguity and role expectations associated with job satisfaction and role conflict and role ambiguity lead to low job satisfaction (Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011). Podsakoff, LePine and LePine (2007) reported that their research findings as negative relationship between role conflict and role ambiguity with job satisfaction. Coverman in 1989 (as cited by Mansoor et al., 2011) reported that role conflict decreases the men and women’ job satisfaction. According to Caplan and Jones in 1975 and Hall and Gordon in 1973 (as cited by Mansoor et al., 2011) pointed out that role conflict becomes a stressor affecting job satisfaction. Role conflict with job satisfaction of professional accountants was associated as the research finding of Lui, Ngo and Tsang in 2010 (as cited by Mansoor et al., 2011). Vinokur-Kaplan in 1991 (as cited by Mansoor et al., 2011) reported as workload is negatively related with job satisfaction and increasing role ambiguity results in decreasing job satisfaction as Revicki and May (1989). Poor job satisfaction was found through the study done by Batesman (1981).

Table 02 presents the correlation coefficients between role stressors and job satisfaction of two studies.

Table 02: Correlation between Role Stressors and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Stressors</th>
<th>Study 01</th>
<th>Study 02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT Professionals</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Role Distance (IRD)</td>
<td>- .075</td>
<td>- .123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Stagnation (RS)</td>
<td>- .096</td>
<td>- .140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Expectation (RE)</td>
<td>- .125</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Erosion (RE)</td>
<td>- .120</td>
<td>- .039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload (RO)</td>
<td>- .112</td>
<td>- .028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Isolation (RI)</td>
<td>- .094</td>
<td>- .024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Inadequacy (PI)</td>
<td>- .101</td>
<td>- .065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Role Distance (SRD)</td>
<td>- .037</td>
<td>- .152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Objective of the Study

It is obvious that role stressors have significant impact on various behaviors of the workers in the different working contexts in the world. Among the impact of role stressors on different behaviors of the workers, impact of role stressors on job satisfaction is common phenomena. However, an empirical finding of the impact of role stressors on job satisfaction of the workers in the Sri Lankan working context is rare and it creates an empirical gap. Based on this scenario, the objective of the study is aimed to find out the impact of role stressors of the executives in the commercial banks in the western province of Sri Lanka on their job satisfaction. Further, this study is aimed to discuss the impact of role stressors of executives in the commercial banks on their job satisfaction on gender basis.

4. Method

The sample consisted of 490 executives in the commercial banks in Sri Lanka and simple random sampling method was hired to derive the sample. Among the 490 executives, 221 executives were male executives and remaining amount (269) were female executives.

Role stressors were measured using the Organizational Role Stress Scale (ORS) developed by Pareek in 1981. It has 50 items to measure the 10 role stressors (5 items for one stressor) with five point scale. Job satisfaction was measured by a questionnaire developed by Weiss et al in 1967. For the convenience of the sample respondents, the short-form questionnaire was used ignoring the long-form of questionnaire developed by Weiss et al. (1967). Inter item consistency reliability of the instruments used in this study is given in Table 03.

5. Findings

Scores obtained on role stress and job satisfaction were subjected to statistical analysis i.e. mean, correlations, simple regressions and multiple regressions. Table 04 depicts the mean values and standard deviations of the variables.

As Table 04, significant role stressors are inter role distance and role erosion among the banking executives. When compared with other role stressors, significantly less effect is recorded from the role stagnation.

As Table 05, correlation between role stressors and job satisfaction of the executives is -.539 (Sig: .000)
and it indicates that there is a moderately negative correlation between role stressors and job satisfaction of the executives in the commercial banks. When compared the correlation results of the 10 role stressors of the banking executives, very weak negative association is recorded for the self-role distance. There is averagely negative association between role erosion and job satisfaction of the banking employees. Other 08 role stressors have weakly negative association with job satisfaction of the banking executives. Simple regression analysis about the role stressors and job satisfaction of the executives is given in Table 06.

| Table 06: Simple Regression Analysis of the Dependent and Independent Variables |
|-----------------------------|--------|-------------|-----|-------|--------|---------|--------|
| R                           | R²     | Adjusted R² | F   | Sig   | Constant | b-value |
|IRD + JS                     | .204   | .042        | .040| 21.191| .000     | 2.248   | - .204 |
|RS + JS                      | .208   | .043        | .041| 21.974| .000     | 4.060   | - .208 |
|SRD + JS                     | .088   | .008        | .006| 3.842 | .051     | 4.039   | - .088 |
|REC + JS                     | .270   | .073        | .071| 38.471| .000     | 4.305   | - .270 |
|RE + JS                      | .486   | .236        | .234| 150.511| .000     | 5.050   | - .486 |
|RO + JS                      | .385   | .148        | .146| 84.728| .000     | 4.464   | - .385 |
|RI + JS                      | .265   | .070        | .068| 36.934| .000     | 4.251   | - .265 |
|Pin + JS                     | .217   | .047        | .045| 24.168| .000     | 4.589   | - .217 |
|RA + JS                      | .323   | .104        | .102| 56.713| .000     | 4.589   | - .323 |
|Rln + JS                     | .142   | .020        | .018| 10.095| .002     | 4.162   | - .142 |
|Role Stress + JS             | .539   | .291        | .289| 199.956| .000     | 6.175   | - .539 |

As Table 06, 29.1% (R-.539) variance of job satisfaction is explained by the role stressors. 4.2% of inter role distance, 4.3% of role stagnation, 0.8% of self-role distance, 7.3% of role expectation conflict, 23.6% of role erosion, 14.8% of role overload, 7% of role isolation, 4.7% of personal inadequacy, 10.4% of role ambiguity, 2% of resource inadequacy explain the variance of job satisfaction.

Multiple regressions of the independent variables with dependent variables are given in Table 07.

| Table 07: Multiple Regression Analysis |
|-----------------|--------|
| R               | .627   |
| R²              | .393   |
| Adjusted R²     | .381   |
| F               | 31.076 |
| Sig             | .000   |

According to Table 07, the R square value of 0.393 (F value = 31.076) has a significant level of 0.000 (p<0.05). This means the proposed model is considered significant and the potential determinant can describe the job satisfaction. It also indicates that 39.3% of the variance of job satisfaction is explained by the role stressors.

6. Findings, Discussion and Recommendation

The major findings of the study based on the statistical results can be summarized as follows.

1. There is moderately negative association of role stress on job satisfaction of banking executives (r is -.539 at sig. of .000)
2. Role erosion has moderately negative association with job satisfaction of banking executives (r is -.486 at sig. of .000)
3. Self role distance has very weakly negative association with job satisfaction of banking executives (r is -.088 at sig. of .000)
4. Inter role distance, role stagnation, role expectation conflict, role overload, role isolation, personal inadequacy, role ambiguity and resource inadequacy have weakly negative association with job satisfaction of banking executives.
5. 29.1% variance of job satisfaction of banking executives is explained by the role stressors.
6. 39.3% variance of job satisfaction of banking executives is explained by the ten role stressors together.

The major finding of the study is that there is moderately negative relationship and impact of role stressors on the job satisfaction of banking executives. This result is maintained with the findings of Samartha et al. in 2011. They concluded their finding of the study as role stress is negatively related to the job satisfaction. Pestonjee and Mishara (1999) also found that there is a negative correlation between job satisfaction and all the dimensions of role stressors.
The results of the study reported that there is a weak negative relationship and impact of inter role distance with job satisfaction of the banking executives. This result is supported by the studies done by Gahlan in 2014, Singh (2014) Vijaya and Hemamalini in 2012. Inter role distance explains the stress which has occurred because of conflict between organizational and non-organizational roles.

As statistical results of the study, role stagnation is weak negatively correlated with the job satisfaction of banking executives. This finding can be confirmed by the study done by Vasudevan et al. (2015), Gahlan (2014) and Singh (2014). If banking executives feel either there is no any opportunity to growth of the career or stuck in the same role, they will feel the job dissatisfaction.

Vasudevan et al. (2015), Vijaya and Hemamalini (2012), Gahlan (2014) and Singh (2014) found that there is negative relationship between role expectation conflicts with job satisfaction. These findings can be used to prove the finding of this study. This study demonstrates that stress of banking executives arise due to conflicting demands from supervisors, subordinates and peers in the bank.

Banking executives in Sri Lanka illustrate that when role has become less important than it used to be, then their job satisfaction remains at a lower level. The r value of the role erosion of this study is -0.385 and 14.8% variance of job satisfaction is explained by the role erosion. This finding is supported by the findings of Gahlan (2014) and Singh (2014).

Role overload is one of the major factors to determine the job satisfaction. This study found the association of job overload with job satisfaction as weak and negative relation. Chandreiah et al. (2003), Vasudevan et al. (2015), Vijaya and Hemamalini (2012), Gahlan (2014) and Singh (2014) found that role overload leads to lower job satisfaction.

There is a weak negative association and impact of role isolation with job satisfaction of banking executives. The findings of Chandreiah et al. (2003), Vasudevan et al. (2015), Gahlan (2014) and Singh (2014) supported this research finding further. If there is no opportunity to communicate with each other, then employee will feel that they experience the job isolation.

Lack of required skills, knowledge, and training to meet the demands of employee’s role, it will lead to stress on personal inadequacy. In this study, banking employees pointed out that association between job satisfaction and personal inadequacy has weak negative relationship and impact. This finding can be confirmed by the findings of Vasudevan et al. (2015), Gahlan (2014) and Singh (2014).

Role ambiguity is another important stress for the banking executives. There is a weak negative association and impact of role ambiguity and job satisfaction of them. Chandreiah et al. (2003), Vasudevan et al. (2015), Vijaya and Hemamalini (2012), Gahlan (2014) and Singh (2014), Cervoni and DeLucia-Waack (2011) and Podsakoff, LePine and LePine (2007) stress this findings through their studies.

Chandreiah et al. (2003), Vasudevan et al. (2015), Vijaya and Hemamalini (2012), Gahlan (2014) and Singh (2014), Cervoni and DeLucia-Waack (2011) and Podsakoff, LePine and LePine (2007) found that there is a negative relationship between resource inadequacy with job satisfaction of employees. In this study, one of the findings is that there is weak and negative association and impact the resource inadequacy with job satisfaction of banking executives.

As the recommendation of the study, bank management of the commercial banks has to consider the role stress of the executives as an important human issue. However, among the role stressors, they have to give significant attention for the inter role distance and role expectation conflict of the executive. Then it suggests that bank management has to offer a work-life balancing programme to overcome the conflict arising from organizational and non-organizational conflicts. Further, the bank management has to redefine the demands of executive coming from supervisors, subordinates and peers to reduce the role expectation conflict. In general, preventive strategies such as job redesign, workplace layout arrangement, creating job challenges, providing job descriptions, facilitating work life balance strategies can be used by the management of the banking sector to minimize the effect of role stressors on the job satisfaction of banking executives as recommendation of the study.
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