Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI) Volume 11, Issue 1, January 2020: 537-556 DOI: 10.53555/tojqi.v11i1.10316

Research Article

Occupational Stress among Software Employees in I.T Sector

Dr. A. Aravind¹, Dr. N Rajashekar²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Osmania University, Hyderabad.

²Trained Graduate Teacher, UGC-JRF(Education), UGC-JRF(Psychology), Department of Education, (Formerly Associated with) Osmania University.

e-mail id: rajashekarnagunuri@gmail.com

Abstract

In the emerging era, life is becoming more and more complex, problematic and conflicting day to day. Stress is an unavoidable consequence of modern living. With the growth of industries, pressure in the urban areas, quantitative growth in population and various problems in day to day life are some of the reasons for an increase in stress. The present study delves into the occupational stress experienced by software employees in the IT sector, aiming to analyze its prevalence and impact on various demographic variables. The research involved a normative survey of 400 software employees in Hyderabad. The study employed Occupational Stress Index developed by Dr. A.K. Srivastava and Dr. A.P. Singh(1981) for collecting the data. Findings revealed that a significant percentage of IT sector employees were experiencing high levels of occupational stress. Findings also revealed that factors such as role overload, strenuous working conditions, and unreasonable group pressures were key stressors. Gender and age were identified as influential factors, with differences noted in dimensions like intrinsic impoverishment and role ambiguity. Interestingly, the study highlighted that both male and female IT employees faced similar levels of occupational stress. While marital status did not significantly affect stress levels, differences were observed in dimensions like role conflict and powerlessness. Similarly, experience levels influenced stress, with certain stress dimensions being more pronounced in employees with varying levels of experience. Age, however, did not show significant differences in overall stress levels, although variations were noted in role conflict between different age groups. Moreover, the research indicated that organizational interventions are crucial to mitigate stress levels among employees. The study underscores the importance of addressing occupational stress in the IT sector through targeted interventions to enhance employee well-being and productivity.

Key words: Occupational Stress, Software Employees

1. Introduction:

In the emerging era, life is becoming more and more complex, problematic and conflicting day to day. Stress is an unavoidable consequence of modern living. With the growth of industries, pressure in the urban areas, quantitative growth in population and various problems in day to day life are some of the reasons for an increase in stress. Stress is a condition of strain that has a direct bearing on emotions, thought process and physical conditions of a person. Most of us experience stress at one time or another. However, excessive or prolonged stress can be harmful. Stress is unique and personal. A situation may be stressful for someone but the same situation may be challenging for others.

Stress has become a very common phenomenon of routine life, and an unavoidable consequence of the ways in which society has changed. 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.

1.1 Meaning and definition of Stress:

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, which 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).

The perception of the effects of stress on an individual has changed. Stress is not always dysfunctional in nature, and, if positive, can prove one of the most important factors in improving productivity within an organization (Spielberger, 1980). If not positive, stress can create a number of physical and psychological disorders among employees, and can be responsible for frustration, haste, and job dissatisfaction. As a result, the lack of work may cause complacency within the organization. Stress is, therefore, multidimensional, and its results depend on whether employees perceive it as a problem or a solution.

1.2 Stress levels in Industrial Community in India:

Fifty-seven per cent of workers in the corporate sector in India reported an increase in stress over the last two years, a survey has said. A Regus statement said, a study by the Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations found that India's rapid economic expansion has boosted corporate profits and employee incomes, but has also sparked a surge in workplace stress and lifestyle diseases that few Indian companies have addressed. The survey said 45 per cent of Indian workers are particularly stressed by the increased focus on profitability that has arisen during the recession. In fact, this particular pressure is stressing out Indian employees more than workers in any of the other countries surveyed.

Another factor responsible for increasing workplace stress is the pressure to maintain excellent customer service: 33 per cent identified this as a major stress-causing factor.

The latest research by workspace provider Regus shows that Indian workers are getting more stressed. The survey reveals that work (51%) and personal finances (50%) are the contributing factors for the increased stress levels of the Indian work-force.

1.3 Need for the Study:

Stress is becoming increasingly global and affects all categories of employees in all countries. Because of this, stress has become important concerns both in research and organizational practices. Ever increasing demands of a highly competitive work environment in I.T. sector require constant updating of knowledge and skills of managers to be able to function effectively.

The present era is considered an era of strain, frustration, conflict, tension, depression, psychosomatic diseases and anxiety, which have become regular features of life. Arising both at work and home, these conditions have a detrimental effect on the behavior of people, which ultimately result in organizational inefficiency and sickness. I.T. sector is no exception to this, as it is an expanding sector worldwide particularly employees are likely to experience greater job-related strain caused by nature of work, greater responsibilities. For improving the performance and wellbeing of the employees, it is essential to study the stress experienced by them which may lead to better understanding of the situation and work efficiency both at individual as well as organizational level. Hence, the present study has been taken up.

1.4 A brief account of Review of Previous Studies:

Kahn et al (1964) identified role conflict with one of the forms of role based stress. Argyris C. (1964) has pointed out that job related tension and job dissatisfaction is correlated with little participation in decision making, ambiguity about job security and poor use of skills and abilities. Caplan et al. (1975) have identified the lack of participation in the decision making process, lack of effective consultation and communication, unjustified restrictions on behavior, office politics and no sense of belonging as potential sources of stress. Fred Luthans(2002) said the effects of stress on individual employees are changes in emotional states relevant to job performance, lowered selfesteem, inability to concentrate and make decisions". Kumar, Chandel, Singh and Pant (1977) emphasized that "Stress caused diseases include Thyrotoxicosis, Hypertension, Peptic Ulcer, Bronchial Asthma, Rheumatoid arthritis and Coronary heart Diseases." Cummings and Cooper (1979) they found that the impact of job stress on the employees' physical health. Ivencevich and Matterson (1980) identified three critical factors such as role ambiguity, role conflict and the degree of responsibility as the major sources of employees' stress. Natha (1980) identified that the role conflict decreases with an increase in job tenure in an organization. Weiss identified that the social support that alleviates the deleterious consequences of stress. Ahmad, Bharadwaj and Narula (1985) they found that out of 10 dimensions of role stress, however, significant differences were obtained in three dimensions, namely, role isolation, role ambiguity, and self-role distance. Cohen and Wills are of the opinion that "People naturally seek help from others-social support- when they are having problems or feeling stressed. Pestonjee (1987) opined that success, achievement, higher productivity and effectiveness call for stress. When stress is left unchecked and unmanaged, it can create problems in performance and affect the health and well-being of the organism. Dastur (1990) has pointed out, negative group climate and powerlessness may be dominant causes of stress experience by Indian managers. Role conflict and ambiguity, work overload, under utilization of skills, resource inadequacy and lack of participation as the main categories of work stressors which were identified by Cummins R. (1990) in his study. Singh and Singh (1992) showed that high anxiety employees showed a positive relationship with role stress. A study conducted by Rajeshwari T.R. (1992) revealed structural rigidity and poor physical working conditions as sources of stress". Chand and Sethi (1997) found that there is a significant positive relationship between job-related strain and role overload and role conflict. Pandey C.S. (1998) results showed that Psychoticism- stability dimensions of personality were found to be associated with higher levels of stress. On the other hand extroversion-introversion was negatively correlated with perceived organizational stress. Luolu's(1999) study found that intrinsic work motivation was positively related to overall job satisfaction, whereas extrinsic motivation was positively related to depression; both supervisor's support and family support were negatively related to depression, anxiety and somatic symptoms. Lim and Hian (1999) found that, Lack of career advancement, workload, risk-taking and decision making and employee morale and organizational culture were identified causes of stress. Michailidis and Georgiou (2005) focused on the degree of occupational stress that is influenced by the factors like level of education, various patterns of their relaxation and any other habits like drinking or smoking that consuming alcoholic drinks is the main factor that determines the degree of occupational stress in an individual. According to Singh and Singh (2009) Job Satisfaction is directly related to Stress and Work culture that an Organization provides. He identified three sectors in which stress originate and classified stress into two main types i.e. eustress and Distress. Bhatti, Shar, Shaikh & Nazar (2010) investigated that, the major causes of stress are firstly workload that causes 25% of stress, secondly timings that results 16% of stress, thirdly climate that causes 11% of stress. Job stressors affecting most of the employees included: role conflict and role ambiguity, lack of promotion and feedback, lack of participation in decision making, lack of authority, workload, unsatisfactory working conditions and interpersonal relationships (Mohsen and Reza, 2011). Sharma & Devi (2012) found various factors that influence stress are age where the younger employees are more stressed as compared to other employees, level of qualification, pay, and authorities of control, awards, and word of praise,

improved designations and working couples. Lu S.F (2012) examined that the Occupational stress among supervisors was found to be significantly associated with heavy load stress, mental requirements of work, massive technical/office work, and the use of microelectronics equipment needing concentration and literacy in IT, and regular upgrading of skills. Vijayalakshmi and Meti (2000) found that non-executive employees exhibited signs of significantly higher occupational stress, which are role conflict, political pressure, poor peer relations and job responsibility. Ajay and Cary (2012) found that stress had a significant negative impact on organizational citizenship behaviors. Karthik, R.(2013) focused on Employee's performance at work is influenced by stress that can be either positive or negative. The employee performs better if they face a low to moderate amount of stress. Hence, it aims at reducing the level of stress rather than eliminating stress completely.

Review of the previous studies does not offer many studies on Software employees of Telangana State.

1.5 Statement of the Problem:

The nature of work among the employees, who constantly need to meet their targets, deadlines, achievement, night shifts and also work overload cause stress among IT employees. The present study aims at studying the stress among IT employees hence, the study is entitled as

"Occupational Stress among Software Employees in I.T Sector".

2. Research Methodology:

2.1 Objectives of the Study:

- To study the level of Occupational Stress among software employees.
- To study the Occupational Stress of software employees with respect to demographic variables.

2.2 Hypotheses:

Ho: There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Gender.

Ho: There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Age.

Ho: There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Marital Status.

Ho: There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Experience.

2.3 Variables:

Dependent variable:

Occupational Stress

Independent variables:

- 1. Gender
- 2. Age
- 3. Marital Status
- 4. Experience

According to the objectives, the present study demands a Normative Survey method. Normative survey method is a method of research, which is designed to obtain pertinent and precise information concerning the current status of phenomena.

In the present study, the population was software employees, who were working at various organizations in the I.T sector, in Hyderabad of Telangana State. The sample of the study constitutes 400 software employees; the sample was collected from both male and female, having experience of 0-3 years, 3-6 years and above 6 years, both married and unmarried employees at Hi-tech city and Madhapur in I.T Organizations namely Microsoft, Cognizant, Accenture, TCS, Deloitte, IBM. Purposive sampling technique was adopted for selection of the sample and for collecting the data. Occupational Stress Index developed by Dr. A.K. Srivastava and Dr. A.P. Singh (1981) was employed for data collection. The scale consists of 46 items. Out of 46 items, 28 are true-keyed and 18 are false keyed. The Occupational Stress sources are broadly divided into twelve dimensions.

The data were collected carefully from all the selected respondents with all the necessary care. The researcher went to various I.T Organizations and the tool was administered carefully on the respondents and information was collected by giving sufficient time. One of the primary limitations of the present study is that the data were collected only from the respondents of Hyderabad district, Telangana. The selection of the sample method was a Non-Probability technique.

3. Analysis and Interpretation:

3.1 Analysis of different levels of Occupational Stress among software employees with a focus on different dimensions of the Occupational Stress Index.

This section deals with the analysis of Occupational Stress among software employees of three categories which are low, moderate and high with respect to different dimensions namely Role overload, Role Conflict, Under Participation, Unprofitability, Powerlessness, Poor Peer Relations, Intrinsic Impoverishment, Low Status, Strenuous Working Conditions, Role Ambiguity, Unreasonable group and political pressures and Responsibility.

Table-3.1: Level of Occupational Stress among Software Employees with Percentage

Dimension of the		Low	Moderate	High	Total
Occupational stress					
	Count	54	170	176	400
Role overload	%	13.5	42.5	44.0	100.0
	Count	162	157	81	400
Role Conflict	%	40.5	39.3	20.3	100.0
Under	Count	237	140	23	400
Participation	%	59.3	35.0	5.8	100.0
-	Count	147	188	65	400
Unprofitability	%	36.8	47.0	16.3	100.0
	Count	225	150	25	400
Powerlessness	%	56.3	37.5	6.3	100.0
	Count	95	186	119	400
Poor Peer Relations	%	23.8	46.5	29.8	100.0
	Count	178	160	62	400
Intrinsic	%	44.5	40.0	15.5	100.0
Impoverishment					
	Count	285	77	38	400
Low Status	%	71.3	19.3	9.5	100.0
Strenuous Working	Count	78	157	165	400
conditions	%	19.5	39.3	41.3	100.0
	Count	221	130	49	400
Role Ambiguity	%	55.3	32.5	12.3	100.0
Unreasonable group	Count	71	175	154	400
and political pressure	%	17.8	43.8	38.5	100.0
	Count	61	176	163	400
Responsibility	%	15.3	44.0	40.8	100.0
	Count	151	155	94	400
Occupational Stress	%	37.75	38.75	23.50	100.0

3.1.1 Interpretation of Occupational Stress Levels:

It is evident from Table-3.1, most of the employees i.e. 38.75% have moderate level of Occupational Stress, 37.75% have low level of Occupational Stress and 23.50% employees have high level of Occupational Stress. When it comes to dimension wise analysis of Occupational Stress, Role overload among software employees seems to be one of the important causes of

Occupational Stress, because amongst 12 dimensions the highest percentage of employees i.e. 44.0% were experiencing high level of Role overload. Which means that most of the employees in IT sector were experiencing Occupational Stress due to excessive workload, doing excessive work in spite of insufficient number of employees and resources, feeling of inability to carry out assignment to the satisfactory level on account of excessive load of work and lack of time, inability to devote sufficient time to domestic and personal problems due to workload which in turn affecting their personal as well as professional life.

It is observed from table- 3.1 that feeling of Unprofitability among software employees is also a leading factor to Occupational Stress. It shows that the highest percentage i.e. 47.0% of employees were perceiving moderate level of Unprofitability, a remarkable percentage of employees i.e. 16.3% were experiencing a high level of Unprofitability, which means that feeling of Unprofitability exists among most of the employees in terms of unsatisfactory salaries compared to their quantum of work as well as lack of rewards for their hard work and efficient performance. The Poor Peer Relations are one of the sources of Occupational Stress. Table-3.1 reveals that 46.5% of employees expressed the moderate level of Poor Peer Relations and 29.8% of employees had high level of Poor Peer Relations, which means that they were not willing to work with others whom they do not like, lack of team spirit, co-operation from colleagues in solving organizational problems.

In addition, the table-3.1 shows that Strenuous Working Conditions are one of the factors leading to Occupational Stress. Most of the employees i.e. 41.3% expressed Strenuous Working Conditions at high level and 39.3% of employees felt Strenuous Working Conditions at moderate level, Which means that most of the employees were experiencing stress ranging from moderate to high levels, in terms of working under tense circumstances, working on risky and complicated assignments.

Unreasonable group and political pressure is also a leading factor of Occupational Stress. Table-3.1 reveals that, most of the employees i.e. 43.8% of employees experienced Unreasonable group and political pressure at moderate level and 38.5% of employees expressed high level of Unreasonable group and political pressure. It reveals that most of the employees were experiencing stress as a result of Unreasonable group and political pressure such as making adjustments between political/ group pressures and formal rules and instructions, doing some work unwillingly owing to certain group/political pressures and maintaining conformity with the group.

Table- 3.1 also reveals that Responsibility is also one of the causes of Occupational Stress of software employees. It represents that, most of employees i.e. 44.0% felt Responsibility at moderate level and 40.8% of employees expressed high level of Responsibility which means that most of the employees were experiencing stress at high and moderate levels due to Responsibility in terms of the Responsibility for the efficiency and productivity of other employees as well as for the progress and prosperity of the organization.

As most of the employees have low levels of Role Ambiguity, Role Conflict, Under Participation, Powerlessness, Intrinsic Impoverishment, and Low Status, it can be said that these are not the leading factors to the Occupational Stress. However, most of the employees were experiencing stress due to these factors at low levels.

3.2 Analysis of level of Occupational Stress among software employees with respect to different Demographic Variables:

Ho: There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Gender.

The level of Occupational Stress among software employees was evaluated using cross-table percentages and chi-square analysis. The respondents were first grouped into three categories i.e., low, moderate and high stress groups based on their scores on the different dimensions of Occupational Stress Index. Analysis was carried out with respect to demographic variables of the study and presented in the present section.

3.2.1(a) Dimensions of Occupational Stress Vs Gender

Table-3.2: Association between Level of Occupational Stress and Gender

	Гable-3.	2: Ass	sociatio	on betweer	n Le	evel o	of Occup	oational Stress	and	d Gender	
			Role ove				_	Calculated x^2 Value	df	Table value at	S/NS
			Low	Modera	40	High	Total			a=0.05	
		Count		146		137	327				
	Male	%	13.5	44.6		41.9	100.0				Not
Gender	Iviaic	Count	_	24		39	73	3.751	2	5.991	Significant
Jenuer	Female	%	13.7	32.9		53.4	100.0	3.701	_	3.771	Significant
	Terriare	Count		170		176	400				
	Total	%	13.5	42.5		44.0	100.0				
		_	Role Co								
			Low		e H	ligh	Total				
		Count		135		61	327				
	Male	%	40.19	6 41.3%	18	3.7%	100.0%				Not
Gender		Count	31	22		20	73	4.227	2	5.991	Significant
	Female	%	42.59	6 30.1%	27	7.4%	100.0%				
		Count		157		81	400				
	Total	%	40.5%		20	0.3%	100.0%				
		Und		icipation							
	1	1	Lov		te	High	Total				
		Cour				19	327				**
<i>a</i> :	Male	%	60.9			5.8%	100.0%	0.017	~	7 001	Not
Gender		Cour				4	73	2.214	2	5.991	Significant
	Female		52.1		- :	5.5%	100.0%				
	T.4.1	Cour				23	400				
	Total	% T	59.3			5.8%	100.0%				
		U	nprofitation Low	Moderate	Hig	-b	Total				
		Count	116	158	53		327				
	Male	%	35.5%	48.3%	16.2		100.0%				Not
Gender	Iviaic	Count	31	30	12		73	1.458	2	5.991	Significant
Gender	Female	%	42.5%	41.1%	16.4		100.0%	1.150	_	3.771	Significant
	Temare	Count	147	188	65		400				
	Total	%	36.8%	47.0%	16.3		100.0%				
			Powerles			, .					
			Low	Moderate	Hig	gh	Total				
		Count	191	116	20		327				
	Male	%	58.4%	35.5%	6.19	%	100.0%				Not
Gender		Count	34	34	5		73	3.498	2	5.991	Significant
	Female	%	46.6%	46.6%	6.89		100.0%				
		Count	225	150	25		400				
	Total	%	56.3%	37.5%	6.39	%	100.0%				
		Poo		Relations		_					
	П	C .	Low	Moderate	Hig		Total				
	F	Count	78	153	96		327				NT. 4
Condi	Male		23.9%	46.8%	29.4		100.0%	0.122	2	5.001	Not Significant
Gender	H	Count	17	33	21.5		73 100.0%	0.133	2	5.991	Significant
	Female		23.3%	45.2%	31.5						
	Total	Count %	23.8%	186 46.5%	29.8		400 100.0%				
	1 Otal	70	23.0%	40.3%	۷۶.۵	70	100.0%				
		Intring	ic Imno	verishment							
			Low	Moderate	Hig	2h	Total				
		Count	152	133	42		327				
	Male	%	46.5%	40.7%	12.8		100.0%				
Gender		Count	26	27	20		73	9.941	2	5.991	Significant
	Female	%	35.6%	37.0%	27.4		100.0%				<i>U</i>
		Count	178	160	62		400				
	1									T. Control of the Con	

	Total	%	44.5%	40.0%	15.5%	100.0%				
			Low St		1					
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
		Count	234	63	30	327				
	Male	%	71.6%	19.3%	9.2%	100.0%				Not
Gender		Count		14	8	73	0.224	2	5.991	Significant
	Female	%	69.9%	19.2%	11.0%	100.0%				
		Count		77	38	400				
	Total	%	71.3%	19.3%	9.5%	100.0%				
	Stı	renuou		ing Conditi						
	1		Low	Moderate	High	Total				
		Count		134	132	327				
	Male	%	18.7%	41.0%	40.4%	100.0%			# 004	Not
Gender		Count		23	33	73	2.360	2	5.991	Significant
	Female	%	23.3%	31.5%	45.2%	100.0%				
		Count		157	165	400				
	Total	%	19.5%	39.3%	41.3%	100.0%				
		R	Role Am							G: :
			Low	Moderate	High	Total	6.713	2	5.991	Significant
	M.1.	Count		112	34	327				
	Male	%	55.4%	34.3%	10.4%	100.0%				
Gender	Б 1	Count		18	15	73				
Gender	Female	%	54.8%	24.7%	20.5%	100.0%				
		Count		130	49	400				
	Total	%	55.3%	32.5%	12.3%	100.0%				
	Unreaso	nable		nd Political						
		a	Low	Moderate	High	Total				
	Mala	Count		145	122	327				Not
Gender	Male	% Carrat	18.3%	44.3%	37.3%	100.0%	1.166	2	5.991	Significant
Gender	Female	Count %	15.1%	30 41.1%	32	73	1.100	2	3.991	Significant
	remaie	70 Count		175	43.8% 154	100.0%				
	Total	%	17.8%	43.8%	38.5%	100.0%				
	Total		Respons		36.370	100.070				
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
		Count		137	142	327				
	Male	%	14.7%	41.9%	43.4%	100.0%				Not
Gender		Count		39	21	73	5.332	2	5.991	Significant
	Female	%	17.8%	53.4%	28.8%	100.0%				
		Count		176	163	400				
	Total	%	15.3%	44.0%	40.8%	100.0%				
	1	Occ		nal Stress						
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
		Count	124	128	75	327				
	Male	%	37.92%	39.14%	22.94%	100.0%	1.062	2	5.991	Not
Gender		Count	27	27	19	73				Significant
	Female	%	36.99%	36.99%	26.02%	100.0%				
		Count		155	94	400				
	Total	%	37.75%	38.75%	23.50%	100.0%				

3.2.1(b) Interpretation of Occupational Stress Levels vs. Gender:

Table-3.2 reveals that the Chi-square value was found to be significant in Intrinsic Impoverishment, Role Ambiguity dimensions of occupational stress. Hence, the Null Hypothesis which states that "There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Gender" is rejected with respect to Intrinsic Impoverishment, Role Ambiguity dimensions of occupational stress.

It is evident from table- 3.2 that only about 1% difference exists between Male and Female employees at low level of Occupational Stress, but the difference is greater at moderate and high levels. These differences were statistically not supported by the results of chi-square which means

that employees of the I.T sector were experiencing similar levels of Occupational Stress irrespective of gender.

However, the differences between Male and Female employees were found to be statistically valid with respect to Intrinsic Impoverishment and Role Ambiguity dimensions.

Table-3.2 reveals that there exists a difference in the percentage of Male and Female employees with respect to different levels of Intrinsic Impoverishment, these differences were supported by the results of chi- square which means that Male and Female employees were experiencing different levels of stress in terms of monotonous assignments, opportunities for unitizing, developing their abilities and experience as well as proficiency. These feelings are more in Female employees who have high level of Intrinsic Impoverishment; however more number of Male employees are experiencing this kind of impoverishment at low and moderate levels.

Similarly Table-3.2 reveals that there exists a difference in the percentage of Male and Female employees with respect to different levels of Role Ambiguity, these differences were supported by the results of chi- square which means that Male and Female employees were experiencing different levels of stress in terms of vague and insufficient information about their roles and responsibilities, uncertainty and ambiguity of the scope of jurisdiction and authorities under which they are working. These feelings are more in Female employees at high level of Role Ambiguity however more number of Male employees is experiencing this kind of Role Ambiguity at low and moderate levels.

Gender differences were not found in other dimensions, which imply that both Male and Female employees working in I.T sector are experiencing similar kind of role overload, Role Conflict, Unreasonable group and political pressures, Poor Peer Relations.

3.2.2(a) Dimensions of Occupational Stress Vs Age

Ho: There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Age.

Table-3.3: Association between Level of Occupational Stress and Age

			Role ove				Calculated x ² Value	df	Table value at $a=0.05$	S/NS
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
	Below30	Count	45	136	139	320				
	years	%	14.1%	42.5%	43.4%	100.0%				Not
	Above30	Count	9	34	37	80	0.490	2	5.991	Significant
Age	years	%	11.3%	42.5%	46.3%	100.0%				
		Count	54	170	176	400				
	Total	%	13.5%	42.5%	44.0%	100.0%				
		I	Role Co	nflict						
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
	Below30	Count	136	114	70	320				
	years	%	42.5%	35.6%	21.9%	100.0%				
Age	Above30	Count	26	43	11	80	9.023	2	5.991	Significant
	years	%	32.5%	53.8%	13.8%	100.0%				
	•	Count	162	157	81	400				
	Total	%	40.5%	39.3%	20.3%	100.0%				
		Und	er Part	icipation						
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
	Below30	Count	184	117	19	320				
	years	%	57.5%	36.6%	5.9%	100.0%				Not
	Above30	Count	53	23	4	80	2.041	2	5.991	Significant
Age	years	%	66.3%	28.8%	5.0%	100.0%				
	•	Count	237	140	23	400				
	Total	%	59.3%	35.0%	5.8%	100.0%				
		U	nprofit	ability						
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
	Below30	Count	116	150	54	320				

	Voore	%	36.3%	6 46.9%	16.9%	100.0%				Not
Age	years Above30	Coun	_	38	11	80	0.499	2	5.991	Significant
Agu	years	%	38.89		13.8%	100.0%	0.477	2	3.771	Significant
	years	Coun		188	65	400				
	Total	%	36.89		16.3%	100.0%				
	10111			lessness	10.570	100.070				
		-	1		IIIak	Total				
	D-120	C	Low		High	Total				
	Below30	Count		128	21	320				Not
A co	years Above30	% Count	53.4%	6 40.0% 22	6.6%	100.0%	5.167	2	5.991	Significant
Age		%	67.5%		5.0%	100.0%	0.107	_	0.551	Significant
	years	Count		150	25	400				
	Total	%	56.3%		6.3%	100.0%				
	1 otta			Relations	0.570	100.070				
		100	Low	Moderate	High	Total				
	Below30	Count	79	144	97	320				
	years		24.7%	45.0%	30.3%	100.0%				
	•			43.0%	22	80				Not
Age	L	Count	16				1.536	2	5.991	Significant
-	years		20.0%	52.5%	27.5%	100.0%				
	Tr.4.1	Count	95	186	119	400				
	Total		23.8%	46.5%	29.8%	100.0%				
		IIItIII	Low	Moderate	High	Total				
	Below30	Count	145	126	49	320				
	years	%	45.3%		15.3%	100.0%				Not
	Above30	Count	33	34	13.370	80	0.430	2	5.991	Significant
Age	years	%	41.3%		16.3%	100.0%				
		Count	178	160	62	400				
	Total	%	44.5%	40.0%	15.5%	100.0%				
			Low	Status						
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
	Below30	Count	225	64	31	320				
	years		70.3%	20.0%	9.7%	100.0%				Not
	Above30	Count	60	13	7	80	0.724	2	5.991	Significant
Age	years		75.0%	16.3%	8.8%	100.0%				
	Tr.4-1	Count	285	77	38	400				
	Total		71.3%	19.3%	9.5%	100.0%				
	31	renuou		king Condit Moderate		Total				
	D -120	C	Low)	Total				
	Below30	Count		126	132	320				Not
	years Above30	% Count	19.4%	39.4%	41.3%	100.0%	0.019	2	5.991	Significant
Age	years	%	20.0%		41.3%	100.0%			/-	
5	jears	Count		157	165	400				
	Total	%	19.5%		41.3%	100.0%				
		R		nbiguity						
			Low		High	Total				
	Below30	Count		105	43	320				
	years	%	53.8%	6 32.8%	13.4%	100.0%				
	Above30	Count		25	6	80				Not
Age	years	%	61.3%		7.5%	100.0%	2.541	2	5.991	Significant
Ш		Count		130	49	400				
	Total	%	55.3%	6 32.5%	12.3%	100.0%				
	Unrea	sonable	group	& political	pressur	e				
			Low	Moderate	High	Total	0.347	2	5.991	Not
	Below30	Count	55	141	124	320	0.517		5.771	Significant
	years	%	17.2%		38.8%	100.0%				3
	Above30	Count		34	30	80				
Age	years	%	20.0%	42.5%	37.5%	100.0%				
1150										

		Count	71	175	154	400				
	Total	%	17.8%	43.8%	38.5%	100.0%				
]	Respons	sibility						
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
	Below30	Count	54	144	122	320				
	years	%	16.9%	45.0%	38.1%	100.0%				Not
Age	Above30	Count	7	32	41	80	5.840	2	5.991	Significant
	years	%	8.8%	40.0%	51.3%	100.0%				
		Count	61	176	163	400				
	Total	%	15.3%	44.0%	40.8%	100.0%				
		Occ	upation	nal Stress						
			Low	Moderate	High	Total	0.154	1	3.841	Not
										Significant
	Below30	Count	120	125	75	320				
	years	%	37.50%	39.06%	23.44%	100.0%				
	Above30	Count	31	30	19	80				
Age	years	%	38.75%	37.50%	23.75%	100.0%				
		Count	151	155	94	400				
	Total	%	37.75%	38.75%	23.50%	100.0%				

3.2.2(b) Interpretation of Occupational Stress Levels Vs Age:

Table-3.3 reveals that the Chi-square value was found to be significant in Role Conflict dimension of occupational stress. Hence, the Null Hypothesis which states that "There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Age" is rejected with respect to Role Conflict dimension of Occupational Stress.

It is evident from table-3.3 that almost equal percentage of Occupational Stress exists among below 30 years and above 30 years Age of employees at high level, only about 1% of difference exists at low level of Occupational Stress, but this difference is greater at moderate levels. These differences were statistically not supported by the results of chi-square which means that employees of I.T sector were equally suffering from Occupational Stress irrespective of Age. However, the differences between below 30 years and above 30 years Age of employees were found to be statistically valid with respect to Role Conflict.

Table-3.3 reveals that there exists a difference in the percentage of employees belong to below 30 years and above 30 years of Age with respect to different levels of Role Conflict, these differences were supported by the results of chi-square which means that employees belong to below 30 years and above 30 years of Age were experiencing different levels of stress in terms of contradictory instructions given by different officers, insufficient instructions and facilities regarding the new assignments and sudden implementation of new dealing procedures and policies in place of those already in practice. These feelings are more in employees belong to below 30 years of Age who have high level of Role Conflict how ever more number of above 30 years Age employees are experiencing this kind of Role Conflict at moderate level.

3.2.3(a) Dimensions of Occupational Stress Vs Marital Status

Ho: There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Marital Status.

Table-3.4: Association between Level of Occupational Stress and Marital Status

		Rol	e overloa	Calculated x^2 Value	df	Table value at a=0.05	S/NS			
			Low	Moderate	High	Total	0.503		# 001	
		Count	20	57	65	142	0.502	2	5.991	Not
	Married	%	14.1%	40.1%	45.8%	100.0%				Significant
Marital		Count	34	113	111	258				

Status	Unmarried	%	13.2%	43.8%	43.0%	100.0%				
Status		Count	54	170	176	400				
	Total	%	13.5%	42.5%	44.0%					
			e Confli							
		Kul	Low	Moderate	High	Total				
			2011	1,100,000		10001	8.632	2	5.991	Significant
		Count	46	69	27	142				
	Married	%	32.4%	48.6%	19.0%	100.0%				
Marital		Count	116	88	54	258				
Status	Unmarried	%	45.0%	34.1%	20.9%					
		Count	162	157	81	400				
	Total	%	40.5%		20.3%	100.0%				
		Under	Particip							
		G .	Low	Moderate	High	Total				
	3.6 . 1	Count	90	45	7	142				
N/I 14 - 1	Married	%	63.4%	31.7%	4.9%	100.0%				NIat
Marital	T In an a mai a d	Count	147	95	16	258	1.581	2	5.991	Not Significant
Status	Unmarried	%	57.0%	36.8%	6.2%	100.0%	1.361		3.991	Significant
	Total	Count	237	140	23	400				
	Total	% IInn	59.3% rofitabil		5.8%	100.0%				
		Onp	Low	Moderate	High	Total				
		Count	53	67	22	142				
	Married	%	37.3%	47.2%	15.5%	100.0%				
Marital	Married	Count	94	121	43	258				Not
Status	Unmarried	%	36.4%	46.9%	16.7%	100.0%	0.099	2	5.991	Significant
		Count	147	188	65	400				8
	Total	%	36.8%	47.0%	16.3%	100.0%				
			verlessne							
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
		Count	92	44	6	142				
	Married	%	64.8%	31.0%	4.2%	100.0%				
Marital	- Triairiea	Count	133	106	19	258	6.789	2	5.991	Significant
Status	Unmarried	%	51.6%	41.1%	7.4%	100.0%				2-8
D tetters	Cimarica	Count	225	150	25	400				
	Total	%	56.3%	37.5%	6.3%	100.0%				
			verlessne		3.2 / 3					
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
		Count	28	71	43	142				
	Married	%	19.7%	50.0%	30.3%	100.0%				Not
Marital		Count	67	115	76	258	2.108	2	5.991	Significant
Status	Unmarried	%	26.0%	44.6%	29.5%	100.0%				
		Count	95	186	119	400				
	Total	%	23.8%	46.5%	29.8%	100.0%				
]	Intrinsic 1			1					
		_	Low	Moderate	High	Total				
		Count	61	59	22	142				
3.5 4.1	Married	%	43.0%	41.5%	15.5%	100.0%	0.250		5.001	Not
Marital		Count	117	101	40	258	0.250	2	5.991	Significant
Status	Unmarried	%	45.3%	39.1%	15.5%	100.0%				
		Count	178	160	62	400				
	Total	%	44.5%	40.0%	15.5%	100.0%				
			w Statu		13.370	100.070				
		L	Low	Moderate	High	Total				+
		Count	105	25	12	142				
	Married	%				100.0%				Not
Marital	iviaiiiCu		73.9%	17.6%	8.5%		0.789	2	5.991	Significant
Status	T Income and	Count	180	52	26	258	222	-		8
Julus	Unmarried	%	69.8%	20.2%	10.1%	100.0%				
		Count	285	77	38	400				
	Total	%	71.3%	19.3%	9.5%	100.0%				1

	Strei	nuous W	orking	Conditions						
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
		Count	30	54	58	142				
	Married	%	21.1%	38.0%	40.8%	100.0%				Not
Marital		Count	48	103	107	258	0.391	2	5.991	Significant
Status	Unmarried	%	18.6%	39.9%	41.5%	100.0%				
		Count	78	157	165	400				
	1	%	19.5%	39.3%	41.3%	100.0%				
		Role	Ambig	uity						
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
		Count	82	47	13	142				
	Married	%	57.7%	33.1%	9.2%	100.0%				Not
Marital		Count	139	83	36	258	1.994	2	5.991	Significant
Status	Unmarried	%	53.9%	32.2%	14.0%	100.0%				
		Count	221	130	49	400				
		%	55.3%	32.5%	12.3%	100.0%				
	Unreasona	ble gro	up and	political pre	ssure					
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
		Count	29	59	54	142				
	Married	%	20.4%	41.5%	38.0%	100.0%				Not
Marital		Count		116	100	258	1.142	2	5.991	Significant
Status	Unmarried	%	16.3%	45.0%	38.8%	100.0%				
		Count	-	175	154	400				
		%	17.8%	43.8%	38.5%	100.0%				
	П	Res	ponsibil							
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
		Count	14	67	61	142				
	Married	%	9.9%	47.2%	43.0%	100.0%				Not
Marital		Count		109	102	258	4.966	2	5.991	Significant
Status	Unmarried	%	18.2%	42.2%	39.5%	100.0%				
		Count		176	163	400				
	_	%	15.3%	44.0%	40.8%	100.0%				
	1	Occupa	ational							
			Low	Moderate	High	Total	0.109	1	3.841	Not
		Count	54	55	33	142			-	Significant
	Married	%	38.03%		23.24%	100.0%				
Marital		Count		100	61	258				
Status	Unmarried	%	37.60%		23.64%					
		Count		155	94	400				
	1	%	37.75%		23.50%					

3.2.3(b) Interpretation of Occupational Stress Levels Vs Marital Status:

Table-3.4 reveals that the Chi-square value was found to be significant in Role Conflict, Powerlessness dimensions of Occupational Stress. Hence, the Null Hypothesis which states that "There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Marital Status" is rejected with respect to Role Conflict, Powerlessness dimensions of Occupational Stress.

It is evident from table- 3.4 that almost equal percentage of employees were experiencing Occupational Stress exists between Married and Unmarried employees at low, moderate and high levels these differences were statistically not supported by the results of chi- square which means that employees of I.T sector were equally suffering from Occupational Stress irrespective of Marital Status. However, the differences between Married and Unmarried employees were found to be statistically valid with respect to Role Conflict and Powerlessness dimensions.

Table-3.4 reveals that there exists a difference in the percentage of Married and Unmarried employees with respect to different levels of Role Conflict, these differences were supported by the results of chi-square which means that Married and Unmarried employees were experiencing different levels of stress in terms of contradictory instructions given by different officers, insufficient instructions and facilities regarding the new assignments and sudden implementation

of new dealing procedures and policies in place of those already in practice. These feelings are more in Unmarried employees who have high levels of Role Conflict however more number of Married employees are experiencing this kind of Role Conflict at moderate level.

Similarly Table-3.4 reveals that there exists a difference in the percentage of Married and Unmarried employees with respect to different levels of Powerlessness, these differences were supported by the results of chi-square which means that Married and Unmarried employees were experiencing different levels of stress in terms of significance given to their suggestions regarding the training programs of the employees, due consideration of their interests and opinions in making appointments for important posts. These feelings are more in Unmarried employees who have high levels of Powerlessness however more number of Married employees are experiencing this kind of Powerlessness at low and moderate levels.

3.2.4(a) Dimensions of Occupational Stress Vs Experience Ho: There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Experience.

Table-3.5 Association between Level of Occupational Stress and Experience

Tai	110-3.3				Lever	n Occuj	pational Stress a	na r	_	
		Rol	e overl	oad			Calculated x^2 Value	df	Table value at $a=0.05$	S/NS
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
	0-3	Count	35	88	118	241				
	years		14.5%	36.5%	49.0%					
Experience		Count	7	42	25	74				
	years	%	9.5%	56.8%	33.8%		10.714	4	9.488	Significant
	6years		12	40	33	85				8
	Above		14.1%	47.1%	38.8%	100.0%				
		Count	54	170	176	400				
	Total		13.5%	42.5%	44.0%					
			le Conf		11.070	100.070				
		140		Moderate	High	Total				
	0-3	Count		80	59	241				
	years	%	42.3%		24.5%	100.0%				
Experience		Count		32	10	74				
Laperience	years	%	43.2%		13.5%	100.0%	13.513	4	9.488	Significant
	6years			45	12	85				
	Above	_	32.9%		14.1%	100.0%				
	Total	Count		157	81	400				
	Total	%	40.5%		20.3%	100.0%				
		, , ,		ipation	20.570	100.070				
		Chaci		Moderate	High	Total				
	0-3	Count		95	14	241				
	years	%	54.8%	39.4%	5.8%	100.0%				
Experience	3-6	Count		17	6	74				Not
Laperience	years	%	68.9%	23.0%	8.1%	100.0%	8.198	4	9.488	Significant
	6years			28	3	85	0.170		71.00	Significant
	Above		63.5%	32.9%	3.5%	100.0%				
	Total	Count		140	23	400				
	Total	%	59.3%		5.8%	100.0%				
			rofitab		3.070	100.070				
		Chp		Moderate	High	Total				
		Count		110	45	241				
	0-3year		35.7%		18.7%	100.0%				
Experience		Count		36	10.770	74				Not
Lapericite	3-6year		37.8%			100.0%	2.704	4	9.488	Significant
	6years	_		42	10	85	2.701	'	2.100	215mileant
	Above		38.8%		11.8%	100.0%				
	Total	Count		188	65	400				
	Total	%	36.8%		16.3%	100.0%				
	l	70	50.070	+7.U70	10.370	100.070		1		

		Pov	verless	ness						
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
	0-3	Count	123	101	17	241				
	years	%	51.0%	41.9%	7.1%	100.0%				
Experience	3-6	Count		30	4	74				
	years	%	54.1%	40.5%	5.4%	100.0%	12.727	4	9.488	Significant
	6years	Count	62	19	4	85				
	Above	%	72.9%		4.7%	100.0%				
	Total	Count		150	25	400				
		%	56.3%		6.3%	100.0%				
		Poor F		lations						
	T			Moderate		Total				
	0-3	Count		109	72	241				
	years	%	24.9%		29.9%	100.0%				37
Experience	3-6	Count		37	19	74	1 (27		0.400	Not
	years	%	24.3%		25.7%	100.0%	1.637	4	9.488	Significant
	6years	Count		40	28	85				
	Above	%	20.0%		32.9%	100.0%				
	Total	Count		186	119	400				
		%	23.8%		29.8%	100.0%				
	Int	rinsic		erishment	TT	/DD / 5				
			Low	Moderat e	High	Total				
	0-3	Count	108	91	42	241				
	years	%	44.8%		17.4%	100.0%				
Experience	3-6	Count		34	6	74				Not
Emperience	years	%	45.9%		8.1%	100.0%	4.352	4	9.488	Significant
	6years	Count		35	14	85				
	Above	%	42.4%		16.5%	100.0%				
	Total	Count		160	62	400				
		%	44.5%		15.5%	!				
ı			ow Stat	1		1				
				Moderate	High	Total				
	0-3	Count	174	42	25	241				
	years	%	72.2%	17.4%	10.4%	100.0%				
	3-6	Count	50	19	5	74				
Experience	years	%	67.6%	25.7%	6.8%	100.0%				Not
	6years	Count	61	16	8	85	2.966	4	9.488	Significant
	Above	%	71.8%	18.8%	9.4%	100.0%				
	Total	Count		77	38	400				
		%	71.3%		9.5%	100.0%				
	Stren	uous V		g Conditio						
		T_	Low	Moderate		Total				
	0-3	Count		94	99	241				
	years	%	19.9%	39.0%	41.1%	100.0%				
E	3-6	Count		26	34	74				NT.
Experience	years	%	18.9%	35.1%	45.9%	100.0%	1 420	4	0.400	Not
	6years	Count	16	37	32	85	1.439	4	9.488	Significant
	Above	%	18.8%	43.5%	37.6%	100.0%				
			78	157	165	400				
	Total	Count			41.3%	100.0%				
		%	19.5%	39.3%	1	l l				
		% Role	19.5% Ambi	guity	High	Total				
	Total	% Role	19.5% Ambig Low M	guity Ioderate l	High	Total				
	Total 0-3 C	Role ount	19.5% Ambig Low Market Ma	guity Ioderate 1 74	35	241				
	Total 0-3 C years	%	19.5% Ambigue Low N 132 4.8%	guity Ioderate 1 74 30.7% 1	35 4.5%	241 100.0%				Not
Experience	O-3 C years 3-6 C	Role Ount % 54	19.5% Ambigue Ambigue 132 4.8% 40	guity Toderate 1	35 4.5% 6	241 100.0% 74	3.622	4	9,488	Not Significant
Experience	O-3 Cyears 3-6 Cyears	% 54 ount % 54	19.5% Ambig Low M 132 4.8% 40 4.1%	guity Toderate 1	35 4.5% 6 3.1%	241 100.0% 74 100.0%	3.622	4	9.488	Not Significant
Experience 6	O-3 Cyears 3-6 Cyears 5 years C	% Role 1	19.5% Ambiguarda 132 4.8% 40 4.1% 49	guity Toderate 1	35 4.5% 6 8.1% 8	241 100.0% 74 100.0% 85	3.622	4	9.488	
Experience 6	O-3 Cyears 3-6 Cyears 6 years CAbove	% Role	19.5% Ambig Low M 132 4.8% 40 4.1%	guity Toderate 1	35 4.5% 6 3.1%	241 100.0% 74 100.0%	3.622	4	9.488	

Un	reasona	able gr	oup &	political p	ressur	e				
			Low	Moderate		Total				
										Not
		-					7.459	4	9.488	Significant
	0-3	Count		103	103	241				
	years	%	14.5%	42.7%	42.7	100.0%				
Experience	2.6	C4	10	22	%	7.4				
	3-6	Count %	19 25.7%	33 44.6%	22	74 100.0%				
	years	%0	23.1%	44.0%	29.7	100.0%				
	6years	Count	17	39	29	85				
	Above	%	20.0%	45.9%	34.1	100.0%				
	110010	/0	20.070	43.770	%	100.070				
	Total	Count	71	175	154	400				
	3	%	17.8%	43.8%	38.5	100.0%				
					%					
		Res	sponsib							
			Low	Moderate	High	Total				
							15.641	4	9.488	Significant
	0-3	Count		112	83	241				
	years	%	19.1%	46.5%	34.4	100.0%				
Experience					%					
	3-6	Count		25	39	74				
	years	%	13.5%	33.8%	52.7	100.0%				
	-	a	~	20	%	0.7				
	6years		5.9%	39	41	85				
	Above	%	5.9%	45.9%	48.2 %	100.0%				
	Total	Count	61	176	163	400				
	Total	%	15.3%	44.0%	40.8	100.0%				
		/0	13.370	44.0 /0	%	100.070				
	<u> </u>	Occur	nationa	l stress	70					
		Jecuj	Low	Moderate	High	Total				
	0-3	Count		92	59	241				
	years		37.34%		24.48					
Experience	-				%					Not
	3-6	Count	29	30	15	74	2.453	2	5.991	Significant
	years	%	39.19%	40.54%	20.27	100.0%				
					%					
	6years			33	20	85				
	Above	%	37.65	38.82%	23.53	100.0%				
			%		%					
	Total	Count	151	155	94	400				
		%	37.75	38.75%	23.50	100.0%				
			%		%					

3.2.4(b) Interpretation of Occupational Stress Levels Vs Experience:

Table-3.5 reveals that the Chi-square value was found to be significant in Role overload, Role Conflict, Powerlessness, Responsibility dimensions of Occupational Stress. Hence, the Null Hypothesis which states that "There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Experience" is rejected with respect to Role overload, Role Conflict, Powerlessness, Responsibility dimensions of Occupational Stress.

It is evident from table- 3.5 almost equal percentage of employees belong to below 3 years, 3-6 years and above 6 years of experience were experiencing Occupational Stress at low, moderate levels and a remarkable difference in the percentage of employees having different length of service, exists at high levels of Occupational Stress. However, these differences were statistically not supported by the results of chi-square which means that employees of the I.T sector were experiencing similar levels of Occupational Stress irrespective of their experience. However, the differences below 3 years, 3-6 years and above 6 years experience of employees were found to be

statistically valid with respect to Role overload, Role Conflict, Powerlessness and Responsibility dimensions.

Table-3.5 reveals that there exists a difference in the percentage of employees who have below 3 years, 3-6 years and above 6 years of experience with respect to different levels of Role overload. These differences were supported by the results of chi-square which means that employees having below 3 years, 3-6 years and above 6 years of experience were experiencing different levels of stress in terms of excessive workload, doing excessive work in spite of insufficient number of employees and resources, feeling of inability to carry out assignments to satisfactory level on account of excessive load of work and lack of time, inability to devote sufficient time to domestic and personal problems due to workload.

These feelings are more in employees belong to below 3 years of experience who have high level of role overload; however more number of employees belong to 3-6 years and above 6 years of experience perceived this kind of Role overload at moderate levels.

In addition, Table-3.5 reveals that there exists a difference in the percentage of employees who have below 3 years, 3-6 years and above 6 years of experience with respect to different levels of Role Conflict, these differences were supported by the results of chi-square which means that employees having below 3 years, 3-6 years and above 6 years of experience were experiencing different levels of stress in terms of contradictory instructions given by different officers, insufficient instructions and facilities regarding the new assignments and sudden implementation of new dealing procedures and policies in place of those already in practice. These feelings are more in employees of 0-3 years of experience who have a high level of Role Conflict; however more number of employees belong to 3-6 years and above 6 years of experience are perceiving this kind of Role Conflict at a moderate level.

Table-3.5 also reveals that there exists a difference in the percentage of employees who belong to below 3 years, 3-6 years and above 6 years of experience, with respect to different levels of Powerlessness, these differences were supported by the results of chi- square which means that employees who have below 3 years, 3-6 years and above 6 years of experience were feeling different kind of stress in terms of significance given to their suggestions regarding the training programs of the employees, due consideration of their interests and opinions in making appointments for important posts. These feelings are more in employees belong to below 3 years of experience. However, Employees of 3-6 years and above 6 years of experience have low levels of Powerlessness.

Moreover, Table-3.5 reveals that there exists a difference in the percentage of employees who have below 3 years, 3-6 years and above 6 years of experience, with respect to different levels of Responsibility, these differences were supported by the results of chi- square which means that employees who have below 3 years, 3-6 years and above 6 years of experience were feeling different levels of stress in terms of the Responsibility for the efficiency and productivity of other employees as well as for the progress and prosperity of the organization. These feelings are more in employees belong to below 3 years and 3-6 years of experience who have moderate and high levels of Responsibility; however more number of employees having above 6 years of experience were experiencing high levels of stress due to Responsibility.

4. Findings, Conclusion and Implications:

4.1 Findings:

It was found that.

- 1. The highest percentage of employees i.e. 44% perceived high level of Role overload followed by Strenuous working conditions (41.3%), Responsibility (40.8).
- 2. The Null Hypothesis which states that "There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Gender" is rejected with respect to Intrinsic Impoverishment, Role Ambiguity dimensions of occupational stress.

The male and female employees working in I.T sector perceiving different levels of Intrinsic Impoverishment and Role Ambiguity.

- 3. The Null Hypothesis which states that "There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Age" is rejected with respect to Role Conflict dimension of Occupational Stress.
- The employees belong to below 30 years and above 30 years of age were experiencing different levels of Role Conflict.
- 4. The Null Hypothesis which states that "There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Marital Status" is rejected with respect to Role Conflict, Powerlessness dimensions of Occupational Stress.
- The Married and Unmarried employees working in I.T sector perceiving different levels of Role Conflict and Powerlessness.
- **5.** The Null Hypothesis which states that "There will be no significant association between Level of Occupational Stress and Experience" is rejected with respect to Role overload, Role Conflict, Powerlessness, Responsibility dimensions of Occupational Stress.

The employees belonged to below 3 years, 3-6 years and above 6 years of experience were experiencing different levels of Role overload, Role Conflict, Powerlessness and Responsibility.

4.2 Conclusion:

The results of the present study indicate that a remarkable percentage of the employees i.e. 23.50% are experiencing high level of Occupational Stress due to various factors. Most of the employees i.e. 38.75% have moderate level of Occupational Stress.

Amongst 12 dimensions on Occupational Stress index, Most of the employees were expressing high levels of Occupational Stress due to Role overload, Strenuous Working Conditions. The other factors such as Unprofitability, Poor Peer Relations, Unreasonable group and political pressure, Responsibility were also leading to Occupational Stress at moderate level.

Amongst 12 dimensions on Occupational Stress Index, Gender disparities were found in Intrinsic Impoverishment and Role Ambiguity dimensions. However, these dimensions were not associated with the other demographic variables i.e., Age, Marital Status and Experience. These variables were found to be associated with the level of Role Conflict among Employees which indicates the association between the variations in the levels of Role Conflict and variations in Age, Marital Status and Experience of Employees.

Marital status was also found to be associated with Powerlessness among employees. The feeling of high Powerlessness is more in Unmarried employees. However more number of Married and Unmarried employees are experiencing this kind of Powerlessness at low and moderate levels. The study also revealed that the experience of employees is associated with Role overload, Role Conflict, Powerlessness, and Responsibility.

Though, the majority of the employees have moderate levels of stress, it is necessary to take appropriate measures at organizational level so that the stress among the employees is either confined to the present level or reduced to the maximum extent possible.

4.3 Implications:

The results and findings of the present study have serious implications to the field of I.T sector in India, which will enable the organizations to identify, modify their policies so as to reduce the workplace stress among employees and increase the productivity of the organization.

- 1. As the findings of the study reveal that a remarkable percentage of employees i.e., 23.5% have high levels of Occupational Stress, there is a need to reduce the stress among these employees. For reducing the stress among employees, the organizations have to follow appropriate methods to reduce Occupational Stress.
- 2. Though the majority of the employees have moderate levels of stress, it is necessary to take appropriate measures at organizational level so that the stress among the employees is either confined to the present level or reduced to the maximum extent possible.
- 3. As per the results of the study, most of the employees (44%) in the I.T sector were

experiencing high levels of role overload and were associated with the experience of the employees. Hence, organizations should consider experience while assigning work. It is necessary to reduce the role overload among employees by means of increasing the number of employees and resources, or increasing the tenure of the tasks assigned to them.

- 4. As most of the employees were experiencing moderate to high levels of Role Conflict, authorities should take care of contradictory instructions given by different officers, insufficient instructions and facilities regarding the new assignments and sudden implementation of new dealing procedures and policies in place of those already in. practice. As Role Conflict among employees is associated with age, marital status and experience organizations should consider these variables while giving instructions.
- 5. As Intrinsic Impoverishment, Role Ambiguity were associated with gender, it is essential to eradicate gender disparities by means of providing equal opportunities for all in terms of providing sufficient information about ,the scope of jurisdiction and authorities under which they are working, opportunities for unitizing, developing their abilities and experience as well as proficiency.
- 6. As Powerlessness and responsibility is associated with experience, organizations should also consider the suggestions, interests and opinions of low experienced employees regarding the training programs, new appointments for important posts.

The Present study on occupational stress among software employees in the IT sector highlights the importance of addressing stress levels in the workplace. The findings suggest that factors such as role conflict, role ambiguity, lack of promotion and feedback, workload, and unsatisfactory working conditions contribute to high levels of stress among employees. It is crucial for organizations to implement targeted interventions to mitigate stress levels and enhance employee well-being and productivity. Additionally, the study emphasizes the need for organizational measures to either maintain stress levels at their current state or reduce them to the maximum extent possible. Addressing stress in the IT sector is essential to prevent negative impacts on employee health and job performance. These implications underscore the significance of creating a supportive work environment that addresses the stressors identified in the study to promote employee well-being and organizational success.

References:

- 1. Selye, H. (1936). A syndrome produced by diverse noxious agents. Nature, 138, 32–35.
- 2. 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.
- 3. 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.
- 4. 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.
- 5. Spielberger, C. (1980). Preliminary manual for the state-trait anger scale. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida.
- 6. Petrie, K. J., Booth, R. J., & Pennebaker, J. W. (1998). The immunological effects of thought suppression. Journal of personality and social psychology, 75(5), 1264. 42% Indian private sector employees face depression: Assocham www.wikipedia.org
- 7. Stress levels rising in India Inc: Survey, Press Trust of India, Bangalore November 27, 2009.
- 8. Stress levels rise in India, Hemali Chhapia, TNN, Sep 10, 2012. www.ibef.org
- 9. Kavitha G., Occupational stress and coping strategies, Discovery Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2009.
- 10. Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, Snook, J.D & Rosenthal R.A (1964); Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict an Ambiguity. New York: Wiley.

- 11. Argyris, C. (1964): Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: Wiley.
- 12. Caplan, R.D., Cobb, S., French, J.R.P., Jr., Harrison, R.V., & Pinneau s.r., Jr. (1975); Job Demands and Worker Health: Main Effects and Occupational Differences. Wahsington, D.C.: US. Government Printing Office.
- 13. Fred Luthans(2002) "Organization Behaviour", Sixth Edition, Article Titled: Job Stress. Page No. 412.
- 14. Kumar .R, Chandel, Singh .A.S, and Pant.G.C, (1977): Immune Response in Stress and Malignancy, Paper presented at the International Seminar on Stress in Health and diseases, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, February.
- 15. Thomas G. Cummings and Cary L. Cooper, "A Lybernatic Framework for Studying Occupation Stress", Human Relations, May 1979, pp. 395-418.
- 16. Ivancevich IM and Matterson MT (1980) Stress and Work Glen View, IL:Scott, Foreman.
- 17. Srivatsava, AK and Singh AP (1981), Construction and Standardization of and Occupational Stress index: A Pilot Study, Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology, (8(2), 133-136).
- 18. Ahmad .S, Bharadwaj .A, and Narula .S, (1985) "A study of Stress Among Executive", Journal of Personality and Clinical studies, page No: 47-50.
- 19. Pestonjee, (1987), "Executive Stress: Should it Always be Avoided?" Vikalpa, Page No. 23-30.
- 20. Dastur RH, (1990), Are you Killing Yourself, Mr. Executive, IBH Publishing House, Bombay.
- 21. Cummins R (1990), Job Stress and the Buffering Effect of Supervisory Support, Group and Organizational Studies, (15, 92-104).
- 22. Rajeshwari T.R. (1992), Employee Stress: A Study with Reference to Bank Employees, Indian Journal of Industrial Relations (27(4), 419- 429).
- 23. Chand P and Sethi AS (1997), Organisational Factors in Development of Work Stress. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations (32(4), pp 459- 462).
- 24. Pandey CS (1998), A study of Relationship Between Personality Dimensions and Organizational Role Stress in a Public Sector Organization, Indian Journal of Industrial Relations (33(4), 506-516).
- 25. Luolu, (1999), Work Motivation, Job Stress and Employees' Well Being, Journal of Applied Management Studies, Vol. 8, No. 1, 1999.
- 26. Lim VKG and Hian TTS (1999), Occupational Stress among Information Technology Personnel in Singapore, www.cocuphealth.file/info/asian/ap199/Singapore.
- 27. Vijaylaxmi AA and Meti V (2000), A Study of Occupational Stress Executives and Non-executives of Private Industrial Organization, Organization Management, (15(4), 26-32). www.Adguide.com (2001).
- 28. Maria Michailidis and Yiota Georgiou, Employee occupational stress in banking, Work 24 (2005) 123–137.
- 29. Dr. Nadeem Bhatti, Amir Hussain Shar, Faiz.M.Shaikh and Muhammad Suhail Nazar, Causes of Stress in Organization, a Case Study of Sukkur, Vol. 5, No. 11; November 2010, International Journal of Business and Management.
- 30. Keshavarz Mohsen and Mohammadi Reza, Occupational stress and Organizational performance, Case study: Iran, Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, Volume 30, 2011, Pages 390-394.
- 31. Suparn Sharma, Jyoti Sharma, Arti Devi, Role Stress Among Banking Sector Employees: A Logit Approach, Vol. XI, No. 3, 2012, The IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior.
- 32. Jain K Ajay and Cooper L Cary, Stress and organizational citizenship behaviors in Indian business process outsourcing organizations, IIMB Management Review, Volume 24, Issue 3, September 2012, Pages 155-163.
- 33. Lu S.F., Organizational work stress among supervisors in manufacturing industries, European Psychiatry, Volume 27, Supplement 1, 2012, Page 1.
- 34. Karthik R., A Study on Stress. Management in Coromandel Engineering Company Limited, Chennai, Vol. 6 (2) Feb. (2013), Advances in Management.