RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STRESS AND JOB PERFORMANCE: A STUDY OF BANKING SECTOR

Prof. Patiraj Kumari*

Department of Management Studies, Kanya Gurukul Campus, (GKV), Dehradun

Email- drpkumari3@rediffmail.com

Dr. Anuradha Bajwa**

Department of Management Studies, Kanya Gurukul Campus, (GKV), Dehradun

Email- Abajwalect@yahoo.com

Bhanu Priya***

Research Scholar (UGC NET-JRF), Department of Management Studies, Kanya Gurukul Campus (GKV), Dehradun

Email- bhanupriyabhaskar.bhaskar@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to measure level of stress experienced by officers of banking sector. This study mainly focuses on the relationship between stress and job performance. A sample of 300 respondents, 75 each from the entry level and middle level officers employed in the public sector and private sector banks of Uttarakhand region were taken. The stratified random sampling was used for selecting the sample for the study. Data was analyzed by using mean, standard deviation, t- test, correlation coefficient, DUNCAN's test. The findings of the study revealed that the private bank officers had high stress as compared to pubic bank officers. The correlation between stress mean score and performance mean score was found to be positive and highly significant (0.3036, p> 0.01) for personal life stress; (0.7364, p> 0.01) for work life stress. The paper reveals that a relationship exists between the stress and job performance among officers of banks in Uttarakhand Region.

Keywords: Stress, Job performance, Public Sector Banks, Private Sector Banks, Bank officers.

INTRODUCTION:

The economy of any nation depends to a large extent on its banking system. Banks constitute the core of a country's financial structure as they are in close association and guidance of Central Banking Authority and add to the money supply of the country. Though banks do not create new wealth but their landing, investing and related activities facilitate the economic proceed of production, distribution and consumption. Banks main function is to collect funds by mobilizing savings and lend those funds to entrepreneurs. In this process they mediate between borrowers who are the investors and the ultimate lenders who are the savers in a community. In fact, banks are the backbone of the economic structure.

Banks are basically human organizations, thus, human resource is the main competitive force, which is essential for each bank. The stiff competition in the banking sector and revolutionary impact of information technology requires skilled and motivated manpower. Banks need to review and overhaul their policies regarding recruitment, training and motivation. The most important task is to attract skilled workforce as well as to retain them. This can be achieved only by creating an atmosphere of recognition of talent of workforce, to encourage them and to reward the talented employees. The principal task before bank management is utilization of its human resources to the optimum for better results. In the date of today, employees have to meet several new challenges which require them to be mentally healthy, motivated and highly satisfied with their jobs. If good working conditions are available to the employees in banks they can enhance their performance level because working conditions for employees directly affects their working capacities.

Stress:

Stress is a consequence of or a general response to an action or situation that places special physical or psychological demands, or both, on a person.

Stress has a variety of meaning to people in the workplace:

1. To production manager in chemical plant- It may be tension of missing shipping date of a large order for a major customer.

2. To business executive- It may be the frustration associated with the inability to acquire sufficient short term loans from banks to cover the operating needs.

3. To bank managers- It may be the overloading and extreme burden of work, time pressure of completion of tasks, excess working hours, long travel, fear of termination of job contract, etc.

The phenomenon of stress is highly individualistic in nature. The people who possess high levels of tolerance power can thrive away stress very well. At the same time, some individuals will not perform well unless they experience a level of stress which energies and activate them to put forth best efforts. On the other hand, others who possess very low levels of tolerance for stress become paralyzed when they have to face stress.

In the words of Szilagyi and Wallace (1990), "Stress is an internal experience that creates a psychological or physiological imbalance within an individual and results from factors in the external environment, the organization or the individual."

According to Spector (2002), "Employees with higher perceived control are less likely to experience stress at work".

The employees' performance is affected by stress that indirectly affects the organization survival, it is because of the reason that if employees reduce their work efficiency and can't work best for their organizations, then this situation not only affects the organizational performance but also results in loss of healthy shares in an increasingly competitive market, and may even jeopardize the survival of the organization (Kazmi, 2008).

Job Performance:

Job performance is a commonly used, yet poorly defined concept in industrial and organizational psychology (the branch of psychology that deals with the workplace). Nowadays, it's a part of Human Resources Management and refers to whether a person is performing his job well or not. Despite the confusion over how it should be exactly defined, performance is an extremely important criterion that relates to organizational outcomes and success. Amongst the most commonly accepted theories, the theory of Campbell and his colleagues (2001) is important. They describe psychological perspective of job performance as an individual level variable, i.e., performance is something a single person does and this differentiates it from more encompassing constructs such as organizational performance or national performance which are higher level variables. So, Job performance can be defined as how well an employee is performing at his work.

Byars and Rue (2006) define performance as the extent to which an employee accomplishes the tasks that make up his or her job.

Williams (1998) defines performance as a record of outcomes produced during a specific job, over a specific time.

According to Borman and Motowidlo (1993) and Campbell, Gasser and Oswald (1996), it is widely agreed that job performance is considered as a multidimensional construct.

Dessler (1983) suggests that work performance is a measure of how well an employee meets the standards that are required for a specific job.

Performance is the accomplishment of a given task measured against preset standards of accuracy, completeness, cost and speed. The behavior of an individual directed towards goal accomplishment may be considered as his work performance. According to Nayyar (1994), work performance is the degree to which an individual executes his or her role with reference to certain specified standards set by the organization.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

Azmi, Shahid, and Alwi (2016) aimed to examine the relationship between job stress and job performance amongst front-liners in a shared service center, Malaysia. The conceptual framework of the study was based on the model of Job Stress (role ambiguity, role conflict, inadequate resources, and workload) and the concept of job performance. A total of 113 front-liners from various departments in a shared service center were selected as respondents through convenience sampling technique. Findings of the study revealed that job stress was significantly related to job performance.

Kyoung, Gyu, and Jung (2015) conducted a study to identify the effect of interpersonal relation and job stress on nursing performance among male nurses. The study was cross-sectional descriptive. The data were collected from 110 male nurses members affiliated with the Korean Man Nurses Association by self-administered questionnaires. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, independent t-test, one way ANOVA with Duncan test, Pearson correlation, and stepwise multiple regression with the SPSS/WIN 21.0. The average scores of interpersonal relation, job stress, and nursing performance were respectively 3.64, 3.10, 3.63. The results of the study revealed that the nursing performance was high in married, good health condition, manager, and high salary among male nurses, also, nursing

performance showed significant positive correlation with interpersonal relation, and a significant negative correlation with job stress. However, the influencing factors of nursing performance among male nurses were interpersonal relation, health status, total duration of career, position.

Suandi, Ismail, and Othman (2014) conducted their study to aim at finding the relationship between organizational climate and job stress with job performance. They concluded that there was a moderate level of relationship whereby the relationship between organizational climate and job performance was positive while the relationship between job stress and job performance was negative. This shows that an increase in organizational climate will improve job performance and the increase in job stress will decrease the job performance.

Moorthy, et.al. (2013) carried out a study to study the cause of job stress (job ambiguity, job conflict, job overload, and job instability) and also the impact of job stress on job performance. A total of 383 bankers of Malaysia were used as a sample for the study. The primary data was collected using questionnaire tool for the data collection. The resuive colts of the study indicated that job ambiguity, job conflict, job overload and job instability were positively related with the job stress, also, a negative correlation was found between job stress and job performance.

Stress does not always result directly from the source of pressure itself, but rather from the perception of that pressure. Therefore, individual difference variables (e.g., emotional intelligence) that might relate to that perception should also be considered. The effects of emotional intelligence on the relationship between job stress and job performance were investigated with a sample of employees in the Taiwanese finance sector. The results indicated that emotional intelligence had a positive impact on job performance and moderated this relationship. In this respect, highly emotionally intelligent employees are more likely than are low emotionally intelligent employees to be able to reduce or transform the potential negative effects of job stress on job performance (Yu-Chi, 2011).

Bano and Jha (2012) in their study aimed at exploring the differences in job-related stress, if any, between public and private sector employees, based on ten role stressors. The study found that both public and private sector employees faced moderate levels of stress. While there is no significant difference overall between public and private sector employees in terms of total stress levels, certain individual stressors-such as work experience and educational qualifications-do yield differences.

Malik (2011) conducted a study on Occupational stress experienced by private and public banks employees The sampling population of this research included 200 employees of public and private bank in Quetta City, 100 employees from public banks and remaining 100 from private banks. The research used the systematic random sampling method. The result showed that occupational stress was found higher among private bank employees as compared to public bank employees.

Mahmood, Hussain, Hannan and Muhammad (2010) in their study revealed that majority of the people felt stress in their jobs and they were neither satisfied with their jobs nor able to fulfill their needs and thus, these factors were creating stress. Stress was perhaps playing positive role in accelerating their performance. Qualifications had been identified as a major linking force. Work load, either under or over, was amongst the one of greatest causes of

stress or needed proper compensation or management to tackle problem. They also suggested that justified compensations should be introduced in business organizations in order to avoid over or under load situations.

Bashir and Ramay (2010) in their study examined the relationship between job stress and job performance on bank employees of banking sector in Pakistan. The results of their study showed that job stress significantly reduced the performance of an individual and also suggested that organizations should facilitate a supportive culture within the working atmosphere of the organization.

Wallace, Arnold, Edwards and Frazier (2009) proposed differential relationship between challenge stressors, hindrance stressors and role- based performance. Those relationships were expected to be moderated by organizational support. In a sample of 215 employees across 61 offices of a state agency, the authors obtained a positive relationship between challenge stressors and role-based performance and a negative relationship between hindrance stressors and role based performance. Organizational support moderated the relationship between challenge sstressors and role based performance, but did not moderate the relationship between hindrance stressors and role based performance.

Leung, Chan and Olomoaiye (2008) aimed their study at investigating the impact of stress on the performance of construction project managers (CPMs). Data collected from 108 CPMs showed that stress reduces the task performance of CPMs. Organizational performance was seen to have a U-shaped relationship with both burnout and physiological stress and was worsened by objective stress.

Kazami and Rubina (2007) showed in their study that there was a negative correlation between job stress and job performance. The subjects who had high level of job stress had low job performance. The stress affected males more than females.

De Rue and Ilgen (2007) analyzed the effect of daily workload on work, family conflict and social behaviours at home. A longitudinal examination of antecedents and outcomes of work to family conflicts was carried out. The most interesting finding in this study was that employees behavior in the family domain was predicted by the employee's perception of work to family conflict and their positive affect at home. Harris, Harvey and Kacmar (2009), investigated the relationship between social stressors and the outcomes of job satisfaction, altruism and turnover intentions. Social stressors are "a class of characteristics, situations, episodes or behavior that are related to psychological or physical strain and that are somehow social in nature."Examples of such stressors include conflicts with one's coworkers, poor group climate (Bruk-Lee and Spector ,2006; Dormann and Zapf, 2002), unfair or unjust treatment(Dormann and Zapf, 2004). Data was obtained from 144 employees from a branch of the state government in the southeast. It was found that social stressors are negatively related to job satisfaction and altruism and positively related to turnover intentions.

Taris, Halbesleban and Bowler (2007) confirmed by individual level research that lack of motivation to perform well may be a functional reaction to work overload, and may act as a safety valve that prevents workers from depleting their energetic resources (Schaufeli and Taris, 2005). High levels of exhaustion should therefore lead to low levels of effort expenditure and performance, in turn leading to lower organizational performance. The

research showed that high levels of burnout (of which emotional exhaustion is a core dimension) impede work performance, though this relation was mediated by the will to achieve the tasks at work.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES:

The objectives of the present study are:

1. To measure the level of stress experienced by public and private sector bank officers.

2. To determine the relationship between stress and job performance of public and private sector bank officers.

3. To determine the effect of stress on job performance of public and private sector bank officers.

Based on the above objectives, the following hypotheses have been formulated for testing:

Ha1: Private sector bank officers have high stress level than the public sector bank officers.

Ha2: Bank officers with high level of stress are likely to show poor job performance.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

Population for the study:

The study was conducted on the entry level and middle level officers employed in the public sector and private sector banks functioning in Uttarakhand region which is comprised of 17 districts and organized into two divisions- the Kumaon division and the Garhwal division.

Since it was impossible to include all the elements of the population in the investigation so representative sample having a salient feature of the population was taken into study.

The sample:

The respondents in the present study belonged to public and private sector banks located in various cities of Uttarakhand.

A sample of 300 respondents, 75 each from the entry level and middle level officers employed in the public sector and private sector banks was taken.

Sampling Method:

The stratified random sampling was used for selecting the sample for the study. The four strata chosen were the entry level public sector bank officers and middle level public sector bank officers, the entry level private sector bank officers and middle level private sector bank officers.

The Tools used:

Stress Inventory

The questionnaire developed by Prof. Patiraj Kumari and Dr. Anuradha Bajwa (2008) has been used to measure the stress level of the respondents. The questionnaire consists of 51 items with two dimensions of stress (personal life stress and work life stress). The reliability of stress inventory is determined with the use of Cronbach's alpha. The value of Cronbach's

alpha for this questionnaire has been calculated to be 0.858 for the whole scale and 0.82, 0.86 for the two sub- scales, respectively. The score range of the inventory is 51-255. It is kept in mind that higher scoring on the stress inventory means lower level of stress in the life of the respondents.

Performance Audit (Self)

The questionnaire developed by Prof. Patiraj Kumari and Dr. Anuradha Bajwa (2008) has been used to measure the performance level of the respondents. The questionnaire consists of 21 items. The reliability of the questionnaire is determined to be 0.831. The score range of the inventory is 21-105. It is kept in mind that higher scoring on the Performance Audit (self) inventory means higher level of performance in the life of the respondents.

Dimensions of Stress	Pvt. E		Pvt. M		Pub. E		Pub. M		Total	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
SDIM 1	67.83	10.49	80.67	76.20	76.20	11.44	81.20	13.66	76.47	12.53
SDIM 2	117.27	19.43	136.73	131.73	131.73	18.19	137.07	17.62	130.70	19.59

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION:

TABLE 1: Comparison of private bank entry level (Pvt.E), private bank middle level (Pvt. M), public bank entry level (Pub. E), public bank middle level (Pub. M) officers on the basis of mean score of two dimensions of stress.

Table 1 gives the comparison of private bank entry level officers, private bank middle level officers, public bank entry level officers and public bank middle level officers on two dimensions of stress using mean values. The public bank middle level officers scored highest mean values for personal life stress (SDIM 1) and work life stress (SDIM 2) followed by private bank middle level officers, public bank entry level officers and private bank entry level officers. High mean score value on the stress inventory scale denotes low stress, so one can say that public bank middle level officers have lowest personal life stress and work life stress, while, private bank entry level officers have highest personal life stress and work life stress.

TABLE 2: Comparison of private bank entry level (Pvt.E), private bank middle level (Pvt. M), public bank entry level (Pub. E), public bank middle level (Pub. M) officers on the basis of performance mean scores.

Performance	Pvt. E		Pvt. M		Pub. E		Pub. M		Total	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
PDIM	75.32	11.49	87.84	12.05	85.33	10.07	90.87	12.49	84.84	11.81

Table 2 depicts the comparison of private bank entry level officers, private bank middle level officers, public bank entry level officers and public bank middle level officers on the basis of performance and it has been found that public bank middle level officers scored highest mean score.

TABLE 3: Comparison of dimensions of stress between private bank officers and public bank officers on the basis of stress mean scores.

Dimensions of Stress	Private (N=150)		Public (N=150)		t-value
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
SDIM 1	74.25	11.65	78.70	12.73	5.36**
SDIM 2	127.00	17.44	134.40	18.72	6.03**

Note: (NS) ➝ Not significant; * ➝ significance at 0.05 level; ** ➝ significance at 0.01 level

Table 3 depicts the comparison between private bank officers and public bank officers on the basis of mean scores of two dimensions of stress. The public bank officers scored higher mean score value (i.e. low stress) on personal life stress (SDIM 1) and work life stress (SDIM 2) than private bank officers. The difference in mean values between private and public sector bank on SDIM1 and SDIM 2 found to have t-values of 5.36 and 6.04 respectively which are significant at 0.01 level.

TABLE 4: Comparison of performance between private bank officers and public bank officers on the basis of mean scores and t-value.

SECTOR	N	MEAN	S.D.	t-value
Private	150	81.58	12.51	6.89**
Public	150	88.10	13.86	

Note: (NS) ➝ Not significant; * ➝ significance at 0.05 level; ** ➝ significance at 0.01 level

Table 4 shows the comparison between private bank officers and public bank officers on the basis of performance. The mean score of public bank officers for performance found to be higher than that of private bank officers. The difference is significant at 0.01 level as per the t-value which is 6.89.

TABLE 5: Comparison amongst private bank entry level (Pvt.E), private bank middle level (Pvt. M), public bank entry level (Pub. E), public bank middle level (Pub. M) officers on the basis of two dimensions of stress utilizing DUNCAN's Mean Test (G1=Pvt.E,G2=Pvt.M,G3=Pub.E,G4=Pub.M)

Dimensions of Stress	G1 (Pvt. E) (N=75)		G2 (Pvt. M) (N=75)		G3 (Pub. E) (N=75)		G4 (Pub. M) (N=75)		Significant Pairs*	F-value
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
SDIM 1	67.83	10.49	80.67	11.69	76.20	11.44	81.20	13.66	G3 V/S G1 G2 V/S G1 G2 V/S G3 G4 V/S G1 G4 V/S G3	10.76**
SDIM 2	117.27	19.43	136.73	20.04	113.73	18.19	137.07	17.62	G3 V/S G1 G2 V/S G1 G2 V/S G3 G4 V/S G1 G4V/S G3	14.66**

Note: (NS) → Not significant; * → significance at 0.05 level; ** → significance at 0.01 level

Table 5 shows the comparison amongst G1-private bank entry level officers, G2-private bank middle level officers, G3-public bank entry level and G4-public bank middle level officers on the basis of two dimensions of stress. Public bank middle level officers scored highest mean values for personal life stress (SDIM 1) and work life stress (SDIM 2) followed by private bank middle level officers, public bank entry level officers and private bank entry level officers in the decreasing order of mean scores. The different mean scores of G1. G2, G3, and G4 on SDIM 1 and SDIM 2 found to have F-value of 10.76 and 14.66 which are significant at .01 level. G2 found to have a significant relation with G1 and G3, while G4 had a significant relation with G1 and G3. G3 and G1 also seem to have a significant relation.

TABLE 6: Comparison amongst private bank entry level (Pvt.E), private bank middle level (Pvt. M), public bank entry level (Pub. E), public bank middle level (Pub. M) officers on the basis of performance utilizing DUNCAN's Mean Test (G1=Pvt.E,G2=Pvt.M,G3=Pub.E,G4=Pub.M)

Performance	G1 (Pvt. E) (N=75)		G2 (Pvt. M) (N=75)		G3 (Pub. E) (N=75)		G4 (Pub. M) (N=75)		Significant Pairs*	F-value
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
PDIM 1	75.32	11.49	87.84	12.05	85.33	10.07	90.87	12.49	G3 V/S G1 G2 V/S G1 G2 V/S G3 G4 V/S G1 G4 V/S G3 G4 V/S G2	7.89**

Note: (NS) → Not significant; *→ significance at 0.05 level; ** → significance at 0.01 level

Table 6 depicts the difference in mean score amongst G1-private bank entry level officers, G2-private bank middle level officers, G3-public bank entry level and G4-public bank middle level officers on the basis of performance. The mean score of G4 is greater than G3, while the mean score of G2 seem to be higher than that of G1. The mean score of private bank middle level officers is higher than that of public bank entry level officers. The different mean scores amongst G1, G2, G3 and G4 are found to have F-value of 7.89 which is significant at 0.01 level. The results show significant relation between pairs G2 and G1, G2 and G3, G4 and G3 and G3 and G1.

TABLE 7: Relationship (Correlation Coefficient) between dimensions of stress and performance of Bank Officers (N=300)

Performance	Dimensions of Stress	
	SDIM 1	SDIM 2
PDIM	0.3036**	0.7364**

Note: (NS) ➝ Not significant; * ➝ significance at 0.05 level; ** ➝ significance at 0.01 level

Table 7 shows the correlation values of performance with personal life stress (SDIM 1) and work life stress (SDIM 2) for the total sample (N=300) of bank officers. The correlation of personal life stress and performance found to be positive and significant. The correlation between work life stress and performance found to be positive and highly significant.

TABLE 8: Relationship (Correlation Coefficient) between dimensions of stress and performance of Private and Public Bank Officers (N=300)

Performance	Dimensions of Stress			
	Private (N=150)		Public (N=150)	
	SDIM 1	SDIM 2	SDIM 1	SDIM 2
PDIM	0.3113**	0.7602**	0.4356**	0.8367**

Note: (NS) ➝ Not significant; * ➝ significance at 0.05 level; ** ➝ significance at 0.01 level

Table 8 presents the intercorrelation values between two dimensions of stress and performance of private bank officers and public bank officers. Performance has highest positive correlation with work life stress (SDIM 2) of public bank officers.

TABLE 9: Relationship (Correlation Coefficient) between dimensions of stress and performance of Private Bank Entry Level and Middle Level Officers

Performance	Dimensions of Stress			
	Pvt. E (N=75)		Pvt. M (N=75)	
	SDIM 1	SDIM 2	SDIM 1	SDIM 2
PDIM	0.4705**	0.6745**	0.4267**	0.7810**

Note: (NS) ➝ Not significant; * ➝ significance at 0.05 level; ** ➝ significance at 0.01 level

Table 9 records the intercorrelation values of two dimensions of stress and performance with respect to private bank entry level officers and private bank middle level officers.

Performance is significantly and positively correlated with personal life stress (SDIM 1) of private bank entry level officers and public bank middle level officers. The correlation of performance with work life stress (SDIM 2) of private bank entry level officers and private bank middle level officers found highly significant and positive, though, the correlation of performance and work life stress is stronger in the case of private bank middle level officers compared to private bank entry level officers.

TABLE 10: Relationship (Correlation Coefficient) between dimensions of stress and performance of Public Bank Entry Level and Middle Level Officers

Performance	Dimensions of Stress			
	Pub. E (N=75)		Pub. M (N=75)	
	SDIM 1	SDIM 2	SDIM 1	SDIM 2
PDIM	0.3535**	0.6529**	0.4300**	0.7652**

Note: (NS) ➤Not significant; * ➤ significance at 0.05 level; ** ➤significance at 0.01 level

Table 10 records the inter correlation values of two dimensions of stress and performance with respect to public bank entry level officers and public bank middle level officers. Performance seem to be significantly and positively correlated with personal life stress (SDIM 1)of public bank entry level officers and public bank middle level officers and work life stress of public bank entry level officers. The correlation of performance with work life stress (SDIM 2) of public bank middle level officers is highly significant and positive.

TABLE 11: Difference between mean scores of two stress groups (low stress group and high stress group) and overall performance of total sample of bank officers (N=300)

Variable	Low stress group			High stress group			t-value
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	
Performance	148	92.1	21.48	152	78.48	23.75	19.05**

Note: (NS) ➤Not significant; * ➤ significance at 0.05 level; ** ➤significance at 0.01 level

Table 11 shows the total bank respondents categorized into high and low stress groups on the basis of median scores in order to determine the effect of stress on overall performance. The mean score value of overall performance of the low stress group is comparatively higher than the mean score value of overall performance of the high stress group showing that the officers with lower stress have higher performance. This difference between the low stress group and high stress group was found to be significant at 0.01level.

TABLE 12: Difference between mean scores of two stress groups (low stress group and high stress group) and overall performance of private bank officers (N=150)

Variable	Low stress group			High stress group			t-value
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	
Performance	71	88.79	19.45	79	75.10	17.68	16.54**

Note: (NS) ➤ Not significant; *➤ significance at 0.05 level; ** ➤ significance at 0.01 level

Table 12 shows the private sector bank respondents categorized into high and low stress groups on the basis of median scores in order to determine the effect of stress on overall

performance. The mean score value of overall performance of the low stress group are comparatively higher than the mean score value of overall performance of the high stress group showing that the officers with lower stress have higher performance. This difference between the low stress group and high stress group found to be significant at 0.01level.

TABLE 13: Difference between mean scores of two stress groups (low stress group and high stress group) and overall performance of public bank officers (N=150)

Variable	Low stress group			High stress group			t-value
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	
Performance	85	91.27	14.49	65	82.63	13.78	20.43**

Note: (NS) →Not significant; * → significance at 0.05 level; ** → significance at 0.01 level

Table 13 shows the public sector bank respondents categorized into high and low stress groups on the basis of median scores in order to determine the effect of stress on overall performance. The mean score value of overall performance of the low stress group are comparatively higher than the mean score value of overall performance of the high stress group showing that the officers with lower stress have higher performance. This difference between the low stress group and the high stress group found to be significant at 0.01level.

FINDINGS:

The major findings of the current study:

1. Public bank middle level officers were found to have the lowest level of personal life stress and work life stress in the four categories of bank officers taken into this study.

2. Public middle level officers had the highest mean scores for performance. High mean scores in performance audit (self) denoted good performance by the officers while low mean scores in performance audit (self) denoted poor performance by the officers.

3. Personal life stress was found to have a significant inverse relationship with performance of bank officers. Work life stress was seen to have a highly significant inverse relationship with performance of bank officers.

4. A low stress group of overall bank officers was seen to have higher mean scores for overall performance of bank officers. This shows that low stress in an officer's life results in better performance.

5. A low stress group of private bank officers was seen to have higher mean scores for overall performance of bank officers as compared to a high stress group of private bank officers. This shows that low stress in an officer's life results in good performance while higher stress reduces his/her performance.

6. A low stress group of public bank officers was seen to have higher mean scores for overall performance of bank officers as compared to a high stress group of public bank officers. This shows that low stress in an officer's life results in good performance while higher stress reduces his/her performance.

7. In case of public banks, greater numbers of officers were found to be in the low stress group than in the high stress group. In case of private banks, greater numbers of officers were seen in the high stress group than in the low stress group. This shows that officers of public banks are less stressed than officers of private banks.

DISCUSSION:

The study has been conducted to determine the level of stress among the officers of private and the public sector banks and the relationship between stress and performance has also been examined. The stress can occur in a bank officer owing to a multitude of reasons, ranging from personal problems, like sickness, strained relations with family and friends, less leisure time, and weak financial position; and work problems, like unclearly defined role, not keeping up with technological innovations, heavy workload, absence of senior and / or peer support, office politics, lack of autonomy , unfair salary, benefits and services, lack of proper training and development programmes, weak performance appraisal, lack of career management , and unhygienic work place conditions. Public and private sector banks in Uttarakhand seem to be interested in the welfare of their employees to a large extend .Still, banks have a lot of scope for improvement as the bank officers face some difficulties due to some of the above mentioned issues. The private- sector bank officers have cited high targets and the pressure to achieve them, harmful office politics, and job insecurity as the main reasons of stress alongside personal problems. In addition, public-sector bank officers have indicated lengthy time bound promotions, disparity in salaries of private and public bank officers, lack of open-door policy, and inadequate maintenance of hygiene in small branches as the causes of stress along with personal problems. Generally, bank officers are considered to be practical and mature in handling all routine problems in an admirable manner. The officers with family support and peer support do well professionally and do not let severe personal problems like death of the loved one affect their performance. They only become sad but do justice to the duties placed upon them. Though it is true that when an officer is bogged down by problems and has little social support, his/her performance shows a sharp decline.

To analyze the data for this study, the total sample of bank officers has been broken into two groups on the basis of low stress and high stress. The mean score of performance for the low-stress group has been found to be higher than the mean score of performance of the high-stress group. The results of the study show that high stress has adverse effect on the employees' job performance.

Table 3 depicted the mean scores for two dimensions of stress i.e. personal life stress (SDIM1) and the work life stress (SDIM2). The mean score of personal life stress for public-bank officers is 78.70 and for private-bank officers is 74.25. The t-value for this comparison is 5.36 which is significant at 0.01 level. The mean score of work life stress for public- bank officers is 134.40 and for private-bank officers is 127.00. The t-value for this comparison is 6.03 which is significant at 0.01 level. Thus, the first hypothesis is accepted. The private-bank officers have high stress level (shown by higher stress mean scores) than their counterpart in public banks. This shows that the working conditions, welfare, work timings etc. of public bank officers is better than that of the private bank officers. Public bank officers may lag a little behind than the private bank employees in terms of salaries still they are better in terms of job-securities, organizational climate, sense of belongingness, welfare, and work life

balance which makes personal and professional life far easier for them. The results have been found to be consistent with the findings of previous researches: Lehal (2007) has revealed that private sector banks have high organizational role stress than the public sector banks. Jobs in private sector though highly paid are generally overloaded and demand long working hours. Job insecurity is considered as a source of stress in private sector. Srivastava (2004) has found service conditions (security, promotion, and welfare) to be responsible for the leading cause of stress in private banks. Employees of private sector banks perceive that their jobs are not secure. In fact, in private sector, the environment is highly competitive and job security is based on performance. In public sector banks, the welfare policies are clearly defined and legally enforced. Retirement, pension, gratuity and other related welfare policies are effectively executed. So, there is no problem with social security. Kumar (2006) has found that the non-nationalized bank employees have high stress as compared to the nationalized bank employees. Among occupational stress variables, role overload, role authority, role conflict and lack of senior support contribute more to stress among non-nationalized banks.

The results presented in Table 11 show that the mean score value of overall performance of the low stress group is higher in comparison to the mean score value of overall performance of the high stress group, which shows that the officers with lower stress have higher performance. This shows that the stress has negative relation with job performance, i.e. when stress occurs, it affects the performance of employees negatively. According to the results, of this study, second hypothesis has been accepted. The findings of this study are supported by the study conducted by Ivancevich and Donnelly (1975) who have found in their study that low stress increases the performance, so both stress and job performance are inversely proportional to each other. Kazmi and Rubina (2007) have examined a negative correlation between job stress and job performance. Further, the result of this study is consistent with the study of Rose (2003) who has found that the stress in work environment reduces the intention of employees to perform better in their jobs, the employees feel demoralized and also their tendency to work well deteriorate. Thus, we can deduce that if a person is not facing any stressors in his life then his performance will be good and as stressors keep on adding to a person's life, his performance will keep on deteriorating.

CONCLUSION:

From the above findings and discussion, it can be concluded that middle-level officers in public-sector banks have the lowest level of the personal-life stress as well as work-life stress in all the four categories of bank officers (private bank entry level officers, private bank middle level officers, public bank entry level officers and public bank middle level officers). Middle-level officers of the public-sector bank have less stress because they enjoy better pay and benefits, more job security and greater autonomy. They have been found to have the high level of performance. The middle-level bank officers are seen to have lower stress and higher performance in comparison to the entry-level bank officers. Personal-life stress has been seen to have significant relationship with performance among the bank officers, and work-life stress has also been seen to have a significant relationship with performance among bank officers. Low-stress group of bank officers seems to have a higher level of performance.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND LIMITATION OF THE STUDY:

The success of the organization depends on the performance of the employees in the organizations. Stress is considered as an important predictor of performance. Hence, the banks ought to seriously think of adopting the appropriate coping strategies for managing employees' stress, which would result in improved performance of bank employees. The findings of this study would be of interest to bank officers of both the public-sector and private- sector. The study can help the banks to assess the level of stress and its impact on their employees' performance, and provide drive to researchers to explore other correlates of these variables for minimizing the negative impact of the organizational stress and improving the employees' performance. This study has been conducted only in one sector, i.e. banking sector and the impact of stress on job performance has been measured only in one sector. For the purpose of generalizing the results of this study future research should be replicated in other sectors/industries as well.

REFERENCES

1. Aghaei, A., Hasanzadeh, R., Mahdad, A., & Atashpuor, S., H. (2010).Occupational Stress and Mental Health of Employees of a Petrochemical Company before and after Privatization. *The International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, Vol. 1(2), pp. 75-79, p-ISSN: 2008-6520; e-ISSN: 2008-6814.*

2. Azmi, F., S., Shahid, S., A., & Alwi, A. (2016). The Relationship between Job Stress and Front-liners'Job Performance in a Shared Service Center in Malaysia. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, Vol. 6(7), pp. 510-513.*

3. Bano, B., & Jha, R., K. (2012). Organizational Role Stress among Public and Private Sector Employees: A Comparative Study, *1:1Summer Issue, The Lahore Journal of Business, Vol. 2(1), pp. 23–36*

4. Bashir, U., & Muhammad, I., R. (2010). Impact of Stress on Employees Job Performance: A Study on Banking Sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Marketing Studies, Vol. 2 (1), pp. 122-126.*

5. Chabbra, B., & Mohanty, R. (2013). Effect of Emotional Intelligence on Work Stress- A Study of Indian Managers. *International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management, Vol.6 (3), pp. 300 – 313.*

6. Kant, S., & Sharma, Y. (2012). A Study on Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Stress among Teachers in Management Institutes in Jakarta. *Journal of Science, Technology & Management, Vol.1 (1), 8278-8387.*

7. Kazmi, R. (2007). Occupational Stress and its effects on Job Performance: A Case Study of Medical House Officers of District Abottabad. *First proceedings of International Conference on Business and Technology, Iqra University, Islamabad, pp. 182-186.*

8. Kyoung, C., M., Gyu, K., C., & Jung, M., H. (2015).Influence of Interpersonal relation and Job Stress on Nursing Performance of Male Nurses. *Journal of Muscle and Joint Health, Vol. 22(3), 195-204.*

9. Mahmood, B., Hussain, S., Hannan, A., & Muhammad, N. (2010). The Relationship between Stress and Work Performance in an Industrial Environment of Faisalabad District. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences, Vol. 8(1), pp. 68-72.*

10. Moorthy, M., K., Lee, J., Y., Hon, P., L., Khong, Y., M., Teow, A., N., & Yeong, S., J. (2013). Determinants of job stress in affecting job performance: a study on the Malaysian banking sector. *International Journal of Business Excellence, Vol. 6(4), pp.1504-1509.*

11. Nadeem, M. (2011). A Study on Occupational Stress Experienced by Private and Public Bank Employees in Quetta City. *African Journal of Business Management, Vol.5 (8), pp. 3063-3070.*

12. *Shahzad, K., Sarmad, M., Abbas, M., & Khan, M. (2011). Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Employees' performance in Telecom Sector of Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management, Vol.5 (4), pp. 1225-1231.*

13. *Suandi, T., Ismail, A., I., & Othman, Z. (2014). Relationship between Organizational Climate, Job Stress and Job Performance Officer at State Education Department. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies, Vol. 2(1), pp. 17-28, ISSN: 2202-9478.*

14. *Wei, F., Feng, Y., & Wu, L. (2009). The Stressors in Professional Women's Work-Family Conflict: A Chinese Conflict. *Canadian Social Science, Vol.5, pp. 62-68.*

15. Yu-Chi,W. (2011). Job Stress and Job Performance among Employees in the Taiwanese Finance Sector: The Role of Emotional Intelligence. *Social Behaviour and Personality: An International Journal, Vol. 39(1), pp. 21-31.*