NOVATEUR PUBLICATIONS
JournalNX- A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal
ISSN No: 2581 - 4230
VOLUME 8, ISSUE 8, Aug.-2022

SIGHTING STRESS AT WORK OF LEADS AND TEAMS IN SOFTWARE FIRMS OF BANGALORE

Ramakrishnan. V
Assistant Professor IIBS Bangalore, Karnataka, India
go2ramakrishnan@rediffmail.com

DR K. Arul
Principal Unique College of Arts and Science
Krishnagiri, TamilNadu, India
arulsvmc@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
Great new technologies have been contributed by Information technology industries to the world. The introduction of new technologies affects psychosocial and mental health of professionals working in this industry. This study tries to understand stressors in occupation of sixty-one leads and sixty-two team members working in IT industry in Bangalore. Managers and team members are metered using (Occupation Stressor Indicator) OSI index.
It was understood that inner elements of job like Type A behavior, Organizational forms and atmosphere were callers for mental disorders and physical ill health in managers. Studies guided statistically that Organizational forms and atmosphere and relationship with people were key callers in team members. Management operations and organizational strengths were main reasons for job satisfaction for both the groups. It is brought out that these outcomes mirror huge economic and communal changes taking place in the industry in Bangalore.

Keywords: IT industry, team leads, team members, Organizational forms and atmosphere, Bangalore

INTRODUCTION

Occupational doctors, policy makers and managers in occupation in developing countries consider occupational stress as key reason that raises occupational health issue for people in occupation. Occupational research is finding importance across the world as it drills mental and physical factors which influences people in their work and closely affects employee's health. Job stress brings big disruptions in psychological or physiological balance in people (Margolies, Kroes&Quinn,1974). Impact of prolonged stress leads to hypertension, coronary heart disease, habit of alcoholism and mental disorders (Cartwright and cooper, 1994). Studies reveal that stress in occupation is left untreated brings negativity in work place which leads to anxiety of mind and physical illness which in turn leads to turnover of employees
Occupational stress affects productivity, job satisfaction and brings tendency to change job. (Blix, Arlene Gray 2006). Stress in occupation is a known health risk which develops numerous disorders, diseases, behavioral and psychological imbalances in wellbeing of a working person. (C.; Henderson, D.F,2016).
Development of huge health and occupational issues depends on internal factors like high demand, less control, is lack of support at work and performance reward imbalance (Basu S, Qayyum H, Mason S,2017).

This makes it very important to probe stressors in software industry and understand how it creates an impact in both managers and employees in Bangalore city.

OBJECTIVE OF STUDY

- To evaluate various stressors in occupation of managers of software companies in Bangalore
- To evaluate various stressors in occupation of team members of software companies in Bangalore.
- To compare various stressors between managers and employees

LITERATURE REVIEW

Stress does not restrict to work place it originates from home as well key factors of stress are internal factors of work, career development, difficulties in role, strain in relationships, organizational forms and atmosphere (spinger 2002).

Work place conditions plays key role in creating negative feeling in working employees like anxiety and physical issues in health. Like headache and pain in stomach. (Spector PE 2002).

There has been increased risk of job associated diseases and accidents due to quick industrial growth(Taap Manshor, A., Fontaine, R. and Siong Choy, C.,2003).

Occupational stress increases employee break up and reduces production and organisational efficiency ..Managers are confused to implement interventions that are cost effective and optimum.(Ongori Henry, Agolla Joseph Evans, 2008)

Occupational stress affects employee absenteeism, performance and productivity institutions are confused to implement programs related to stress management at minimum costs. Stress affects employees in many ways and is the main source for employee break up with organization. (Marin A,Ruotsalainen JH, 2006)

Software professional's creativity is generally used on global platforms where there is less information about humans in this scenario. (A. Amin, S. Basri, 2011)

Occupational Stress Indicator (OSI) scale which was fully documented was used for the study. (Cooper, Sloan, & Williams, 1988)

METHODOLOGY

A survey was conducted from 161 managers and 162 team members who were working in IT industry in Bangalore. Interviews were conducted with the help of questioners. Out of the total team members 69 were males and 52 were females and managers counted 102 males and 20 females. Age in average was 30 years and in average period in service was11 years and 37 years and 18 years.

Information of people on sex age status in marriage, number of children they had, duration in employment,

Designation in employment, anticipated date of promotion, work in free time and work out habits were measured. Occupation stress indicator(OSI) was used. Questioners were send to respondents to be filled by themselves. OSI includes 3 parts beginning of job stress, the person undergoing stress in occupation, coping strategies and impact of stress on individual (job satisfaction, mental health and physical health). A seven scale tool including an independent variable, three moderating items and three dependent items as coming behind.

Independent variable had 61 points for origin of stress. six possible stressors at work included

Internal factors of job, administrative aspects, relationship with people and interactions based at home and office climate. Coefficients in Cronbach test included 0.68, 0.77, 0.76,.0.79 duly. Total reliability for scales was measured at 0.95.

Moderating factors include type a behavior having 14 sub variables. Measurements for feeling for life Ways of behavior and goals. cronbach alpha coefficients for them included 0.57,0. 61,0.38 respectively. Total reliability for moderating variables was 0.77. Control at work having 12 sub variables comprising organizational strengths, management operations and personal influences. alpha score for these subscales were 0.38,0.56, 0.58 wholly. Score of reliability on the whole was .70.

Coping ways having 28 sub variables added aspects like community support, task plans, reasoning and influence of home and work climate, and involvement with time. scores of cronbach was 0.48,0.61,0.53,0.39,0.41,0.57 in total. Total alpha score was 0.85.

Dependent variables measured were job satisfaction having 22 items. Understanding growth and value perspectives in the mind of employees, job on the whole, organizational forms and atmosphere Organizational operations and interpersonal relationship in organization. score of alpha for them was e0.75, 0.68, 0.77, 0.63, 0.38, 0.65. Total alpha score for the sub variable was 0.93. Physical health having 12 items, made a reliability of 0.85. Mental health with 18 items had Cronbach's alphas core of 0.73. Physical health and mental health having low scores indicated wellbeing in work places.

ANALYSING VARIABLES

Using multiple regression analysis relationship linking of independent, moderate and dependent variables were understood. Identification of optional yield equation variables with cut off points was identified on three statistical points 1.F Ratio with significance was present. 2.Partial coefficient variable for independent moderating and depended variable had relevant statistical significance 3 input of each additional variable creates variance more than 1%. To understand difference of independent, moderating and independent variables of employees and manager's t tests two tailed was exercised.

Table 1 Analyzing software leads and team member through independent modrating and depended variables

Variables				
LEADS		R	R^2	CHANGED $_R2$
Mental Health	Elements in job	0.3148	0.0993	0.0993
	With A type Behavior	0.3886	0.1511	0.0518
	Reasoning	0.4514	0.2037	0.0528
	Number of kids	0.4729	0.2236	0.110
	Profession and Attainment	0.4953	0.2453	0.0217
	Community Support	0.5160	0.2662	0.0221
	Number of years lived	0.5400	0.2916	0.0253
F=6.39,P<0.05	Personnel influences	0.5579	0.3112	0.0197
Physical Health	Organizational forms and atmosphere	0.3572	0.1276	0.1276
	Reasoning	0.4007	0.1606	0.0331
	Feeling about life	0.4339	0.1883	0.0278

	Designation of job	0.4573	0.2101	0.0209
	Sex influence	0.4771	0.2275	0.0185
	Role in management	0.4936	0.2435	0.0159
	Influence of work and home	0.5144	0.2646	0.0212
	Behavioral ways	0.5318	0.2828	0.0184
F=5.58,P<0.05	Participation	0.5454	0.2975	0.0148
Job Satisfaction	Management operations	0.2743	0.0753	0.0753
	A type behavior	0.3518	0.1239	0.0488
	Organizational strengths	0.4099	0.1678	0.0442
F=7.21,P<0.05	Work experience	0.4446	0.1977	0.0298
Team Members				
Mental Health	Organizational forms and atmosphere	0.2831	0.0802	0.0802
	Anticipated date of promotion	0.3386	0.1147	0.0346
	Profession and Attainment	0.3656	0.1337	0.0191
	Feeling about life	0.3868	0.1496	0.016
	Behavioral ways	0.4386	0.1924	0.0429
	Reasoning	0.4588	0.2105	0.0182
	Number of years lived	0.4827	0.2330	0.0226
F=4.69,P<0.05	Number of kids	0.5007	0.2507	0.0178
Physical Health				
	Different relationship	0.5111	0.2612	0.2612
	Management operations	0.5722	0.3274	0.0663
	Anticipated date of promotion	0.6013	0.3615	0.0342
	Work in free time	0.6264	0.3923	0.0308
	Participation	0.6537	0.4273	0.0351
	Profession and Attainment	0.6671	0.4450	0.0178
	Feeling about life	0.6801	0.4612	0.0163
	Organizational strengths	0.6957	0.4840	0.0228
	Habits of workouts	0.7075	0.5005	0.0166
F=11.58,P<0.05	Behavioral ways	0.7161	0.5128	0.0124
Job Satisfaction	Management operations	0.3484	0.1214	0.1214
	Organizational strengths	0.4498	0.2025	0.0811
	Profession and Attainment	0.5183	0.2686	0.0662
	Community Support	0.5454	0.2975	0.0288
	Designation of job	0.5631	0.3171	0.0197
	Personal influences	0.5781	0.3342	0.0172
	Feeling about life	0.5913	0.3496	0.0155
	Sex influence	0.6023	0.3627	0.0132
	With A type Behavior	0.6073	0.3688	0.0062
	Work in free time	0.6174	0.3812	0.0125
F=6.85,P<0.05	Number of years lived	0.6271	0.3931	0.0121
	Employment duration	0.6375	0.4064	0.0133

X`x

VARIABLES OF MANAGERS

Multiple regression analysis was done on dependent variables, demographic variables and moderating variable score of stressors were set on independent variables. results of the test can be found in table 1 mental wellbeing prediction having eight factors had a variance of 31.12%.

Intrinsic factors. A type behaviour and reasoning had upward prediction (R^2Change >0.05). Ill health on physically had a variance of 29.75%. Totally it consisted of reasoning, feeling about life, designation of job, influence of sex, managerial operations, influence of home and office, behaviour ways. Organizational forms and atmosphere made a score of 12.75% of total variance make a strong prediction. Prediction in job satisfaction included management operation, a type behaviour and organizational strength and duration of service all contributing to a total score of 19.77% variance.

VARIABLES OF TEAM MEMBERS

Analysing demographic variables of stressors in occupation type A behaviour, point of control and strategies for coping were mapped on mental health conditions, physical health and job satisfaction for specimen of team members. The result of this can be found in table.

Mental ill health was predicted with eight factors having total score of 25.07%. Organizational forms and atmosphere and anticipated date of promotion had high prediction of R^2 change Value of0.09 and0.04. differential relationship had a high prediction of 26.12%.management operations anticipated date of promotion ,work in free time and involvement had predictions of(R^2 Change > 0.03). Profession and attainment , ways of living ,organizational strength, work out practices and behavioural ways had significant variation, but variation was small. Twelve factors for job satisfaction had a scoring of 40.64% variation. Management operations had powerful variance of 12.4%.

VARIABILITY BETWEEN LEADS AND TEAM MEMBERS

In table 2 we find t test comparisons for managers and team members. Managers tend to have more pressure than team members organizational forms and atmosphere, managerial operations scores tend to be slightly high than those of team members(P<5)

There was no significant differences between leads and team members for scores of variables like mental and physical health, job satisfaction and subscale scores.

Table 2. Comparing Dependent, Moderating and Independent Variables Between leads and Team in software companies

Variables	**Managers**		**Team members**		
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**t- value**
Sources of stress					
Fctors internal to job	32.427	5.8182	31.273	5.9232	1.53147
Managerial operations	37.665	7.322	35.719	7.4064	2.05866*
Differential Relationships	33.403	7.1197	31.851	6.9243	1.72066
Profession and Attainment	31.33	6.1042	30.19	6.0489	1.44886
Organizatioanal forms and atmoshphere	39.944	6.7864	37.909	7.8359	2.16299*
Influence of work and home	36.517	8.2295	35.099	8.476	1.44886
A Type Behivour					
Way of living	25.944	2.5302	26.223	3.1531	0.7652

Behivoural ways	19.688	2.9601	19.314	3.2042	0.94639
Desire	13.099	1.4683	13.107	1.5801	0.04640
Total A Type behavior	58.740	5.7065	58.645	6.4068	0.10907
Focus of control					
Management Operations	17.116	2.1212	16.917	2.2678	0.70082
Organizational Strengths	19.952	2.5058	19.051	2.7321	2.68018*
Personal Influences	13.116	1.428	12.908	1.2451	1.19674
Total Focus of control	50.181	4.728	48.877	4.9776	2.09416*
Stress coping					
Community Support	17.771	2.6778	17.257	2.9454	1.42438
Task planning	29.278	4.0642	27.381	4.698	3.36982*
Reasoning	13.548	1.8769	12.654	2.5812	3.09776*
influence home / work	15.886	3.0969	16.389	2.8059	1.32698
managing time	17.222	2.2138	16.718 2	2.5008	1.65817
participation	25.638	3.5932	25.446	3.9455	0.39888
Total Coping	119.35	12.914	115.844	14.109	2.01817*
Job satisfaction					
Valuation of Growth & Achivement	23.868	4.8821	23.778	5.3548	0.13996
Job alone	17.501	2.8175	17.844	3.0333	0.91334
Oraganizational Forms	20.779	3.8538	21.248	3.8563	0.94872
Organizational Operations	16.337	3.2158	16.025	3.8524	0.68398
Differential Relationships	13.418	1.8311	13.158	2.2248	0.99885
Total satisfaction in job	91.903	14.505	92.051	16.296	0.07478
Present Mental Condition					
Mental condition	73.458	9.4522	74.803	9.7534	1.08972
Physical condition	36.688	10.606	36.197	11.423	0.34670

Note: All two tailed tests
probabilities are mentioned*P<0.05

Idea wrap

Factors projecting job dissatisfaction were management operations, organizational strengths and duration of service.

Key factors projection mental ill health for workers were organizational forms and atmosphere and expecting promotion on a particular date.

Main physical complaints were differential relationship with people, operations of management, expecting promotion on a future date, engaging in other work in free time and participation other group activities.

Job dissatisfaction factors projected were operations of management, organizational strengths and professional and career attainment.

While comparing team leads with team members, team leads believed that they have better knowledge and control over work. They also thought they had more power in the organization.

In terms of stress managers reported more stress and were involved in greater spectrum of coping activities. Involvement in these activities were more frequent managers were highly focused on their tasks and were less emotional.

Workers having higher score in this study had less control, were using coping plans very often. People who demonstrated type A behavior were prone to coronary behavior and were facing mental and physical distress.

It industry having big changes and big developments uses varied management styles, works in global cluture, has multidimensional socity undergoing big transformation.

It industy being highly technical in nature uses management processes in a free rein style giving greater flexibility to its employees.

All factors in this study shows us there is heavy mental load of work and light decision making lode in people working in It industry.

If IT companies develop better decision making and communication skills on floor, supported with great policy making in recruitment of people and enabling them with customized training there if great chance of organizational growth and development.

REFERENCES

1. Cartwright S., & Cooper, C. L. (1994). No Hassle! Taking the Stress out of Work. London: Century Limited. Cooper, C. L., Sloan, S. J., & Williams, S. (1988). The Occupational Stress Indicator. Windsor: NFER Nelson
2. Occupational Stress Among University Teachers Blix, Arlene Gray,1994 Vol 32 157-169, Educational research
3. .C.; Henderson, D.F. Occupational Stress: Preventing Suffering, Enhancing Wellbeing. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 2016, *13*, 459
4. Basu S, Qayyum H, Mason SOccupational stress in the ED: a systematic literature reviewEmergency Medicine Journal 2017;34:441-447.
5. Stress Management for Primary Health Care Professionals. Springer, Boston, MA
6. Spector PE. Employee Control and Occupational Stress. Current Directions in Psychological Science. 2002;11(4):133-136.
7. A.Amin, S. Basri, M. F. Hassan and M. Rehman, "Occupational stress, knowledge sharing and GSD communication barriers as predictors of software engineer's creativity," *2011 IEEE International*
8. Taap Manshor, A., Fontaine, R. and Siong Choy, C. (2003), "Occupational stress among managers: a Malaysian survey", Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol. 18 No. 6, pp. 622-628.
9. Marin A,Ruotsalainen JH,Serra C,Verbeek JH,Preventing occupational stress in health care workers. Cochrane database of systematic reviews2006, issue 4,Art no:CD002892 *Conference on* Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management, 2011, pp. 394-398, doi: 10.1109/IEEM.2011.6117946.