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Abstract

Area of the Study
The impact of role stressors on the job satisfaction among the non-executives in the Sri Lankan commercial banking sector is the main area of this study.

Problem of the Study
Non-executives in the commercial banking sector in Sri Lanka is a major category of working group whose contribution is significant and important to survival of the banks in the competitive scenario. Success of their working life depends on the high level of day to day job satisfaction. However, the nature of job brings the risky and stressfulness. Therefore, this study is aimed to find out the effect of organizational role stress on the JS of the non-executives in the banking sector.

Method of the study
The sample of the study was 252 non-executives and sample was selected as simple random sampling method. Two standard questionnaires were used to gather the primary data and correlation and regression analysis were used to analyses the data.

Findings of the Study
The major finding of the study is that there is moderately negative relationship and impact of role stressors on the job satisfaction of banking non-executives.

Conclusion of the Study
The main conclusion of the study that the management of the banking companies have to pay their attention to reduce the different role stressors among the non-executives.
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1. Introduction
As Smith (2000) and Chang and Lu (2007), stress becomes an ever-presenting problem in modern life and it is a very universal experience of the day to day life of human beings (Bano & Jho 2012). It is a severe concern in many organizations as the views of researchers in occupational field (Cooper & Cartwright 1994; Varca 1999; Ornelas & Kleiner 2003). Selye introduced the term of stress in 1936 and Paul (2002) and Danna and Griffin (2002) pointed out that stress is one of the most important health risks in the workplace and it is general in developed as well as developing countries. As a result, stress is motionless a popular topic (Vokić & Bogdanić 2007). As Vokić and Bogdanić (2007), psychological, sociological and medical perspectives were the primary focus of stress and issues of occupational stress which are dealt in the business views (Vokić & Bogdanić 2007).
From the business perspective, researchers dealt with role stress of employees and literature on role stress has largely been published in psychological and sociological journals (Biddle, 1986). There are ten measures of role stressors such as inter role distance, role stagnation, role expectation conflict, role erosion, role overload, role isolation, personal inadequacy, self role distance, role ambiguity and resource inadequacy (Piyasena and Kottawatta 2016). As Dhawan, role stress is as stress generated as a result of occupying a role (Dhawan 2013, p. 3). As Beehr et al. (1976), negative outcomes of role stress are dissatisfaction with work, dissatisfaction with life, low self-esteem, depressed mood, self-reported fatigue, tension or anxiety, and several risk factors in coronary heart disease. Among these outcomes of stress, impact of job stress on overall job satisfaction becomes most predictable outcome. This study is aimed to discuss how organizational role stressors affect on job satisfaction of banking non-executives in Sri Lankan commercial banking sector.

2. Literature Review
2.1. Job Satisfaction
As Arshar (2014), job satisfaction is one of the job attitudes, which has widespread amount of literature available in the world. However, it is very hard to define because of the awfully subjective nature from individual to individual (Panday & Kavitha 2015). Job satisfaction concept was introduced by Hoppock (1935) in the book of Job satisfaction and he opined that physiological and psychological feeling of the worker is the job satisfaction. Job satisfaction defined by Locke: the degree of happiness or positive emotional state/feeling that originates from one’s job experiences (Locke 1976). As Cormic and other in 2007 (as in Bilge & Kelecioglu 2007), job satisfaction can be examined through the amount of employees’ expectations on job characteristics and is closely linked to that individual's behaviour in the workplace (Davis et al.1985).

2.2. Role Stress
According to Gilboa et al. (2008), Jackson and Schuler (1985) and Tubre’ and Collins (2000), role stressors are some of the most commonly studied work stressors. Pareek (2003) categorized all ten role stressors into two role systems as role space and role set. Narrow definitions for the all ten stressors under role space and role set are given in Table 01.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 01: Definitions for Role Stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Role Space - This represents all the roles performed by an individual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Inter Role Distance (IRD) - Role stress arises due to conflict between organizational and non-organizational roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii Role Stagnation (RS) - Role stagnation stress due to the feeling of being stuck in the same role and not to grow for future roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii Self-Role Distance (SRD) - SRD stress arises due to disliking of the role given or mismatch between the person and his/her job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Role Set - This represents all the roles with whom a role occupant is required to interact for the performance of his role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Role Expectation Conflict (REC) - REC stress arises due to conflicting demands from superior,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subordinate and peers in the organization.

ii **Role Erosion (RE)** – This stress arises when role has become less important than it used to be.

iii **Role Overload (RO)** - Role Overload is experienced when there are too many or too high expectations from a role and the role given are overburdened.

iv **Role Isolation (RI)** - Role Isolation stress is experienced due to the feeling of not being able to communicate with others.

v **Personal Inadequacy (PIn)** - This stress arises due to the lack of required skills, knowledge, and training to meet the demands of one’s role.

vi **Role Ambiguity (RA)** - Role Ambiguity is experienced when the role occupant is not clear about expectations from his/her role.

vii **Resource Inadequacy (RIn)** - This stress arises due to the lack of resources (human or material) to meet the demands of the role.

Adopted from Dhawan, 2013, pp. 3-4

### 2.3. Role Stress and Job Satisfaction

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

### 3. Objective of the Study

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

4. Method

The sample consisted of 252 non-executives in the commercial banks in Sri Lanka and simple random sampling method was hired to derive the sample. Among the 252 executives, 113 non-executives were male non-executives and remaining amount (139) were female non-executives.

Role stressors were measured using the Organizational Role Stress Scale (ORS) developed by Pareek in 1981. It has 50 items to measure the 10 role stressors (5 items for one stressor) with five-point scale. Job satisfaction was measured by a questionnaire developed by Weiss et al. in 1967. For the convenience of the sample respondents, the short-form questionnaire was used ignoring the long-form of questionnaire developed by Weiss et al. (1967). Inter item consistency reliability of the instruments used in this study are Inter-Role Distance (IRD) - 0.843, Role Stagnation (RS) - 0.823, Self-Role Distance (SRD) - 0.878, Role Expectation Conflict (REC) - 0.799, Role Erosion (RE) - 0.809, Role Overload (RO) - 0.811, Role Isolation (RI) - 0.779, Personal Inadequacy (PIN) - 0.798, Role Ambiguity (RA) - 0.807, Resource Inadequacy (RIn) - 0.840 and Job Satisfaction (JS) - 0.806

5. Findings

As Table 03, significant role stressors are interrole distance and role expectation conflict of the banking non-executives. When compared with other role stressors, significantly less effect is recorded from the role stagnation.

Table 02 presents the correlation between these two variables to find out the association between role stressors and job satisfaction of banking non-executives.

Table 02: Correlation between Role Stressors and Job Satisfaction of the Executives and Non-Executives
The correlation between role stressors on job satisfaction of the executive is -0.680 (Sig: .000) and non-executives is -0.552 (Sig: .000). It indicates that there is a moderately negative correlation between role stressors and job satisfaction of both categories of workers in the commercial banks. When compared the correlation results of the 10 role stressors of the banking executives and non-executives, weak negative association are recorded for the role isolation and resource inadequacy for both categories of employees. However, role overload is recorded as strongly negative association in the executives.

Simple regression analysis about the role stressors and job satisfaction of both categories are given in Table 03.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-executives</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRD + JS</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>94.607</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS + JS</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>156.282</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD + JS</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>95.547</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC + JS</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>95.070</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE + JS</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>85.034</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO + JS</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>216.460</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI + JS</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>28.520</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIn + JS</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>17.958</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA + JS</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>18.484</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIn + JS</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>35.547</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Stress + JS</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>280.121</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 03, 46.3% (R=.680) variance of job satisfaction is explained by the role stressors of executives and 44.7% (R=.668) variance of job satisfaction is explained by the role stressors of non-executives.

Multiple regressions of the independent variables with dependent variables are given in Table 04.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-executives</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>57.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 04, the R square value of 0.634 (F value = 46.530) has a significant level of 0.000 (p<0.05) and 63.4% variance of job satisfaction is explained by the 10 role stressors together in executives. In the non-executives, the R square vale of 0.628 (F value = 57.039) has a significant level of 0.000 (p<0.05) and 62.8% variance of job satisfaction is explained
by the 10 role stressors together. This means that the proposed models are considered significant and the potential determinant can describe the job satisfaction.

6. Findings, Discussion and Recommendation

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

1. There is a moderately negative relationship between role stress and JS among the non-executives in the commercial banks ($r = -0.668$, Sig is 0.000).
2. There is moderately negative relationship between IRD and JS among the non-executives in the commercial banks ($r = -0.463$, Sig is 0.000).
3. There is moderately negative relationship between RS and JS among the non-executives in the commercial banks ($r = -0.557$, Sig is 0.000).
4. There is moderately negative relationship between SRD and JS among the non-executives in the commercial banks ($r = -0.465$, Sig is 0.000).
5. There is moderately negative relationship between REC and JS among the non-executives in the commercial banks ($r = -0.464$, Sig is 0.000).
6. There is moderately negative relationship between RE and JS among the non-executives in the commercial banks ($r = -0.444$, Sig is 0.000).
7. There is moderately negative relationship between RO and JS among the non-executives in the commercial banks ($r = -0.620$, Sig is 0.000).
8. There is weakly negative relationship between RI and JS among the non-executives in the commercial banks ($r = -0.276$, Sig is 0.000).
9. There is weakly negative relationship between PIn and JS among the non-executives in the commercial banks ($r = -0.222$, Sig is 0.000).
10. There is weakly negative relationship between RA and JS among the non-executives in the commercial banks ($r = -0.225$, Sig is 0.000).
11. There is weakly negative relationship between RIn and JS among the non-executives in the commercial banks ($r = -0.305$, Sig is 0.000).
12. 44.7% of variance of JS is explained by the role stress among the non-executives in the commercial banks.
13. 21.4% of variance of JS is explained by the IRD among the non-executives in the commercial banks.
14. 31% of variance of JS is explained by the RS among the non-executives in the commercial banks.
15. 21.6% of variance of JS is explained by the SRD among the non-executives in the commercial banks.
16. 21.5% of variance of JS is explained by the REC among the non-executives in the commercial banks.
17. 19.7% of variance of JS is explained by the RE among the non-executives in the commercial banks.
18. 38.4% of variance of JS is explained by the RO among the non-executives in the commercial banks.
19. 7.6% of variance of JS is explained by the RI among the non-executives in the commercial banks.
20. 4.9% of variance of JS is explained by the PIn among the non-executives in the commercial banks.
21. 5.1% of variance of JS is explained by the RA among the non-executives in the commercial banks.
22. 9.3% of variance of JS is explained by the RIn among the non-executives in the commercial banks.
23. 62.8% of variance of JS is explained by the 10 role stressors together among the non-executives in the commercial banks.

Moderately negative relationship and impact of role stressors on the job satisfaction of banking non-executives is the major finding of the study. This result is maintained with the findings of Samartha et al. in 2011. They concluded their finding of the study as role stress is negatively related to the job satisfaction. Pestonjee and Mishara (1999) and Piyasena and Kottawatta (2016) also found that there is a negative correlation between job satisfaction and all the dimensions of role stressors.

The results of the study reported that there is a weak negative relationship and impact of inter role distance with job satisfaction of the banking non-executives. This result is supported by the studies done by Gahlan in 2014, Singh (2014) Vijaya and Hemamalini (2012) and Piyasena and Kottawatta (2016). Inter role distance explains the stress which has occurred because of conflict between organizational and non-organizational roles.

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

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

Banking non-executives in Sri Lanka illustrate that when role has become less important than it used to be, then their job satisfaction remains at a lower level. The r value of the role erosion of this study is -0.513 and 26.3% variance of job satisfaction is explained by the role erosion. This finding is supported by the findings of Gahlan (2014) and Singh (2014).

This study found the association of job overload with job satisfaction as weak and negative relation. Piyasena and Kottawatta (2016), Chandreiah et al. (2003), Vasudevan et al. (2015), Vijaya and Hemamalini (2012), Gahlan (2014) and Singh (2014) found that role overload leads to lower job satisfaction.
There is a weak negative association and impact of role isolation with job satisfaction of banking non-executives. The findings of Chandreiah et al. (2003), Piyasena and Kottawatta (2016), Vasudevan et al. (2015), Gahlan (2014) and Singh (2014) supported this research finding further. If there is no opportunity to communicate with each other, then employee will feel that they experience the job isolation.

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

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

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

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