

CHAPTER 5
ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

5.1 Introduction

5.2 Data Analysis

5.2.1 Descriptive Analysis

5.2.2. Causes of Workplace Stress

5.2.3 Effect of Stress on Morale and Job Satisfaction.

5.2.4 Level of Stress of Co-operative Bank Employees.

5.2.5 Psychological Effect of Stress on Bank Employees.

5.2.6 Personality Identification.

5.2.7 Coping Strategies Used by Co-operative Banks

to Reduce Stress.

5.2.8 Testing of Hypotheses

CHAPTER 5

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

5.1 Introduction

The data is processed and analyzed in accordance with the outline laid down in the research plan. Data analysis refers to the computation of certain measures along with searching for patterns of relationship that exist among data groups.

Data relating to personality identification has been analyzed with R.W.Bortners short rating scale. Through which Type A and Type B personality can be identified in study.

This chapter deals with processing, tabulation, presentation, analysis and interpretation of data.

5.2 Data Analysis

The Researcher has presented data analysis in eight parts as follows

Part I - Descriptive Analysis

Part II - Causes of Workplace Stress

Part III - Effect of Stress on Morale and Job Satisfaction.

Part IV - Level of Stress of Co-operative Bank Employees.

Part V - Psychological Effect of Stress on Bank Employees.

Part VI - Personality Identification.

Part VII - Coping Strategies Used by Co-operative Banks to Reduce Stress.

Part VIII - Testing of Hypotheses

Part I**5.2.1 Descriptive Analysis**

Descriptive analysis includes Demographic profile of sample respondents detailing Gender, Marital Status, Educational Qualification, Age, Experience and Income.

Following table shows the Demographic Profile of sample respondents. Respondents have been classified according to demographic features as Gender, Marital Status, Educational Qualification, Age, Experience and Income of respondents.

Table 5.2.1.1**Demographic Profile of Sample Respondents.**

(n=113)

Sr.	Profile Particulars		Number of Respondents	Percentages
1	Gender	Male	86	76.1
		Female	27	23.9
2	Marital Status	Single	9	8
		Married	104	92
3	Education	Graduate	94	83.18
		Post Graduate	19	16.82
4	Age	21-30	12	10.6
		31-40	47	41.6
		41-50	35	31.0
		51 & above	19	16.8
5	Experience	Below 5 years	18	16
		6-10 years	38	33.6
		11-15 years	22	19.5
		16-20 years	11	9.7
		21 & above	24	21.2
6	Income (Per month in Rs.)	5000 – 10000	7	6.19
		10001-15000	21	18.58
		15001-20000	18	15.92
		20001-25000	17	15.04
		25001-30000	15	13.3
		30001-35000	12	10.62
		35001-40000	9	7.96
		40001& above	14	12.39

Source: (Field Data)

Table 5.2.1.1 shows the demographic profile of respondents. Out of total Respondents, 76.1% are male and 23.9% are female samples respectively.

Marital status reflects that 92% respondents are married and 8% respondents are single.

As per Academic Qualification, 83.18% respondents are Graduate and 16.82 % respondents are Post Graduate.

41.6% respondents are in the age group of 31-40 and only 31% respondents are in the age group 41-50. 16.8% respondents are in the age group of 51 & above.

33.6% respondents are having experience 6 to 10 years.19.5% respondents are having 11 to 15 years.

18.58% of samples have income 10001-15000 per month and only 6.19% respondents have income 5000-10000 per month.

Demographic Profile of Sample Respondents.

Following table shows the Demographic Profile of sample respondents. Respondents have been classified according to demographic features as Post, Other Source of Income, Number of Family Members, Land Holding, Own House, Parental Responsibility and Parents Get Pension.

Table 5.2.1.2
Demographic Profile of Sample Respondents.

(n=113)

Sr.	Profile Particulars	Number of Respondents	Percentages	
1	Post	Br. Manager / Manager	10	8.8
		Accountant/Asst. Accountant	7	6.2
		Development Officer/ Loan Superintendent	14	12.4
		Officer	17	15.2
		Cashier	11	9.6
		Clerk	45	39.8
		Software Eng / Technical Officer	9	8
2	Other Source of Income	Agriculture	39	97.5
		Rent	1	2.5
3	Number of Family Members	2 to 4	92	81.42
		5 to 7	19	16.81
		8 & more	2	1.77
4	Land Holding (In Acres)	1 to 3	28	68.3
		4 to 6	9	22
		7 to 9	3	7.3
		10 & more	1	2.4
5	Own House	Yes	95	84.1
		No	18	15.9
6	Parental Responsibility	Yes	80	70.8
		No	33	29.2
7	Parents Get Pension	Yes	26	23
		No	87	77

Source: (Field Data)

Table 5.2.1.2 shows the demographic profile of respondents. Out of total Respondents, 39.8% respondents are working on clerical post and 15.2 % are working as officer.

97.5% respondents have agriculture as other source of income, 2.5% respondents have rent as other source of income.

81.42% respondents have 2-4 members in their family and only 1.77% respondents have 8 & more members in their family.

68.3% respondents have 1-3 acres of land holding and only 2.4% respondents have 10 & more than 10 acres of land holding.

Out of total respondents, 84.1% respondents have their own house and 15.9% respondents don't have their own house.

70.8% respondents have parental responsibility and 29.2% respondents don't have parental responsibility.

77% respondent's parents don't get pension and 23% respondents parents get pension.

Part II**5.2.2 Causes of Workplace Stress**

To understand the causes of workplace stress, respondents were asked to give their opinion on a five point scale. The ranks were ascertained by obtaining the mean value of the responses. Results are shown in the following tables.

Following table shows the causes of workplace stress due to task demand of Sample Respondents.

Table 5.2.2.1**Causes of Workplace Stress due to Task Demand**

(n=113)

Sr.	Task Demand	Mean	Rank
1	My job contain work overload	3.292035	4
2	I have to work for long hours	3.39823	3
3	I am handling too many tasks at a time	3.539823	2
4	Work involve extensive traveling	2.309735	9
5	I don't get adequate time to perform all tasks.	3.123894	5
6	Need to achieve targets / deadlines.	3.716814	1
7	Lack of regular tea and lunch breaks.	2.920354	6
8	My skills are not properly used.	2.79646	7
9	Long auditing / inspection process.	2.769912	8
10	Custody of money, fear of theft.	2.168142	10
11	I feel that I am not able to do this job.	1.530973	11

Source: (Field Data)

Table 5.2.2.1 shows causes of workplace stress due to task demand of sample respondents. Need to achieve targets, Handling too many tasks at a time and work for long hours have ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd having mean 3.716814, 3.539823 and 3.39823 respectively.

Work involve extensive traveling, Custody of money, fear of theft and I feel that I am not able to do this job have means 2.309735, 2.168142 and 1.530973 respectively with ranks 9th, 10th and 11th respectively.

Respondents have to achieve targets and they handle too many tasks at a time are major reasons of workplace stress due to task demand.

Respondents have given very less importance to they are not able to do their job.

Following table shows the causes of workplace stress due to role demand of Sample Respondents.

Table 5.2.2.2

Causes of Workplace Stress due to Role Demand

(n=113)

Sr.	Role Demand	Mean	Rank
1	My role is unclear to me	1.849558	9
2	I face conflicting demands from others.	2.451327	3
3	I get contradictory messages from boss / colleagues.	1.982301	7
4	My job contents are clear to me.	4.424779	1
5	I feel lack of career development opportunities.	2.035398	6
6	I am not enjoying my work.	1.858407	8
7	I am not ready to accept additional responsibility.	1.637168	10
8	I am completing tasks with fewer resources.	4.212389	2
9	Facing lack of support from others.	2.115044	5
10	My work is not appreciated by my boss.	2.230088	4

Source: (Field Data)

Table 5.2.2.2 shows causes of workplace stress due to role demand of sample respondents. My job contents are clear to me, I am completing tasks with fewer resources and I face conflicting demands from others have ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd having mean 4.424779, 4.212389 and 2.451327 respectively. I am not enjoying my work, My role is unclear to me and I am not ready to accept additional responsibility have means 1.858407, 1.849558 and 1.637168 with ranks 8th, 9th and 10th respectively.

Respondent's job contents are clear to them but they have to do work other than their job contents which creates stress and they have to complete tasks with fewer resources are main reasons of workplace stress.

Very less importance is given by the respondents that they are not ready to accept additional responsibility.

Following table shows the causes of workplace stress due to physical demand of Sample Respondents.

Table 5.2.2.3

Causes of Workplace Stress due to Physical Demand

(n=113)

Sr.	Physical Demand	Mean	Rank
1	Poorly designed office	2.911504	2
2	Less social interaction	2.584071	4
3	Noise	2.99115	1
4	Poor lightening	1.99115	5
5	Polluted drinking water	1.823009	6
6	Inadequate work surface	2.752212	3

Source: (Field Data)

Table 5.2.2.3 shows causes of workplace stress due to physical demand of sample respondents. Noise, Poorly designed office and Inadequate work surface have ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd having mean 2.99115, 2.911504 and 2.752212 respectively. Poor lightening, Polluted drinking water has means 1.99115, 1.823009 with ranks 5th and 6th respectively.

Noise at workplace and poorly designed office are main reasons of workplace stress.

Respondents have given less preference to factors like polluted drinking water and poor lightening.

Following table shows the causes of workplace stress due to relationships of Sample Respondents.

Table 5.2.2.4

Causes of Workplace Stress due to Relationships

(n=113)

Sr.	Relationships	Mean	Rank
1	Lack of communication with staff	2.070796	1
2	Improper behavior of boss / colleagues	1.964602	4
3	I face group pressure	1.893805	5
4	Face harassment at workplace	1.557522	6
5	Improper leadership style of my boss	1.99115	3
6	Conflicting personality of my boss	2.017699	2

Source: (Field Data)

Table 5.2.2.4 shows causes of workplace stress due to relationships of sample respondents. Lack of communication with staff, Conflicting personality of my boss and Improper leadership style of my boss have ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd having mean 2.070796, 2.017699 and 1.99115 respectively.

Respondents face group pressure, Face harassment at workplace has means 1.893805, 1.557522 respectively with ranks 5th and 6th respectively.

Respondents have given main reason for workplace stress is lack of communication with staff and conflicting personality of their boss.

Very less importance is given to harassment at workplace and respondents face group pressure.

Part III**5.2.3 Effect of Stress on Morale and Job Satisfaction**

To understand the effect of stress, respondents were asked to give their opinion on a five point scale. The ranks were ascertained by obtaining the mean value of the responses. Results are shown in the following tables.

Following table shows the effect of stress on morale of Sample Respondents.

Table 5.2.3.1**Effect of Stress on Morale**

(n=113)

Sr.	Statements	Mean	Rank
1	Feel proud that I am working with this bank.	4.433628	3
2	Fair treatment by bank management.	4.230088	4
3	Progress of my bank.	4.672566	1
4	Ready to work more with this bank.	4.486726	2
5	Happy with job standards	4.141593	5

Source: (Field Data)

Table 5.2.3.1 shows effect of stress on morale of sample respondents. Progress of bank, Ready to work more with this bank and Feel proud that I am working with this bank have ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd having mean 4.672566, 4.486726 and 4.433628 respectively.

Respondents have given 4th and 5th ranks to fair treatment by bank management and Happy with job standards with means 4.230088, 4.141593 respectively.

Respondents shown positive attitude towards progress of their bank and they are ready to work more with their bank. This indicates willingness of respondents to work with their bank.

Respondents have shown negative attitude towards job standards and treatment by bank management.

Following table shows Sample Respondents satisfaction with job related conditions.

Table 5.2.3.2

Sample Respondents Satisfaction with Job Related Conditions.

(n=113)

Sr.	Statement	Mean	Rank
1	Colleagues	4.159292	1
2	Salary	3.619469	4
3	Place at which you work	4.017699	2
4	Employee welfare schemes	3.761062	3

Source: (Field Data)

Table 5.2.3.2 shows sample respondents satisfaction with job related conditions. Colleagues, Place at which they work have ranked 1st and 2nd with mean 4.159292 and 4.017699 respectively.

Respondents have given 3rd and 4th ranks to employee welfare schemes and salary with means 3.761062 and 3.619469 respectively.

Respondents are satisfied with colleagues and their workplace.

Factors such as employee welfare schemes and salary respondents have shown less satisfaction.

Following table shows Sample Respondents satisfaction with existing managerial practices of their bank.

Table 5.2.3.3

Sample Respondents Satisfaction with Existing Managerial Practices

(n=113)

Sr.	Statement	Mean	Rank
1	Rewards	3.884956	2
2	Opportunities for promotion	4.017699	1
3	Leave policies of bank	3.761062	3
4	Recognition of skills & abilities	3.513274	4
5	Expression of grievances.	3.433628	5

Source: (Field Data)

Table 5.2.3.3 shows sample respondent's satisfaction with existing managerial practices of their bank.

Opportunities for promotion, Rewards and Leave policy of bank have ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd with mean 4.017699, 3.884956 and 3.761062 respectively.

Respondents have given 4th and 5th ranks to Recognition of skills & abilities and Expression of grievances with means 3.513274 and 3.433628 respectively.

Respondents are satisfied with promotional opportunities exists in their bank, rewards and leave policy of bank. But respondents are less satisfied with recognition of their skills and abilities and expression of grievance.

Part IV**5.2.4 Level of Stress of Co-operative Bank Employees.**

To understand the stress level respondents were asked to give their opinion on a five point scale for fifteen statements. Results are shown in the following tables.

Following table shows Level of Stress of Sample Respondents

Table 5.2.4.1**Level of Stress of Sample Respondents**

Sr.	Level of Stress	No. of Respondents	Percentage
1	Low (15-30)	3	2.65
2	Medium (31-50)	87	77
3	High (51- 75)	23	20.35
	Total	113	100

Source: (Field Data)

Table 5.2.4.1 shows that majority of the respondents that is 77% are under medium stress level. 20.35% of the respondents are under high stress level. And only 2.65% respondents are under low stress level.

It can be concluded that most of the Co-operative bank employees are under medium stress level and few Co-operative bank employees are under high stress level.

Following table shows the agreeableness of Sample Respondents for Occupational Stress Index.

Table 5.2.4.2
Occupational Stress Index of Sample Respondents

Sr.	Statements	Wt Avg.	Rank
1	I have to do a lot of work in this bank.	26.13	5
2	The available information relating to my role and its outcomes are vague and insufficient.	16.66	11
3	My different officers often give contradictory instructions regarding my work.	16	13
4	Owing to excessive workload, I have to manage with insufficient number of employees & resources.	22.26	8
5	The objectives of my work role are quite clear and adequately planned.	31.66	1
6	Officials do not interfere with my jurisdiction and working method.	30.73	2
7	I have to dispose off my work hurriedly owing to excessive workload.	26.6	4
8	I am unable to perform my duties smoothly owing to uncertainty & ambiguity of the scope of my authorities.	16.26	12
9	I am not provided with clear instructions and sufficient facilities regarding the new assignments assigned to me.	15.26	14
10	Being busy with official work, I am not able to devote sufficient time to my domestic & personal problems.	25.93	6
11	It is not clear what type of work & behavior my higher authorities & colleagues expect from me.	15.13	15
12	Employees attach due importance to the official instructions & formal working procedures.	30.6	3
13	I have to do such work as ought to be done by others.	24.8	7
14	It becomes difficult to implement all of a sudden the new dealing procedures and policies.	20.06	9
15	I am unable to carry out my assignments to my satisfaction on account of excessive load of work & lack of time.	18.53	10

Source: (Field Data)

Table 5.2.4.2 shows the agreeableness of Sample Respondents for OSI.

Respondents have given 1st, 2nd and 3rd rank to The objectives of my work role are quite clear and adequately planned, Officials do not interfere with my jurisdiction and working method and Employees attach due importance to the official instructions & formal working procedures with weighted average 31.66, 30.73 and 30.6 respectively.

Respondents shown less agreeableness on they are not provided clear instructions and sufficient facilities regarding new assignment assigned to them and it is not clear to them what type of work and behaviour their superiors and colleagues expected from them with ranks 14th and 15th with weighted average 15.26 and 15.13 respectively.

Part V**5.2.5 Psychological Effect of Stress on Bank Employees.**

To understand psychological effect of stress, mean values were obtained and ranks were ascertained. Results are shown in the following table. Results are shown in the following table.

Following table shows Psychological Effect of Stress on Sample Respondents.

Table 5.2.5.1**Psychological Effect of Stress on Respondents**

(n=113)

Sr.	Psychological Effect	Mean	Rank
1	Anger	3.079	2
2	Anxiety/ Unease	2.805	3
3	Depression	2.123	6
4	Nervousness	2.212	5
5	Tension	3.495	1
6	Low confidence	1.955	8
7	Fear	2.654	4
8	Boredom	1.946	9
9	Wrong decision making	1.911	10
10	Inability to concentrate on work.	2.017	7

Source: (Field Data)

Table 5.2.5.1 shows Psychological Effect of Stress on Sample Respondents.

Tension, Anger and Anxiety have ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd having means 3.495, 3.079 and 2.805 respectively. Low confidence, Boredom and Wrong decision making have means 1.955, 1.946 and 1.911 with ranks 8th, 9th and 10th respectively.

Major psychological effects are tension, anger and anxiety.

Very less psychological effect of stress on respondents are low confidence, boredom and wrong decision making.

Part VI**5.2.6 Personality Identification.**

To understand the personality identification of respondents R. W. Bortners short rating scale is used. Results are shown in the following table.

Following table shows Personality Identification of Sample Respondents.

Table 5.2.6.1**Personality Identification of Sample Respondents**

(n=113)

Personality Type	No. of Respondents	Percentage
A	73	64.60
B	40	35.40

Source: (Field Data)

Table 5.2.6.1 shows Personality Identification of Sample Respondents.

Majority of the respondents that is 64.60% are having Type A personality and 35.40% respondents are having Type B personality.

It was concluded that majority of bank employees are having Personality Type 'A'.

Part VII**5.2.7 Coping Strategies Used by Co-operative Banks to Reduce Stress.**

To understand the coping strategies used by co-operative banks to reduce stress, they were asked to tick options. Results are shown in the following table.

Following table shows Coping Strategies Used by Co-operative Banks to Reduce Stress.

Table 5.2.7.1**Coping Strategies Used by Co-operative Banks to Reduce Stress.**

(n=113)

Sr.	Coping strategies used by Co-operative banks	No. of Respondents	Percentage
1	Meditation	15	13.27
2	Exercise	2	1.76
3	Workshops	18	15.92
4	Lectures	39	34.51
5	Flex work	5	4.42
6	Job redesign	3	2.65
7	Employee counseling	21	18.58
8	Training	77	68.14
9	Changes in workload and deadlines	16	14.15

Source: (Field Data)

Table 5.2.7.1 shows Coping Strategies used by Banks to reduce Stress of Sample Respondents.

Majority of the respondents that is 68.14% mentioned training is provided to reduce stress. 34.51 % respondents mentioned that lectures are given to reduce stress. Also employee counseling is provided as mentioned by 18.58% respondents.

It is concluded that majority co-operative banks are using Training sessions to reduce stress of their employees.

Part VIII**5.2.8 Testing of Hypotheses.**

This part of analysis details about hypotheses testing. Researcher has set hypothesis on the basis of respondents Working Hours, Personality Type and Stress Level.

The hypothesis is tested by using Pearson Correlation Coefficient, Chi-square Test.

Following table shows the result of Pearson Correlation between Stress Level and Employees Working more than 8 hrs per day.

The hypothesis is,

H_0 – Employees working more than 8 hours per day are under more stress.

H_1 - Employees working more than 8 hours per day does not undergo more stress.

Table 5.2.8.1**Stress Level and Employees Working Hours.**

Correlations

		Work more than 8 hrs per day	Stress Level
Work more than 8 hrs per day	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.119
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.211
	N	113	113
Stress Level	Pearson Correlation	-0.119	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.211	
	N	113	113

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Table 5.2.8.1 shows a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine whether there is relationship between employees stress level and employees who work more than 8 hours per day.

The result reveals negative relationship between employee stress level and employees who work more than 8 hours per day

$r(113) = -0.119, p = 0.211; p > 0.01$

Hence H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected.

It is concluded that employees working more than 8 hours per day are under more stress.

Following table shows the result of Pearson Correlation between Stress Level and number of times employees work more than 8 hours in a week.

The hypothesis is,

H_0 - Number of times employees work more than 8 hours in a week are under more stress.

H_1 - Number of times employees work more than 8 hours in a week doesn't undergo more stress.

Table 5.2.8.2

Stress Level and number of times employees work more than 8 hours in a week.

Correlations			
		Number of times in a week	Stress Level
Number of times in a week	Pearson Correlation	1	.040
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.672
	N	113	113
Stress Level	Pearson Correlation	.040	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.672	
	N	113	113

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Table 5.2.8.2 shows a Pearson correlation analysis conducted to examine whether there is relationship between employees stress level and number of times employees work more than 8 hours in a week.

The result reveals positive relationship between employees stress level and number of times employees work more than 8 hours in a week.

$$r(113) = 0.04, p = 0.672; p > 0.01$$

Hence H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected.

It is concluded that number of times employees work more than 8 hours in a week are under more stress.

Following table shows the results of Pearson Correlation between Stress Level and Anger as Psychological Effect on employees.

The hypothesis is,

H₀- Workplace stress doesn't have effect of anger on employee.

H₁- Workplace stress has effect of anger on employee.

Table 5.2.8.3

Stress Level and Anger as Psychological Effect.

Correlations			
		Stress level	Anger
Stress level	Pearson Correlation	1	.204*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.030
	N	113	113
Anger	Pearson Correlation	.204*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.030	
	N	113	113
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Table 5.2.8.3 shows a Pearson correlation analysis conducted to examine whether there is relationship between employees stress level and anger as psychological effect.

The result reveals significant positive relationship between employees stress level and anger as psychological effect.

$$r(113) = 0.204, p = 0.03; p < 0.05$$

Hence H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted.

Hence, it is concluded that Workplace stress has effect of anger on employee.

Following table shows the results of Pearson Correlation between Stress Level and Unease as Psychological Effect on employees.

The hypothesis is,

H_0 - Workplace stress doesn't have effect of unease on employee.

H_1 - Workplace stress has effect of unease on employee.

Table 5.2.8.4
Stress Level and Unease as Psychological Effect.

Correlations			
		Stress Level	Unease
Stress Level	Pearson Correlation	1	.243**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.010
	N	113	113
Unease	Pearson Correlation	.243**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	
	N	113	113

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Table 5.2.8.4 shows a Pearson correlation analysis conducted to examine whether there is relationship between employees stress level and unease as psychological effect.

The result reveals a significant positive relationship between employees stress level and unease.

$$r(113) = 0.243, p = 0.010$$

Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Hence, it is concluded that Workplace stress has effect of unease on employee.

Following table shows the result of Pearson Correlation between Stress Level and Depression as Psychological Effect on employees.

The hypothesis is,

H_0 -Workplace stress doesn't have effect of depression on employee.

H_1 - Workplace stress has effect of depression on employee.

Table 5.2.8.5
Stress Level and Depression as Psychological Effect.

Correlations			
		Stress Level	Depression
Stress Level	Pearson Correlation	1	.105
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.269
	N	113	113
Depression	Pearson Correlation	.105	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.269	
	N	113	113

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Table 5.2.8.5 shows a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine whether there is relationship between employees stress level and depression as psychological effect.

The result reveals positive relationships between employees stress level and depression.

$r(113) = 0.105$, $p = 0.269$; $p > 0.01$

Hence H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected.

Hence, it is concluded that Workplace stress doesn't have effect of depression on employee.

Following table shows the result of Pearson Correlation between Stress Level and Nervousness as Psychological Effect on employees.

The hypothesis is,

H_0 - Workplace stress doesn't have effect of Nervousness on employee.

H_1 - Workplace stress has effect of Nervousness on employee.

Table 5.2.8.6
Stress Level and Nervousness as Psychological Effect.

Correlations			
		Stress Level	Nervousness
Stress Level	Pearson Correlation	1	.282**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.003
	N	113	113
Nervousness	Pearson Correlation	.282**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	
	N	113	113
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Table 5.2.8.6 shows a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine whether there is relationship between employees stress level and nervousness as psychological effect.

The result reveals significant positive relationship between employees stress level and nervousness.

$r(113) = 0.282, p = 0.003; p < 0.01$

Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Hence, it is concluded that Workplace stress has effect of Nervousness on employee.

Following table shows the result of Pearson Correlation between Stress Level and Tension as Psychological Effect on employees.

The hypothesis is,

H_0 - Workplace stress doesn't have effect of Tension on employee.

H_1 - Workplace stress has effect of Tension on employee.

Table 5.2.8.7
Stress Level and Tension as Psychological Effect.

Correlations			
		Stress Level	Tension
Stress Level	Pearson Correlation	1	.176
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.063
	N	113	113
Tension	Pearson Correlation	.176	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.063	
	N	113	113

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Table 5.2.8.7 shows a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine whether there is relationship between employees stress level and tension as psychological effect.

The result reveals positive relationships between employees stress level and tension.

$r(113) = 0.176, p = 0.063; p > 0.01$

Hence H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected.

Hence, it is concluded that Workplace stress doesn't have effect of Tension on employee.

Following table shows the result of Pearson Correlation between Stress Level and Low Confidence as Psychological Effect on employees.

The hypothesis is,

H_0 -Workplace stress doesn't have effect of Low Confidence on employee.

H_1 - Workplace stress has effect of Low Confidence on employee.

Table 5.2.8.8

Stress Level and Low Confidence as Psychological Effect.

Correlations			
		Stress Level	Low Confidence
Stress Level	Pearson Correlation	1	.287**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.002
	N	113	113
Low Confidence	Pearson Correlation	.287**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	
	N	113	113
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Table 5.2.8.8 shows a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine whether there is relationship between employees stress level and Low Confidence as psychological effect.

The result reveals significant positive relationship between employees stress level and Low Confidence.

$r(113) = 0.287, p = 0.002; p < 0.01$

Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted

Hence, it is concluded that Workplace stress has effect of Low Confidence on employee.

Following table shows the result of Pearson Correlation between Stress Level and Fear as Psychological Effect on employees.

The hypothesis is,

H_0 - Workplace stress doesn't have effect of Fear on employee.

H_1 - Workplace stress has effect of Fear on employee.

Table 5.2.8.9
Stress Level and Fear as Psychological Effect.

Correlations			
		Stress Level	Fear
Stress Level	Pearson Correlation	1	.172
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.069
	N	113	113
Fear	Pearson Correlation	.172	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.069	
	N	113	113

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Table 5.2.8.9 shows a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine whether there is relationship between employees stress level and fear as psychological effect.

The result reveals positive relationships between employees stress level and fear.

$$r(113) = 0.172, p = 0.069; p > 0.01$$

Hence H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected.

Hence, it is concluded that Workplace stress doesn't have effect of Fear on employee.

Following table shows the result of Pearson Correlation between Stress Level and Boredom as Psychological Effect on employees.

The hypothesis is,

H_0 - Workplace stress doesn't have effect of Boredom on employee.

H_1 - Workplace stress has effect of Boredom on employee.

Table 5.2.8.10
Stress Level and Boredom as Psychological Effect.

Correlations			
		Stress Level	Boredom
Stress Level	Pearson Correlation	1	.124
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.190
	N	113	113
Boredom	Pearson Correlation	.124	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.190	
	N	113	113

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Table 5.2.8.10 shows a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine whether there is relationship between employees stress level and boredom as psychological effect.

The result reveals positive relationship between employee stress level and boredom.

$r(113) = 0.124$, $p = 0.190$; $p > 0.01$

Hence H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected.

Hence, it is concluded that Workplace stress doesn't have effect of Boredom on employee.

Following table shows the result of Pearson Correlation between Stress Level and Wrong Decision Making as Psychological Effect on employees.

The hypothesis is,

H_0 - Workplace stress doesn't have effect of Wrong Decision Making on employee.

H_1 - Workplace stress has effect of Wrong Decision Making on employee.

Table 5.2.8.11

Stress Level and Wrong Decision Making as Psychological Effect.

Correlations			
		Stress Level	Wrong Decision Making
Stress Level	Pearson Correlation	1	.229*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.015
	N	113	113
Wrong Decision Making	Pearson Correlation	.229*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.015	
	N	113	113

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Table 5.2.8.11 shows a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine whether there is relationship between employees stress level and wrong decision making as psychological effect.

The result reveals significant positive relationship between employees stress level and wrong decision making.

$r(113) = 0.229, p = 0.015; p < 0.05$

Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Hence, it is concluded that Workplace stress has effect of Wrong Decision Making on employee.

Following table shows the result of Pearson Correlation between Stress Level and Inability to concentrate as Psychological Effect on employees.

The hypothesis is,

H_0 – Workplace stress doesn't have effect of Inability to concentrate on employee.

H_1 - Workplace stress has effect of Inability to concentrate on employee.

Table 5.2.8.12

Stress Level and Inability to Concentrate as Psychological Effect.

Correlations			
		Stress Level	Inability to concentrate
Stress Level	Pearson Correlation	1	.290**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.002
	N	113	113
Inability to concentrate	Pearson Correlation	.290**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	
	N	113	113
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Table 5.2.8.12 shows a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine whether there is relationship between employees stress level and Inability to concentrate as psychological effect.

The result reveals significant positive relationship between employees stress level and Inability to concentrate.

$r(113) = 0.290, p = 0.002; p < 0.01$

Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted.

Hence, it is concluded that Workplace stress has effect of Inability to concentrate on employee.

Following table shows the result of Chi-square test between Stress Level and Personality type of sample respondents.

Stress Level and Personality Type.

The hypothesis is set on the basis of Personality is,

H₀- Employees with similar personality type don't face similar level of workplace stress.

H₁- Employees with similar personality type face similar level of workplace stress.

Following table frequency tabulation of respondents according to Personality Type

Table 5.2.8.13

Stress Level and Personality Type.

Personality Type	Stress Level			Total
	Low	Medium	High	
A	1	57	15	73
B	2	30	8	40
Total	3	87	23	113

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Chi-square Calculation

Table 5.2.8.14

Calculated Value of χ^2	Table Value of χ^2	Degree of Freedom	Level of Significance
1.3183	5.991	2	5%

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Table 5.2.8.14 shows that Calculated value of χ^2 is less than Table Value of χ^2 .

Hence H₀ is accepted and H₁ is rejected.

Hence, it is concluded that employees with similar personality type don't face similar level of workplace stress.