

Change in Organizational Role Stress is Panacea of HRM Practices: A Comparative Study of Higher Education Institutions

Afroze Nazneen (Corresponding author)

Asst. Professor, College of Business

University of Jeddah, Jeddah, KSA

E-mail: anazneen@uj.edu.sa

Inass Salamah Ali

Asst. Professor, College of Business

Dar-Al-Hekmah University, Jeddah, KSA

Received: May 31, 2019

Accepted: June 27, 2019

Published: August 4, 2019

doi:10.5296/ijافر.v9i3.15209

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijافر.v9i3.15209>

Abstract

The present study conducted on faculty members of self-financing higher education institutions and government managed higher education institutions. It was aimed to ascertain the levels of organizational role stress and HRM practices, determine the relationships between role stress and HRM practices. Further it aimed at to compare the perception of self-financing institution and government higher education institutions employees on organizational role stress and HRM practices. Sample of present research based on convenient random sampling technique adopted to select 229 respondents from different self-financing institutions and government higher education institutions. Organizational role stress scale and HRM practices scales used to collect the data. The data analyzed by means of descriptive statistics and t- test to compare the groups. The results revealed that role overload appeared the most dominant stressor followed by role ambiguity, role erosion and inter role distance among faculties of self-financing institutions whereas inter role distance and role isolation emerged as the dominant stressors for faculties of government higher education institutions. The faculties of self-financing institutions are reasonably satisfied with team

work and performance appraisal systems of HRM practices whereas faculties of government higher education institutions are more satisfied with compensation and participation in decision making dimensions of HRM practices. The results revealed inverse relationships between organizational role stress and HRM practices in all types of institutions. Further results observed that two groups of faculties differed significantly on role stagnation, role erosion, role overload, self-role distance, role ambiguity and resource inadequacy. On the other hand two groups differ significantly on all dimensions of HRM practices. Further results discussed in detail with suitable example.

Keywords: Role stress, Organizational role stress, Training and development, Compensation management, Role erosion, Role overload

1. Introduction

Although we all talk about stress, it often isn't clear what stress is really about. Many people consider stress to be something that happens to them, an event such as an injury or a job loss. Others think that stress is what happens to our body, mind, and behavior in response to an event. While stress does involve events and our response to them, these are not the most important factors. Our thoughts about the situations in which we find ourselves are the critical factor. When something happens to us, we automatically evaluate the situation mentally. Everyone sees situations differently and has different coping skills. For this reason, no two people will respond exactly the same way to a given situation. Additionally, not all situations that are labeled "stressful" are negative

"Stress is a threat to the quality of life and to physical and psychological well-being". A lot has been scripted about stress from different perspectives, but there still remains great deal of confusion in understanding the original nature of stress in various settings. The concept of stress is inadequately defined. There is no sole fixed definition in being. It is actually just an idea which is very general to both the experts and layman. It, however, is understood by most of the people in common situations, but when it comes to accuracy, very few people are able to explain it rightly. The very idea of stress was introduced in 1936 by Hans Selye, who actually borrowed it via natural sciences. "During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, stress was equated with force, pressure or strain exerted upon a material object or person which resists these forces and attempts to maintain its original state". Hans' 'General Adaptation Syndrome' provoked quite a lot of research on this topic, primarily focusing stress and disease, i.e., noxiousness to tissues systems and adaptation response to tissues systems.

The conflicts which arise as a result of incompatibility amongst these expectations by the 'significant' others (and by the individual himself) are called role set conflicts (Pareek, 1983). These conflicts take the following forms:

1. Self-Role Distance (SRD)
2. Inter-Role Distance (IRD)
3. Role Stagnation (RS)

4. Role Isolation (RI)
5. Role Ambiguity (RA)
6. Role Expectation Conflict (REC)
7. Role Overloads (RO)
8. Role Erosion (RE)
9. Resource Inadequacy (RIN)
10. Personal Inadequacy (PI)

Human resource management (HRM) has been considered as one of the most interesting subject among the researcher from last several years especially in the education industry. Human Resources Management is the core area of concern for every organization whether concerned with public affairs or private. Human resource now a day considered as Human capital, the most valuable resource in the organization, but their value and effectiveness is possible only with their efficient management, otherwise the vast potential and energy present in them is wasted. Foremost objective is to manage human resource in the organization. Other resources, like financial & material howsoever, may able to give desired results if there is proper application of the HRM approaches in the organization. Many authors and researchers defined HRM as a process of managing people in work organizations and to achieve sustainable competitive advantage, these practices need to be integrated with the business policy.

In early phase of industrialization, HRM functions has ignored by the organizations. These practices were not considered as an important factor for organizational success. Emerging competition, globalization and fast growing industrialization provide an importance to the human resource management and soon human resource management (HRM) replaced the term personnel management, defined as a process of managing human resource in organizations. Armstrong (1987) summarized personnel managers and researcher's view on HRM as, putting old wine in new bottles. Fundamental ideologies behind HRM and personnel management were same. It could in fact be more or less another name for personnel management, the thing that makes a difference was treating human resource as other key resource. The management of human resource has considered as part of the strategic planning processes of the organization. Although there is nothing new in the idea, insufficient attention has been paid to it in many organizations.

Effective human resource management is critical factor to achieve organizational goals in which human resource managers help organization to meet objectives both effectively and efficiently (Bratton et al, 1999). To modify and influence employees' behavior within organizations human resource management plays a very significant role. A highly satisfy and committed employees with the positive attitude achieve the organizational goal more effectively (Armstrong, 2006).

The importance of Human Resource Management (HRM) emerged with the highly competitive environment. It is viewed as a change or development that personnel management need to respond with the fundamental environmental changes (Personnel Today, 1991). Human resource management (HRM) is concerned with all aspects of managing human resource in organizations. It start with human resource planning, recruitment of the employee, selection, Training and development of the employees, performance and potential appraisal, career development, compensation management, corporate social responsibility, knowledge management, employee relations, employee health and safety and HRM accounting and auditing.

The concept of Human Resource Management was explained by Bakke in the year 1966. He defined HRM as “a general function of management and a process of organizing and implementing the policies for managing resources effectively”. The under-standing of human resource, employee retentions, employee development, effective and skilled employment, and optimal use of the man power were major human resources functions.

Likert (1967) conceptualized human resources as the most valuable resources, but their value and effectiveness is possible only with their efficient management, otherwise the vast potential and energy present in them is wasted. The other resources the financial and material howsoever, may be abundant, hid results only with proper application of the important approach of HRM. Likert was right in opinion that effectiveness of firm is determined by the competence level, motivation and general effectiveness of human resource employed in the organization. Well manage and executed human resource leads to effectiveness of the organization. Managing human resources regarded as central and most important task, because all other resources are depends upon how well it is managed. Byers and Rue (1984), defined HRM as an activity to encompass all those activities that are intended to endow with and co-ordinate the all employee of an organization.

Schuler and Jackson (1987) viewed human resource management as a system in which organization and employee’s survival is based on the effective implementation of the policies associated with acquisition, development, motivating, and retention of employees. Organization goal can be achieved more effectively with the effective implementation of the policies. Guest, (1987) defined HRM with three main approaches. HRM as a new name of personnel management, organizations are need not do such fundamental changes to the department, rephrasing and reorganizing personnel roles and the functions of personnel department, and integrating human resource with strategic management and the emphasis on proper and positive utilization of human resources. Thus HRM defined as: “A set of policies and procedures designed to maximize organizational integration, employee commitment, flexibility and quality of work.”

2. Review of Literature

Pignata et al. (2018) conducted a study to enhance the understanding of psychosocial factors and extend research on work stress interventions. Researchers investigated about the key human resource stress interventions implemented at five Australian universities over a three-year period. They also explored the types of individual, organization, and

individual/organization-directed interventions that were implemented, and the strategies that were prioritized at five different universities. Across universities, the dominant interventions were strategies that aimed to balance the social exchange in the work contract between employee-organization with an emphasis on initiatives to: enhance training, career development and promotional opportunities; improve remuneration and recognition practices; and to enhance the fairness of organizational policies and procedures. Strategies to improve work-life balance were also prominent. The findings contribute to the improved management of people at work by identifying university-specific HR initiatives, specifically leadership development and management skills programs which were identified as priorities at three universities.

Hargrove, B. (2016) found that workplace stress is still unstated in terms of its impact on employees working at various levels. Workers experience stressful circumstances everywhere in the organization which includes working conditions, work expectations, and interpersonal interactions. Employees confronted with the stress both psychologically and physically. Study was focuses to review three distinct concepts that influence stress at work: stressors, stress response, and stress-related outcomes. Balaji (2014) found that managers are responsible for not overworking or stressing out their employees. Human resources departments are responsible for making stress management resources available and raising organizational awareness of them. Employees who are stress-free are more productive, have a better view of the organization, and are more likely to stay with the organization, resulted in form of fewer accidents, lower healthcare costs, and higher morale.

Corin & Bjork (2016) concluded in their study that stress at work arises from issues such as too much work, conflicting goals, vague task goals, emotional demands, lack of autonomy, and absence of supervisory support. They examined a wide-ranging approach by studying a multitude of job demands and job resources relevant for human service managers, thereby giving a comprehensive picture of their work assignment. The results revealed that the job demands are high, while the job resources that are supposed to balance these demands according to the JD-R framework are largely lacking, especially within the care settings. The results support a demand for redesigning public sector managerial work, rather than the managers' individual's behavior and mindset, in order to remove several of the hindrances present in their work and thus enhance performance and promote sustainable jobs.

Viotti and Converso (2016) found that the social climate in the organization, defined as organizational support and support from their superiors, were the strongest predictors of reduced work stress among employees. Topic, Baum, and Kabst (2016) noted that even high-performance work practices such as performance evaluation systems and continuing education programs in organizations are associated with higher stress among some employees because they are seen as energy depleting, job-related demands. There was a positive relationship between challenge demands and individual stress among employees.

Teichmann & Dondon (2011) divided the sources of stress into the three main levels, namely the individual level, organization and work level, and the last level identified as framework of stressors in university. In the occupational stress profile of Bordeaux University's faculties of

science and engineering the major sources of stress are workload and bureaucracy. Nearly half of academics find that professional development issues are a source of stress for them. Over 40% of academics report such sources of stress as university life (mainly management) and relationships. The profile of sources of stress in Bordeaux University's faculties of science and engineering hint that the number of sources of occupational stress in university could eliminate or minimize their stressful influence on academics.

Ali (2009) conducted a study on organizational role stress among civil police and reserve police force to ascertain the degree of stress. It was found that Role Expectation Conflict appeared highest rank within the stressors followed by Inter Role Distance, Role Stagnation, Resource Inadequacy, Role Overload whereas Role Erosion showed lowest rank. The two groups differed significantly on IRD, RE, RI, SRD and RIN dimensions of Organizational Role Stress.

Teo and Waters (2002) conducted a study to examine the occupational stress-strain relationship. Results of the study indicated that human resource (HR) practices did not reduce the sources of stress (role overload and responsibility) within the workplace. In particular, family-friendly practices, job training, and SMIs reduced interpersonal strain. An examination of vocational strain showed that it was negatively associated with SMIs and job training. It was concluded that HR practices may be effective as part of a symptom-directed approach to stress intervention.

Adriaenssens et al. (2006) conducted a study to investigate, the well-being of academic staff at the University of Antwerp and the interaction between HR practices and employee well-being. It was investigated that employee satisfaction and stress are a function of the subjective perception of the work environment which, in turn, is affected by the HR practices that are in place in organizations. Workload and time pressures, uncertainty, lack of feedback and social support were identified as the major element to cause job stress. It was also concluded that the HR-related job characteristics cause job dissatisfaction.

Abouserie, R. (1996) conducted a study on university academic staff, consisting of 305 males and 109 females to identify sources of stress and consequent stress levels. The results indicated that academic staff rate work as the most significant cause of stress in their lives (74%) and conducting research (40.3%) was the main cause of stress at work. Results showed also that 74.1% and 10.4% of the academic staff fall into the moderate and serious stress categories respectively, and that there were no significant differences between males and females in stress levels. There were significant differences between the four academic rank groups in stress levels, with lecturers as the most stressed group.

3. Objectives

1. To study the level of organizational role stress and HRM practices among faculty members.
2. To evaluate the relationship among organizational role stress and HRM practices.

3. To compare the organizational role stress and HRM practices of self-financing institutions and government institutions.

4. Methodology

4.1 Sample

The study was conducted on 246 faculty members of Engineering, Management and Information technology institutions of self-financed and government higher educational institutions. After scrutiny of the filled data 17 were rejected because of various reasons like incomplete information, wrong entries etc. The remaining 229 cases were selected for final inclusion in this study. Further 119 respondents selected from self-financing institutions and 110 respondents selected from government institutions with an average age of 43.74 years and experience 13.42 years. Out of total selected respondents 157 male and 72 female were included in the sample.

4.2 Tools Used

4.2.1 Organizational Role Stress

Scale developed by Pareek, (1983) was used, consists of 50 items and measure 10 types of role stressors. Each dimension of ORS is measured by five questions. Each question rated on a 5- point Likert scale with a weighted score of 0-4. Each stressor consists of 5 items and range of score varies from 0-20. The total ORS score ranged from 0-200. The reliability and validity is well within acceptable norms.

4.2.2 HRM Practices Scale of Qureshi and Ramay (2006)

HRM Practices Scale of Qureshi and Ramay (2006) was used, comprised of 25 statements on training, team work, performance appraisal, compensation, and employee participation.

4.3 Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed by means of descriptive statistics a Mean, sd. and correlations and t-test used to compare the means of two groups.

4.4 Procedure

Faculty members from Management, Engineering and Information Technology departments of affiliated colleges of self-financed and government higher educational institutions, located in the various cities of Punjab were selected on random basis as a sample keeping in mind the availability of the data, cost and distance for the data collection. Only faculty members with more than two years of experiences were taken in to consideration. The data were collected using survey method. Each of the respondents was personally contacted in group by the investigator and the data were collected through questionnaire. They were asked to fill the questionnaire after going through carefully the given instructions on each scale separately. They were also assured of confidentiality of their responses.

5. Results & Discussion

Table 1. Showing mean and Sd. of organizational role stress and dimensions HRM practices of faculty members of self-financing higher educational institutions (N =119)

VARIABLES STUDIED	Self-financing Higher Educational Institutions	
	MEAN	SD
Inter Role Distance	8.27	3.53
Role Stagnation	7.83	4.14
Role Expectation Conflict	7.35	4.23
Role Erosion	8.97	3.67
Role Overload	10.61	3.19
Role Isolation	7.89	3.98
Personal Inadequacy	6.97	4.29
Social Role Distance	7.19	3.71
Role Ambiguity	10.04	3.33
Resource Inadequacy	9.73	3.25
Total Organizational Role Stress	75.31	38.5
Training	12.84	2.62
Performance Appraisal	14.85	3.01
Team Work	16.15	3.34
Employee Participation	12.27	3.67
Compensation	13.72	3.48
Total HRM	77.43	17.51

Source: Compiled from primary data

The results presented in Table 1 shows that faculty members of self-financed institutions are experiencing moderately high level on organizational role stress. It was found from the above results that role overload emerged as the dominant stressor with mean score (Mean = 10.61)

followed by Role Ambiguity (Mean = 10.04), Resource inadequacy (Mean = 9.73) and Role Erosion (Mean = 8.97) t. They experienced least stress on Personal Inadequacy (Mean = 6.97) preceded by Self role distance (7.19) and Role Expectation Conflict (Mean = 7.35). In the case of HRM practices results shown that the faculty members working in self-financing institutions were less satisfied with the compensations and performance appraisal system with mean scores 2.93 and 2.97 respectively. It was also reported that the faculty member's responded towards training and team work was perceived moderately satisfied and it was also found that faculty members have a strong assumption that the job which they are performing is not challenging and highly routine which leads to demotivation. The results are supported by the findings of Nazneen and Singh (2012), Bhalla and Zafar (2014). Overall HRM practices in self-financing institution are not satisfactory and need immediate intervention.

Table 2. Showing mean and Sd. of organizational role stress and dimensions of HRM practices of faculty members of government higher educational institutions (N =110)

VARIABLES STUDIED	Government Higher Educational Institutions	
	MEAN	SD
Inter Role Distance	8.69	3.13
Role Stagnation	6.37	3.91
Role Expectation Conflict	6.91	3.84
Role Erosion	7.95	3.17
Role Overload	7.17	3.29
Role Isolation	8.39	3.71
Personal Inadequacy	7.13	3.97
Self Role Distance	6.41	3.28
Role Ambiguity	7.13	4.43
Resource Inadequacy	6.96	3.17
Total Organizational Role Stress	72.13	36.43
Training	15.97	3.63

Performance Appraisal	10.59	2.31
Team Work	13.76	2.69
Employee Participation	16.23	3.17
Compensation	17.51	3.91
Total HRM	81.47	13.81

Table 2 exhibits the mean and sd. on role stressors and dimensions of HR practices among faculty members of government higher educational institutions. Based on results obtained it was found that inter role distance appeared to be dominant stressor with mean score 8.69 and sd. 3.13 followed by role isolation and role overload with mean score 8.39 and 7.17 respectively and showing a moderate level of organizational role stress. The least dominant stressors among government employees appeared Role stagnation (Mean = 6.37) preceded by Self Role Distance (Mean = 6.41) and Resource Inadequacy (Mean = 6.96). It was observed that the faculty members working in Government Institutions were less satisfied with employees' performance appraisal. Faculty members of government education institutions responded with above the average satisfaction level towards the compensation with mean score 17.51 followed by employee participation in decision making process and training and development. This indicated that government institutions are following the guidelines of regulatory bodies with respect to the compensation, employee's participation, training and development. They appear to be least satisfied with performance appraisal system and its very common because most of the government organization has very political and biased approach in performance appraisal and feature like gender, caste, religion etc. influence badly. Overall HRM practices in government institutions found to be satisfactory.

Table 3. Showing correlations between of organizational role stress and dimensions of HRM practices among faculty members of self-financing higher educational institutions

VARIABLES	TR	PA	TW	EP	COMP	THRM
Inter Role Distance	-0.04	0.018	-0.31*	-0.14	-.131**	-.297**
Role Stagnation	0.018	-0.09	-0.36*	-0.21	-0.049	-.202*
Role Expectation Conflict	-0.16	-0.07	-0.29**	-0.25**	0.004	-.287**
Role Erosion	-0.11	-0.011	-0.29**	-0.2	.127**	-.256**
Role Overload	-0.06	-0.14	-0.15	-0.04	0.001	-0.085

Role Isolation	-0.03	-0.1	-0.27**	-0.19	-.138**	-0.093
Personal Inadequacy	-0.13	-0.04	-0.36*	-0.26**	.192**	-.428*
Self Role Distance	-0.05	0.06	-0.21*	-0.1	-0.057	-.399*
Role Ambiguity	-0.05	-0.05	-0.18	-0.14	-.222*	-.332*
Resource Inadequacy	-0.08	-0.07	-0.12	-0.13	-.265**	-.263**
Total Organizational Role Stress	-0.07	-0.05	-0.33*	-0.21**	-0.052	-.349**

** : Significant at .01 levels

* : Significant at .05 levels

Table 3 is showing correlation between all dimension of Organizational Role Stress and HRM practices. The results found that dimensions of organizational role stress and dimensions of HRM practices were negative correlated among the faculty members of self-financing higher educational institutions. It means that HRM practices created a negative impact on the stress level of the faculty members. While comparing the each dimension one by one it was observed that performance appraisal has a positive correlation with Inter-Role Distance (IRD) and Self-Role Distance (SRD). Compensation has also created a positive impact on Role Expectation Conflict (REC), Role Erosion (RE), Role Overloads (RO) and Personal Inadequacy (PI). It was also observed that training and Role Stagnation (RS) has also a positive correlation. Results indicated that compensations can be the best practices to reduce the stress level of faculty members working in the self-financing educational institutions. Faculty members will be ready to take the challenges of the job if they are paid satisfactory.

Table 4. Showing correlation between organizational role stress and dimensions of HRM practices among faculty members of government higher educational institutions

VARIABLES	TR	PA	TW	EP	COMP	THRM
Inter Role Distance	-0.009	0.047	-.205**	-0.079	0.092	-.133*
Role Stagnation	0.017	-0.068	-.317**	-.172**	-0.099	-.355**
Role Expectation Conflict	-.187**	-0.058	-.244**	-.224**	-0.096	-.212**
Role Erosion	-0.086	0.041	-.263**	-.143**	-0.017	-.244**

Role Overload	0.071	0.058	-0.047	.035*	0.075	-0.018
Role Isolation	-0.051	-0.079	-.198**	-.151**	-0.068	-.240**
Personal Inadequacy	-.113*	0.034	-.311**	-.181**	-0.022	-.259**
Social Role Distance	-0.047	-.116*	-.162**	-0.045	.136**	-0.023
Role Ambiguity	-0.065	-0.038	-0.097	-0.057	.121**	0.023
Resource Inadequacy	-.141**	-0.011	-0.062	-0.097	0.061	0.06
Total Organizational Role Stress	-0.076	0.015	-.245**	-.142**	0.021	-.179**

** : Significant at .01 levels

* : Significant at .05 level

Table 4 shows the correlation metrics among faculty members of government higher educational institutions. Results have suggested negative correlation with organizational role stress and HRM practices except Role Ambiguity (RA) and Resource Inadequacy (RIN) which shown a positive correlation with the total HRM practices. Similar to self-financing educational institutions, faculty members of government educational institution have also reported a positive correlation between compensation and Inter-Role Distance (IRD), Role Overloads (RO), Self-Role Distance (SRD), Role Ambiguity (RA) and Resource Inadequacy (RIN). Training practices has also shown a positive impact on Role Stagnation (RS). There was a positive correlation observed between Performance appraisal and Inter-Role Distance (IRD), Role Erosion (RE), Role Overloads (RO) and Personal Inadequacy (PI). It supports the finding of Nazneen and Bhalla (2013).

Table 5. Compare the two groups of Faculty members of self-financing higher education institutions and government higher education institutions on organizational role stress and dimensions of HRM practices

VARIABLES	Self-financing Higher Educational Institutions (N=119)		Government Higher Educational Institutions (N=110)		t-Value
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	
Inter role Distance	8.27	3.53	8.69	3.13	0.12

Role Stagnation	7.83	4.14	6.37	3.91	2.18*
Role Expectation Conflict	7.35	4.23	6.91	3.84	0.83
Role Erosion	8.97	3.67	7.95	3.17	2.28*
Role Overload	10.61	3.19	7.17	3.29	8.34**
Role Isolation	7.89	3.98	8.39	3.71	1.00
Personal Inadequacy	6.97	4.29	7.13	3.97	0.29
Self-Role Distance	7.19	3.71	6.41	3.28	1.74*
Role Ambiguity	10.04	3.33	7.13	4.43	5.71**
Resource Inadequacy	9.73	3.25	6.96	3.17	6.72**
Total ORS	75.31	38.5	72.13	36.43	0.64
Training & Development	12.84	2.62	15.97	3.63	7.82**
Performance Appraisal	14.85	3.01	10.59	2.31	12,87**
Team Work	16.15	3.34	13.76	2.69	6.17**
Employee Participation	12.27	3.67	16.23	3.17	8.85**
Compensation	13.72	3.48	17.51	3.91	7.91**
Total HRM	77.43	17.51	81.47	13.81	1.94*

** : Significant at .01 levels

* : Significant at .05 levels

Table 5 exhibits results based on comparison of means on role stress and HRM practices among the faculty members of self-financing institutions and government higher education intuitions. The mean and sd. on role stagnation among self-financing teachers are found 7.83 and 4.14 whereas mean and sd. among government faculty are found 6.37 and sd. 3.91 with t-value 2.81 which is significant at .05 levels. It might be attributed that faculties do not have the opportunity for upward mobility. Role erosion is another factor on that significant difference observed. They are experiencing stress on this count because the assigned role

performed by someone else who has not assigned that role. But this condition is not obvious in the case of government higher education institutions. Role overload is one of the important stressors for self-financing institutions. The mean and sd. on role overload among self-financing faculties found 10.61 and 3.19 whereas mean and sd. among government higher education faculties observed 7.17 and 3.29. When two groups were compared t- value found 8.34 which are significant at .01 levels. The result might be interpreted that faculties of self-financing institutions bearing more work load as compared to their counterpart and they performed different non-teaching work example, conducting counseling session during admission, preparing attendance, preparing official files etc. hence they are experiencing more role overload as compared to faculty members of government higher education institutions. Along with teaching job that faculty of self-financed and government higher educational institutions have shown moderate level of organizational role stress.

Two groups of employees compared on the dimensions of HRM practices and overall HRM practices. The mean and sd. on training and development found 12.84, 2.62 and 15.97, 3.63 for self-financing institutions and government institutions employees respectively. The observed $t = 7.82$ significant at .01. The result indicated that government employees are significantly more satisfied with training and development policy of government managed institutions. The results revealed the fact that employees of self-financing institutions are significantly more satisfied with performance appraisal system and team work as compared to government owned institutions. Whereas employees participation in decision making and compensation system are significantly better enjoyed by government managed institutions as compared to self-financing institutions. Overall HRM practices are prevailing significantly more in government owned institutions than self-financing institutions.

6. Conclusion & Suggestions

In the present era every employee experiencing stress and assessing the role of HRM practices in day to day working life. They are working in such an environment where everyone experiencing different types of stress and try to manage it and get the benefit of HRM practices to perform their assigned roles in the organization. The results revealed that role overload appeared the most dominant stressor followed by role ambiguity, role erosion and inter role distance among faculties of self-financing institutions whereas inter role distance and role isolation emerged as the dominant stressors for faculties of government higher education institutions. The faculties of self-financing institutions are reasonably satisfied with team work and performance appraisal systems of HRM practices whereas faculties of government higher education institutions are more satisfied with compensation and participation in decision making dimensions of HRM practices. The results revealed inverse relationships between organizational role stress and HRM practices in all types of institutions it means if the satisfaction level on all HRM practices will increase there is a possibility that organizational role stressors will go down. Further results observed that two groups of faculties differed significantly on role stagnation, role erosion, role overload, self-role distance, role ambiguity and resource inadequacy. On the other hand two groups differ significantly on all dimensions of HRM practices. It is concluded that to reduce the stress level among the faculty members of self-financed and government higher educational

institutions, institutions should focus on the compensation structure, effective training modules and transparent performance appraisal techniques and also must come up with some stress management programmes like Stress Audit and identify the prevailing stressors and plan an OD interventions to remove or minimize the stressors. Self-finance institutions must also ensure that they are paying to their employee as per the government rules and regulation but it was observed that most of the self-financed institutions are not paying as per the fixed norms hence exploiting the faculty members which leads to demotivation and increased stress level. It is the responsibility of the Regulatory authority to ensure the compliance as per the norms in self-financed institutions to avoid such harassment and exploitation of faculty members.

References

- Abouserie, R. (1996). Stress, coping strategies and job satisfaction in university academic staff. *Educational Psychology, 16*(1), 49-56.
- Adriaenssens, L., De Prins, P., & Vloeberghs, D. (2006). Work experience, work stress and HRM at the university. *Management Revue, 344-363*.
- Ali, N. (2009). Organizational Role Stress: A Comparative Study of Civil Police and Reserve Police Force. *Human Behaviour - Journal of Applied Psychology, 4*(1), 47-54.
- Armstrong, M. (1987). *Human resource management: a case of the emperor's new clothes*.
- Armstrong, M. (2006). *A handbook of human resource management practice*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Balaji, R. (2014, April). Role of Human Resource Manager in Managing Stress of Employees in Manufacturing Concerns. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology, 3*(4).
- Bhalla, P., & Zafar, S. (2014). A study of ORS and Organizational Commitment in Organized Retail Sector. *Research Journal of Economics and Business Studies, 24*(5), 503-521.
- Bratton, K. A., & Haynie, K. L. (1999). Agenda setting and legislative success in state legislatures: The effects of gender and race. *The Journal of Politics, 61*(3), 658-679.
- Byars, L. L., & Rue, L. W. (1984). *Human Resource and Personnel Management*. Homewood, IL.: Richard D. Irwin.
- Corin, L., & Björk, L. (2016). Job demands and job resources in human service managerial work an external assessment through work content analysis. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies, 6*(4), 3-28.
- Guest, D. E. (1987). Human resource management and industrial relations. *Journal of Management Studies, 24*(5), 503-521.
- Hargrove, B., Hargrove, D., & Becker, W. S. (2016). Managing stress: human resource management interventions in distress and eustress. *Journal of Human Resources Education, 25*(10), 2.

- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: its management and values*.
- Nazneen, A., & Bhalla, P. (2013). Comparative Study of Organizational Role Stress and Job Satisfaction among Male and Female Employees of Organized Retail Sector. *International Journal of Business Management & Research (IJBMR)*, 3(4), 19-28.
- Pareek, U. (1983). Organizational role stress scale. *ORS Scale Booklet, Answer Sheet and Manual*. Ahmedabad: Navin Publications.
- Pignata, S., Winefield, A., Boyd, C., & Provis, C. (2018). A qualitative study of hr/ohs stress interventions in Australian universities. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(1), 103.
- Schuler, R. S., & Jackson, S. E. (1987). Linking competitive strategies with human resource management practices. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 1(3), 207-219.
- Teichmann, M., & Dondon, P. (2011). Sources of stress in Bordeaux University academics. *Recent Researches in Educational Technology: 8th WSEAS International Conference on Engineering Education (EDUCATION'11)* (pp. 98-105).
- Teo, C., & Waters, L. (2002). The role of human resource practices in reducing occupational stress and strain. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 9(3), 207-226.
- Topcic, M., Baum, M., & Kabst, R. (2016). Are high-performance work practices related to individually perceived stress? A job demands-resources perspective. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(1), 45-66.
- Viotti, S., & Converso, D. (2016). *Relationship between job demands and psychological outcomes among nurses: does skill discretion matter?*

Copyright Disclaimer

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)