International Research Journal of Human Resources and Social Sciences
ISSN(O): (2349-4085) ISSN(P): (2394-4218)
Impact Factor- 5.414, Volume 5, Issue 02, February 2018
Website- www.aarf.asia, **Email** : editor@aarf.asia , editoraarf@gmail.com

STRESS AND PRODUCTIVITY LEVELS AMONG WOMEN EMPLOYEES IN INDIAN IT SECTOR

Bharathi T
Jain University, Bangalore. Karnataka, India

Dr. K S Gupta
KSG Center for Quality Minds, Bangalore. Karnataka, India

ABSTRACT

The aim of the present study is to identify the stress and productivity levels among IT women employees. The study also focuses on the influence of select demographic characteristics on productivity. The present study was carried out on 605 women employees working at all levels in select IT companies. The data is collected through structured questionnaire. Descriptive statistics was done to know the stress and productivity levels, ANOVA were performed to detect the variance demographics characteristics on Productivity. The study results show that the mean Job stress levels are 4.3166 and productivity levels are 2.9857, the one sample t test indicate High stress and high Productivity. It also shows that there are significant differences in the demographic characteristics and Productivity factors except for few factors. .

Key Words: Job Stress, Productivity, Demographic Characteristics, Descriptive Statistics, t-Test, One-Way ANOVA, Indian IT Sector

Introduction

Stress is defined as "a state of psychological and physiological imbalance resulting from the disparity between situational demand and the individual's ability and motivation to meet those needs". It can be have positive or negative effect as described by Seyle, H (1974). Stress may be caused due to physical, psychological, or behavioral deviation in the person. The factors causing Stress is called Stressor. The various stressors can be said as Environmental, Organizational, and Individual etc. Job Stress is defined as the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirements of the job do not match with individual's capabilities, resources or needs. Usman Basheer (2010) has identified the causes of Job Stress as Overload, Role ambiguity, Role Conflict, Responsibility for people, Participation, Lack of feedback, keeping with rapid technological changes. Some workplace stress is normal, excessive stress can interfere with employee productivity and can affect the physical, mental and emotional health. High Stress levels lead to less productivity. It also leads to high absenteeism levels, less organization commitment, less job involvement, job satisfaction, and less engagement.

The IT industry has witnessed stress among the employees for quite a long time. With growth in employment of women employees in IT sector, the expectations related to Job has also increased. Men and women face same work pressures but the multi role played by women employees leads to Job Stress. Bhattacharyya, Asmita (2012) has conducted sociological analysis on women in Indian IT sector. The study analyses about the opportunities and constraints for women in IT sector. Productivity is said as a measure of the efficiency of a person, machine, factory, system etc., in converting inputs into useful outputs. Output can be goods or services and inputs include the labour, efforts, time and skills. Productivity is a critical determinant of cost efficiency. The business, which understands the importance of productivity in the workplace, is more successful. Productive employees are assets to organization, where maximize the utilization of human resources capacity happen. IT sector have the challenge to keep a watch on stress levels of its employees and in turn increase their productivity.

Literature Review

Henry Mwanaki (2007) in their studies identified the major factors that affect the Productivity of Craftsmen in Uganda. The highest ranked have the greatest influence in lines with Pareto rule. The highest ranked factors are incompetent supervisors, lack of skills, rework, lack of

tools/equipment and poor construction methods. 167 Contractors registered with Contractors Association, UNABCEC and engaged in formal building work are the samples for the study. Respondents were required to rate using their experience about the affect of 36 factors on Productivity with respect to time, cost and quality. The researchers opine that level of supervision and level of skills of craftsmen has to be improved. In addition, contractors should focus on improving these areas by giving refresher courses, rewarding based on skill and output, and participating in structured training on workers in the construction industry. Umesh, U (2016) has identified high levels of Job Stress among female employees. He conducted the study on 30 female employees working in middle level in Indian Bank (public) and ICICI (private) in Kerala. He opines that the IT revolution has influenced rapid changes in banking sector, which has resulted in high stress level among them. The factors like job design, physical environment, role ambiguity, interpersonal relationship, role overload, social support, authority and power were considered for the study. It is found that role overload, social support, authority and power influenced job stress more than other factors.

Amankwah, et. al (2015) conducted a study about Job satisfaction and productivity of construction professionals. The survey includes structured questionnaire, semi structured interviews and site visits and 115 samples by simple random sampling method. The study showed that years of experience and the background of the individual respondents had nothing to do with the level of stress being experienced. The highest ranked stressor is job demands, working conditions, participation and control, interpersonal relationship, career development and job security, role change and income. The effect of stress on construction professionals on job satisfaction are having difficulty in relaxing or getting to sleep naturally, having tension or migraine headache and feeling pressured and finding it difficult to concentrate during their work days. Ranking analysis is used for analysis. The factors that help to overcome stressful situations are better planning, more and better information, clearer responsibilities, increase in salary and bonuses, stress management programs, additional work force, more freedom and authority.

Naqvi, et al (2013) identifies and analyses the causes and effects of Job Stress on Employees Productivity. The employees working in Public health sector of Muzaffarabad and Poonch divisions of Azad Jammu and Kashmir was selected for the study. Their sample consisted of 210 employees. The structured questionnaire consisted of 38 items for Job stress and Productivity. Statistical Analysis like descriptive statistics, correlation and regression analysis was performed.

The mean score determine that management system is the major contributor to Job Stress. The other causes are lack of financial rewards, low control over the work environment, personal issues and inflexibility in work hours. The mean scores also show that employees productivity is decreased when they feel stress at job. The correlation indicates that job stress is negatively associated with the employees' productivity and an increase in Job Stress will decrease the employees' productivity.

Problem Statement

Stress has become a common term in Indian IT sector. Many studies have been conducted on Stress Management but the problem still persists. This study is conducted to know the Job Stress levels and Productivity levels. The Job Stress and Productivity levels can be high or low. By knowing this, further analysis can be done about its influence on employees. Also the study tries to know the select demographic characteristics influence on Productivity factors.

Scope of Study

The present study focuses on women employees working in Indian IT companies, the study tries to identify the levels of Stress and Productivity. It also tries to investigate the relation of select demographic characteristics on Productivity.

Research Objectives

The following are the objectives are the study

1. To analyze the Stress level and Productivity level among the women employees.
2. To investigate the select demographic characteristics influence on Productivity of women Employees.

Research Methodology

Women employees at all levels working in IT are considered as population for the study. The sampling plan is Convenience sampling method based on convenience, proximity and accessibility of the respondents. The study is Descriptive in nature. The type of universe is Infinite. Convenience sampling plan was used to pick the sample, which is a popular non-probability sampling technique. The sample size for the study was 605 women employees. The primary data is collected through structured questionnaire and secondary data is collected from journals, websites. The questionnaire was designed based on demographic characteristics, stress

factors and productivity factors. Demographic characteristics consists of 12 questions, stress factors consist of 13 variables with 74 items and Productivity factors consist of 7 variables with 34 items. Total 108 items were designed for the study. The researcher using SPSS conducted statistical Tests like descriptive Statistics for analysing objective 1 and ANOVA to investigate about objective 2.

Result and Discussion

Analyzing the Level of Job Stress and Productivity among Women IT Employees

Hypothesis - 1

H0 – The level of Job Stress and Productivity among the selected women employees in selected Indian IT Companies is significantly low.

H1 – The level of Job Stress and Productivity among the selected women employees in selected Indian IT Companies is significantly high.

For testing this hypothesis, the researcher used the one sample t-test with test value, as the mid value on a 5-point scale is 2.5.

Table No. 1 – Descriptive Statistics

Construct	Factors	N	Mean	SD
Job Stress Factors	Workload	605	4.2748	0.45447
	Role Ambiguity	605	4.315	0.28188
	Job Security	605	4.3041	0.31561
	Gender Discrimination	605	4.3104	0.27903
	Interpersonal Relationship	605	4.314	0.27513
	Change of Job	605	4.3215	0.34127
	Resource Constraints	605	4.3212	0.26079
	Role Fit	605	4.3227	0.30327
	Job Satisfaction	605	4.3292	0.26549
	Organizational Commitment	605	4.3315	0.24946
	Job Involvement	605	4.3185	0.24185
	Organizational Support	605	4.3141	0.19403
	Work Life Balance	605	4.324	0.25037
Productivity Factors	Timings	605	3.2211	0.35237
	Competence of Supervisors	605	3.0223	0.47963
	Compensation	605	3.0198	0.53404
	Systems and Procedure	605	3.2701	0.29361
	Group Dynamics	605	3.8988	0.22096
	Absenteeism	605	3.5871	0.24582
	Presentism	605	3.9273	0.21314
Mean	Employee Job Stress	605	4.3166	0.12884
	Employee Productivity	605	2.9857	0.21191

The above table shows the descriptive statistics of level job stress factors and productivity among the selected women IT employees in India. The mean score of the response indicates that the women IT employees in India are highly stressed across all the components of job stress. However, their productivity level is moderate at 2.99. The mean score of their response is more than the half way, 2.5 for all the components of stress and productivity. The overall job stress level mean score is 4.3166, which is more than 2.5, indicating that the women employees are stressed high at

Table 2 – The Results of One-Sample t-Test for Job Stress Level and Productivity Level

Construct	Factors	t-Value	Df	Sig. (1-tailed)
Job Stress Factors	Workload	96.055	604	0.0000
	Role Ambiguity	158.377	604	0.0000
	Job Security	140.603	604	0.0000
	Gender Discrimination	159.592	604	0.0000
	Interpersonal Relationship	162.179	604	0.0000
	Change of Job	131.282	604	0.0000
	Resource Constraints	171.772	604	0.0000
	Role Fit	147.835	604	0.0000
	Job Satisfaction	169.469	604	0.0000
	Organizational Commitment	180.587	604	0.0000
	Job Involvement	184.952	604	0.0000
	Organizational Support	229.966	604	0.0000
	Work Life Balance	179.188	604	0.0000
Productivity Factors	Timings	-19.47	604	0.0000
	Competence of Supervisors	-24.497	604	0.0000
	Compensation	-22.115	604	0.0000
	Systems and Procedure	-19.261	604	0.0000
	Group Dynamics	-66.919	604	0.0000
	Absenteeism	-91.342	604	0.0000
	Presentism	-66.092	604	0.0000
Mean	Employee Job Stress	346.802	604	0.0000
	Employee Productivity	-59.694	604	0.0000

The above tables show the results of one-sample t-test for analyzing the level of job stress and productivity among the selected IT women employees in India. The result shows that there exists the stress among the IT women employees and high level of productivity, as the t-statistic value is more than 1.96 for all the job stressors, for overall stress level and productivity level among the IT women employees. The significance values are less than 0.05 (5%) for all the factors indicating that significantly the IT women employees are stressed at high level and their

productivity is too high. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance for all the components mentioned in the above table.

Differences in Productivity across the Selected Demographic Characteristics

Hypothesis - 2

H0 - The different age groups of IT women employees do not differ significantly in their opinion on productivity.

H1 - The different age groups of IT women employees do differ significantly in their opinion on productivity.

Table No 3 - ANOVA Results for Differences in Age and Productivity

Productivity Dimensions	F-Value	p-Value	Null Hypothesis
Timings	3.493	0.015	Rejected
Competence of Supervisors	2.962	0.032	Rejected
Compensation	3.11	0.026	Rejected
Systems and Procedure	2.626	0.05	Rejected
Group Dynamics	2.904	0.034	Rejected
Absenteeism	4.055	0.007	Rejected
Presentism	3.438	0.017	Rejected

Age and Productivity factors: An analysis of the above table shows the F value at 3.493 for Timings, 2.962 for Competence of Supervisors, 3.11 for Compensation, 2.626 for Systems and Procedures, 2.904 for Group Dynamics, 4.055 for Absenteeism and 3.438 for Presentism. The P value is 0.015 for Timings, 0.032 for Competence of Supervisors, 0.026 for Compensation, 0.05 for Systems and Procedure, 0.034 for Group Dynamics, 0.007 for Absenteeism and 0.017 for Presentism. The significance value is less than 5% for all the Productivity factors. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis - 3

H0 - There are no significant differences in the opinions of selected IT employees' productivity across their income.

H1 - There is a significant difference in the opinions of selected IT employees' productivity across their income.

Table No 4 - ANOVA Results for Differences in Income and Productivity

Productivity Dimensions	F-Value	p-Value	Null Hypothesis
Timings	3.66	0.012	Rejected
Competence of Supervisors	3.103	0.026	Rejected
Compensation	3.258	0.021	Rejected
Systems and Procedure	2.751	0.042	Rejected
Group Dynamics	3.043	0.028	Rejected
Absenteeism	4.248	0.006	Rejected
Presentism	3.601	0.013	Rejected

Income and Productivity factors: An analysis of the above table shows the F value at 3.66 for Timings, 3.103 for Competence of Supervisors, 3.258 for Compensation, 2.751 for Systems and Procedures, 3.043 for Group Dynamics, 4.248 for Absenteeism and 3.601 for Presentism. The P value is 0.012 for Timings, 0.026 for Competence of Supervisors, 0.021 for Compensation, 0.042 for Systems and Procedure, 0.028 for Group Dynamics, 0.006 for Absenteeism and 0.013 for Presentism. The significance value is less than 5% for all the Productivity factors. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis - 4

H0 - There is no significant differences in the opinions of selected IT employees productivity across their Educational Qualification.

H1 - There is a significant difference in the opinions of selected IT employees productivity across their Educational Qualification.

Table No 5 - ANOVA Results for Differences in Educational Qualification and Productivity

Productivity Dimensions	F-Value	p-Value	Null Hypothesis
Timings	0.681	0.506	Not Rejected
Competence of Supervisors	5.432	0.005	Rejected
Compensation	5.703	0.004	Rejected
Systems and Procedure	0.959	0.384	Not Rejected
Group Dynamics	5.326	0.005	Rejected
Absenteeism	5.274	0.005	Rejected
Presentism	6.304	0.002	Rejected

Educational Qualification and Productivity factors: An analysis of the above table shows the F value at 0.681 for Timings, 5.432 for Competence of Supervisors, 5.703 for Compensation, 0.959 for Systems and Procedures, 5.326 for Group Dynamics, 5.274 for Absenteeism and 6.304 for Presentism. The P value is 0.506 for Timings, 0.005 for Competence of Supervisors, 0.004 for Compensation, 0.384 for Systems and Procedure, 0.005 for Group Dynamics, 0.005 for Absenteeism and 0.002 for Presentism. The significance value is less than 5% for the Productivity factors. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. However, for Educational Qualification with Timings, Systems and Procedures the hypothesis is not rejected which means it is not right fit.

Hypothesis - 5

H0 - There is no significant differences in the opinions of selected IT employees productivity across their Designations.

H1 - There is a significant difference in the opinions of selected IT employees productivity across their Designations.

Table No 6 - ANOVA Results for Differences in Designations

Productivity Dimensions	F-Value	p-Value	Null Hypothesis
Timings	6.357	0.0120	Rejected
Competence of Supervisors	11.332	0.0010	Rejected
Compensation	14.425	0.0000	Rejected
Systems and Procedure	2.426	0.1200	Not Rejected
Group Dynamics	13.472	0.0000	Rejected
Absenteeism	13.339	0.0000	Rejected
Presentism	15.946	0.0000	Rejected

Designation and Productivity factors: An analysis of the above table shows the F value at 6.357 for Timings, 11.332 for Competence of Supervisors, 14.425 for Compensation, 2.426 for Systems and Procedures, 13.472 for Group Dynamics, 13.339 for Absenteeism and 15.946 for Presentism. The P value is 0.012 for Timings, 0.001 for Competence of Supervisors, 0.000 for Compensation, 0.12 for Systems and Procedure, 0.000 for Group Dynamics, 0.000 for Absenteeism and 0.000 for Presentism. The significance value is less than 5% for the Productivity factors. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. But for Designation with Systems and Procedures the hypothesis is not rejected which means it is not right fit.

Hypothesis - 6

H0 - There is no significant differences in the opinions of selected IT employees productivity across their Experience.

H0 - There is a significant difference in the opinions of selected IT employees productivity across their Experience.

Table No 7 - ANOVA Results for Differences in Experience

Productivity Dimensions	F-Value	p-Value	Null Hypothesis
Timings	2.010	0.111	Not Rejected
Competence of Supervisors	3.584	0.014	Rejected
Compensation	4.562	0.004	Rejected
Systems and Procedure	0.767	0.513	Not Rejected
Group Dynamics	4.261	0.005	Rejected
Absenteeism	1.594	0.190	Not Rejected
Presentism	1.330	0.263	Not Rejected

Experience and Productivity Factors: An analysis of the above table shows the F value at 2.01 for Timings, 3.584 for Competence of Supervisors, 4.562 for Compensation, 0.767 for Systems and Procedures, 4.261 for Group Dynamics, 1.594 for Absenteeism and 1.330 for Presentism. The P value is 0.111 for Timings, 0.014 for Competence of Supervisors, 0.004 for Compensation, 0.513 for Systems and Procedure, 0.005 for Group Dynamics, 0.019 for Absenteeism and 0.263 for Presentism. The significance value is less than 5% for the Productivity factors. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. For Experience with Timings, Systems and Procedures, Absenteeism and Presentism, the hypothesis is not rejected which means it is not right fit.

Hypothesis 7

H0 - There is no significant differences in the opinions of selected IT employees productivity across their Marital Status.

H1 - There is a significant difference in the opinions of selected IT employees productivity across their Marital Status.

Table No 8 - ANOVA Results for Differences in Marital Status

Productivity Dimensions	F-Value	p-Value	Null Hypothesis
Timings	1.4620	0.2240	Not Rejected
Competence of Supervisors	2.6060	0.0510	Rejected
Compensation	3.3180	0.0200	Rejected
Systems and Procedure	0.5580	0.6430	Not Rejected
Group Dynamics	3.0990	0.0260	Rejected
Absenteeism	1.1590	0.3250	Not Rejected
Presentism	0.9680	0.4080	Not Rejected

Marital Status and Productivity factors: An analysis of the above table shows the F value at 1.462 for Timings, 2.606 for Competence of Supervisors, 3.318 for Compensation, 0.558 for Systems and Procedures, 3.099 for Group Dynamics, 1.159 for Absenteeism and 0.968 for Presentism. The P value is 0.224 for Timings, 0.051 for Competence of Supervisors, 0.020 for Compensation, 0.643 for Systems and Procedure, 0.026 for Group Dynamics, 0.325 for Absenteeism and 0.408 for Presentism. The significance value is less than 5% for the Productivity factors. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. However, for Marital Status with Timings, Systems and Procedures, Absenteeism and Presentism, the hypothesis is not rejected which means it is not right fit.

Hypothesis - 8

H0 - There is no significant differences in the opinions of selected IT employees productivity across their Place of Work.

H1 - There is a significant difference in the opinions of selected IT employees productivity across their Place of Work.

Table No 9 - ANOVA Results for Differences in Place of Work

Productivity Dimensions	F-Value	p-Value	Null Hypothesis
Timings	4.3870	0.0130	Rejected
Competence of Supervisors	2.8750	0.0570	Rejected
Compensation	4.2040	0.0150	Rejected
Systems and Procedure	0.7070	0.4930	Not Rejected
Group Dynamics	3.9270	0.0200	Rejected
Absenteeism	4.1620	0.0160	Rejected
Presentism	7.0590	0.0010	Rejected

Place of Work and Productivity factors: An analysis of the above table shows the F value at 4.387 for Timings, 2.875 for Competence of Supervisors, 4.204 for Compensation, 0.707 for Systems and Procedures, 3.927 for Group Dynamics, 4.162 for Absenteeism and 7.059 for Presentism. The P value is 0.013 for Timings, 0.057 for Competence of Supervisors, 0.015 for Compensation, 0.493 for Systems and Procedure, 0.020 for Group Dynamics, 0.016 for Absenteeism and 0.001 for Presentism. The significance value is less than 5% for the Productivity factors. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. However, for Place of Work with Systems and Procedures the hypothesis is not rejected which means it is not right fit.

Hypothesis - 9

H0 - The Number of Children do not make differences in the opinions of selected IT employees productivity.

H1 - The Number of Children do make difference in the opinions of selected IT employees productivity.

Table No 10 - ANOVA Results for Differences in Number of Children

Productivity Dimensions	F-Value	p-Value	Null Hypothesis
Timings	8.1050	0.0050	Rejected
Competence of Supervisors	2.2760	0.1320	Not Rejected
Compensation	7.7680	0.0050	Rejected
Systems and Procedure	1.3070	0.2530	Not Rejected
Group Dynamics	7.2550	0.0070	Rejected
Absenteeism	7.6910	0.0060	Rejected
Presentism	13.0430	0.0000	Rejected

Number of Children and Productivity factors: An analysis of the above table shows the F value at 8.105 for Timings, 2.276 for Competence of Supervisors, 7.768 for Compensation, 1.307 for Systems and Procedures, 7.255 for Group Dynamics, 7.691 for Absenteeism and 13.043 for Presentism. The P value is 0.005 for Timings, 0.132 for Competence of Supervisors, 0.005 for Compensation, 0.253 for Systems and Procedure, 0.007 for Group Dynamics, 0.006 for Absenteeism and 0.000 for Presentism. The significance value is less than 5% for the Productivity factors. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. But for Number of Children with Competence of Supervisors, Systems and Procedures the hypothesis is not rejected which means it is not right fit.

Hypothesis - 10

H0 - The Number of Dependents do not make differences in the opinions of selected IT employees productivity.

H1 - The Number of Dependents do make difference in the opinions of selected IT employees productivity.

Table No 11 - ANOVA Results for Differences in Number of dependents

Productivity Dimensions	F-Value	p-Value	Null Hypothesis
Timings	3.118	0.026	Rejected
Competence of Supervisors	0.875	0.453	Not Rejected
Compensation	2.988	0.031	Rejected
Systems and Procedure	0.503	0.681	Not Rejected
Group Dynamics	2.791	0.04	Rejected
Absenteeism	2.959	0.032	Rejected
Presentism	5.018	0.002	Rejected

Number of dependents and Productivity factors: An analysis of the above table shows the F value at 3.118 for Timings, 0.875 for Competence of Supervisors, 2.988 for Compensation, 0.503 for Systems and Procedures, 2.791 for Group Dynamics, 2.959 for Absenteeism and 5.018 for Presentism. The P value is 0.026 for Timings, 0.453 for Competence of Supervisors, 0.031 for Compensation, 0.681 for Systems and Procedure, 0.040 for Group Dynamics, 0.032 for Absenteeism and 0.002 for Presentism. The significance value is less than 5% for the Productivity factors. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. But for Number of Dependents with Competence of Supervisors, Systems and Procedures the hypothesis is not rejected which means it is not right fit.

Hypothesis - 11

H0 - The health problems faced by the IT employees do not make any differences in their opinions on productivity.

H1 - The health problems faced by the IT employees do make any difference in their opinions on productivity.

Table No 12 - ANOVA Results for Differences for Health Problems

Productivity Dimensions	F-Value	p-Value	Null Hypothesis
Timings	2.164	0.029	Rejected
Competence of Supervisors	0.529	0.835	Not Rejected
Compensation	1.806	0.073	Rejected
Systems and Procedure	0.304	0.965	Not Rejected
Group Dynamics	1.687	0.099	Rejected
Absenteeism	2.087	0.035	Rejected
Presentism	3.032	0.002	Rejected

Health Problems and Productivity Factors: An analysis of the above table shows the F value at 2.164 for Timings, 0.529 for Competence of Supervisors, 1.806 for Compensation, 0.304 for Systems and Procedures, 1.687 for Group Dynamics, 2.087 for Absenteeism and 3.032 for Presentism. The P value is 0.029 for Timings, 0.835 for Competence of Supervisors, 0.073 for Compensation, 0.965 for Systems and Procedure, 0.099 for Group Dynamics, 0.035 for Absenteeism and 0.002 for Presentism. The significance value is less than 5% for the Productivity factors. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. However, for Health Problems with Competence of Supervisors, Systems and Procedures the hypothesis is not rejected which means it is not right fit.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Job Stress has its impact on Productivity (Bharathi, T 2017b) and they are negatively correlated. Their study indicates that increase in Job Stress decreases the Productivity. The present study shows that the, descriptive statistics mean score for stress levels are higher i.e. 4.3166 and productivity level is moderate at 2.99. The results of one-sample t-test shows that there exists the high level of Job Stress as the t- Statistic value is more than 1.96 for all job stressors and the significance values are less than 0.05(5%) for all factors indicating productivity which means high level of productivity. As compared to earlier study conducted by Indhumathi and Thirumakkal (2015) the stress level is low at Pothys Boutique, where the study was conducted. Our study proves statistically that there exists high stress level and high productivity level among

IT women employees. In this way, we can say that the stress influences positively among the selected respondents when it is showing higher productivity

The ANOVA test value of demographic characteristics like Age, Income, Designation, Experience, Educational Qualification, Marital Status, Number of Children, Number of dependents and Health Problems are considered for the study along with Productivity factors like Timings, Systems and Procedures, Competence of Supervisors, Compensation, Group Dynamics, Absenteeism and Presentism. There are significant differences in the opinions of selected IT employees' productivity across their age groups and income, where null hypothesis is rejected. There are differences in the opinions of select IT women employees on Productivity across their Educational Qualifications except for timings, Systems and Procedure. There are differences in the opinions of select IT women employees on Productivity across their Designation and Place of Work except for Systems and Procedure. There are differences in the opinions of select IT women employees on Productivity across their Experience, Marital Status except for timings, Systems and Procedure, Absenteeism and Presentism. There are differences in the opinions of select IT women employees on Productivity across their No. of Children, No. of Dependents, and Health Problems except for Competence of Supervisors, Systems and Procedures.

Suggestion and Implications

The measures to reduce the level of stress and improve productivity have to be taken by the organization. Bharathi and Gupta, (2017b) in their studies suggests that promoting job enrichment can help to reduce stress. Redesigning jobs can lead to better productivity. Encourage employee participation where employees are involved in decision-making processes. This can lead to good communication and role ambiguity can be reduced. Warraich Usman (2014) suggests that organizations can help employees to reduce stress levels by redesigning jobs to lower the workload on employees. It is also suggested that the organizations should provide counseling for employees to learn stress management techniques to overcome stress related problems.

Conclusion

Job Stress is inevitable in IT companies because of the nature of the work. The various Job Stress factors influence Productivity as concluded by Bharathi, T, et. al (2017a). From the above study, the Mean job Stress is high and the mean productivity level is moderate, which implies

that higher the stress level moderate is the productivity. The regression model shows that increase in Job Stress lead to decrease in Productivity. The Study also highlights that select demographic characteristics has significance on Productivity factors. The organizations have to take up effective stress management programs to help the women employees to overcome job stress and improve productivity levels.

References:

1. Ali, W. U., Raheem, A. R., Nawaz, A., & Imamuddin, K. (2014). Impact of stress on job performance: An empirical study of the employees of Private Sector Universities of Karachi, Pakistan. *Research Journal of Management Sciences*, *3*(7), 14-17.
2. Alinaitwe, H.M., Mwakali, J.A. and Hansson, B. (2007). Factors affecting the productivity of building craftsmen: Studies of Uganda. *Journal of Civil Engineering and Management*, 13(3): 169–176.
3. Amankwah, Oti., Boakye-Agyemang, N.A., Martin, Lydia. (2015). The Effect of Stress on the Job Satisfaction and Productivity of Construction Professionals in the Ghanaian Construction Industry. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol 5, N0. 5. P- 42-49
4. Bashir, U., & Ramay, M. I. (2010). Impact Of Stress On Employees Job Performance A Study On Banking Sector Of Pakistan. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 2, May 2010, pp. 122-126. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2281979
5. Bharathi, T and Gupta KS (2017a). "Job Stress and Productivity: A Conceptual Framework". *International Journal of Emerging Research in Management & Technology*. Vol 6, Issue 8, August 2017, pp. 393-398
6. Bharathi, T and Gupta KS (2017b). A Study on Job Stress and its influence on the Productivity among Women Employees in IT Sector. *SAGAR International Journal of Management and Research*. Vol 11, Issue 2, Oct- Dec 2017. p 21-31
7. Bhattacharyya, A., & Ghosh, B. N. (2012). Women in Indian information technology (IT) sector: A sociological analysis. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *3*(6), 45-52.

8. Hans Selye, Stress without Distress, Philadelphia: Lippin Cott, 1974.
9. Indhumathi, G and Thirumakkal, M (2015). A Study on role of occupational stress on employees on employees productivity, *International Journal of Management* (IJM) Volume 6, Issue 1, January, pp. 560-572.
10. Naqvi, S. M. H., Khan, M. A., Kant, A. Q., & Khan, S. N. (2013). Job stress and employees' productivity: case of Azad Kashmir public health sector. *Interdisciplinary journal of contemporary research in business*, *5*(3), 525-542.
11. Umesh, U, A Study on the occupational stress among selected female bank employees working in the middle level hierarchy cadre of Indian Bank (public sector) and ICICI (private sector) in the Southern Malabbar region of Kerala State, India. *International Journal of Recent Advances in Organizational Behaviour and Decision Sciences*. Vol 2, Issue 3, 2016.