

# A Study on Stress and Coping Strategies for its Management in Hospital Organizations in Patna District

S. Arif Hussain

Research Scholar, Department of Management,  
Jagdishprasad Jhabarmal Tibrewala University,  
Chudela, Jhunjhunu District, Rajasthan

Received: April 18, 2018

Accepted: May 23, 2018

## ABSTRACT

*The efficiency of the employees is the mainly key aspect to the extent that the success of an organization is apprehensive. The efficiency consecutively is reliant on the psychosocial well being of the human resources. The influence of organizational stress is a significant issue for employees and organizations. Healthcare professional works is most stressful when compared to other organization employee's work. The objective of the current study is to identify the stress and find out differences among public and private hospitals about stress dimensions in Patna districts. The data was gathered through questionnaires from 300 employees. Stratified random sampling technique was used for sample. The study found that most of employees consider high level of stress. The study concluded that there are significant differences exist among hospitals about stress dimensions that mean different follow different practices. The study revealed that administration should adapt organizational stress coping strategies to cope up with stress in hospitals in Patna district.*

## Keywords:

## Introduction

Stress is a widespread incident that fundamentally apparent itself in person due to strain originating from numerous understandings or demanding circumstances. Because of the environment of the health facilities settings that holds an extensive series of slackly included actions, stress turn into a matter of apprehension. Iglehart, (2000), concluded that the health care industry includes an important constituent of our nation's financial development. The healthcare experts have their jobs to superior administration and manage their subordinate in attainment of their managerial objective with efficiently and proficiently. Workplace stress can lead to insufficient healthiness and work-related damages. Bovier and Perneger (2003), concluded that in health care, employee work stress can have a unconstructive burden on the worth of patient care. In spite of the truth that there are a few available researches investigating the occurrence of stress between health care professionals in the India, no such studies are available from State of Bihar, due to this reason scholar decided to conduct a study to evaluate the incidences of job stress among the different healthcare professionals effective in healthcare organizations in Patna district. Those factors that might influence job stress or satisfaction among health care employees were also investigated. The main purpose of the study is to investigate the existing stress management practices in public and private hospital organizations in Patna District.

## Review of literature

### Stress

Robins et el (2010), A dynamic condition in which an individual confronts an opportunity, constraint, or demand related to a desire and perceives the outcome both uncertain and important.

### Common Causes of Stress

#### Stressor

Robins et el (2010), Something that causes stress in an individual. Stress can be caused by factors called stressors. Causes of stress can be grouped into two major categories: organizational and personal stress

#### Symptoms of Stress

There are number of biological, psychological and behavioral changes which can be symptomatic of stress.

#### Sources of stress

Organizational factors, Personal factors

#### Consequences of stress

T. Cox (1978), Subjective effects, Behavioral effects, Cognitive effects, Physiological effects, Organizational effects

---

## Management of Stress

VSP RAO (2005), there is varieties of ways in which individuals cope with stress at work; broadly these could be classified in to two categories: individual coping strategy and organizational coping strategy.

Moorhead and Griffin (1995), with knowing that stress is general in organizations and potentially is injurious, the organizations and persons should pay special attention to manage stress effectively. There is variety of personal and organizational strategies to manage the Stress Management.

Spence, Barnett, Linden, Ramsden, & Taenzer, (1999), There are many definitions of stress, For example Job stress was explained as the harmful bodily and touching responses that emerged when the necessities of the work do not contest the competencies, resources, or needs of the employee. In addition, it has also been referred to as the imprecise depressing answer of the body to stipulate in the job position. Stress can be in general described as unnecessary, unsuitable or overstated answer to a condition.

Nirmala K V (2015), identified that the levels of stress is very elevated between nursing employees and they are subsequent only a very few coping techniques to overcome their stress. This is the reason why, they are feeling high level of stress. If the nursing staff follows the above mentioned both the physical and mental stress management methods to cope with stress and they can beat stressors and free from stress in their everyday life.

Abdul Salam Munir Abu-Helalah Et el (2014), concluded that overall pervasiveness of job stress is reasonably higher than reported in other published researches, yet there was a very high rate of job satisfaction; one that was much higher than reported in other studies. We recommend that future study center on methods of stress reduction and investigate the impact of high stress on staff performance.

Mary Ann Yeboah Et el (2014), A main cause of spirited benefit of an association is the quality and strength of its human resources. Stress and burnout are concepts that have continued the attention of nurses and scholars for numerous decades. These thoughts are extremely pertinent to the workforce in general and nursing in particular. Healthcare employees provide the psychological and bodily human attempt that wires their associations to give services. Hospitals as modern organizations should execute the whole thing probable to make sure that workers related stress that has influence on employee's efficiency and others are totally removed. The study is reliable with presented studies that worker stress is reasoned by concerns connecting to insist, control, support, association, role and change.

Vivek B. Waghachavare, Girish B. Dhumale, Yugantara R. Kadam, Alka D. Gore (2013), concluded that students from all three fields of education are showing to stress; though, it looks that engineering students are less lying face down to the progress of stress contrast to medical and dental students.

## Research Methodology

The aim of the study is to identify the opinions on current organizational and job stress among health professionals in public and private hospital and find out differences between them, 4 elements were taken for the study and independent sample t test has been applied for hypothesis test. SPSS 16 Software was used for data analysis.

## Sample design

10 hospitals which have bed capacity 31-100 beds were selected and five hospitals from both public and private. 30 samples were taken from each hospital. Total 300 responses were taken and 150 samples from both public and private hospitals.

## Questionnaire Design

Questionnaire was designed with the help of VSP Rao Textbook, Human Resource Management. The instrument comprises 4 sections that Organizational stressors, Personal factors, Individuals coping strategies, Organizational coping strategies.

## Method of data collection

Primary data was collected by the questionnaire and secondary data were collected with the help of published literature i.e. text books, case studies and journals.

## Objective

- I. To find out the job stress in both public and private hospitals in Patna.
- II. To know the differences in opinions on job stress between different types of hospitals.
- III. To find out differences in organizational coping strategies between types of hospitals

**Hypothesis**

H<sub>01</sub>: There are no significant differences on opinions of respondents about organizational stressors between types of hospitals

H<sub>02</sub>: There are no significant differences on opinions of respondents about individual factors between types of hospitals

H<sub>03</sub>: There are no significant differences on opinions of respondents about individual coping strategies between types of hospitals

H<sub>04</sub>: There are no significant differences in opinions of respondents about organizational coping strategies followed between types of hospitals

**Data analysis and interpretation:**

**Table No. 1: Independent Samples Test (Organizational stressors)**

|                                 |                             | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |      | t-test for Equality of Means |         |                 |                 |                       |  |       |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--|-------|
|                                 |                             | F                                       | Sig. | t                            | df      | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Differenc |       |
|                                 |                             |   |      |                              |         |                 |                 |                       | Lower                                    | Upper |
| <b>Organizational stressors</b> | Equal variances assumed     | 171.709                                 | .000 | 13.213                       | 298     | .000            | 1.627           | .123                  | 1.384                                    | 1.869 |
|                                 | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 13.213                       | 185.843 | .000            | 1.627           | .123                  | 1.384                                    | 1.870 |
|                                 | Equal variances assumed     | 135.502                                 | .000 | 13.487                       | 298     | .000            | 1.587           | .118                  | 1.355                                    | 1.818 |
|                                 | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 13.487                       | 183.671 | .000            | 1.587           | .118                  | 1.355                                    | 1.819 |
|                                 | Equal variances assumed     | 89.652                                  | .000 | 13.650                       | 298     | .000            | 1.640           | .120                  | 1.404                                    | 1.876 |
|                                 | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 13.650                       | 199.301 | .000            | 1.640           | .120                  | 1.403                                    | 1.877 |
|                                 | Equal variances assumed     | 198.806                                 | .000 | 14.544                       | 298     | .000            | 1.753           | .121                  | 1.516                                    | 1.991 |
|                                 | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 14.544                       | 193.084 | .000            | 1.753           | .121                  | 1.516                                    | 1.991 |
|                                 | Equal variances assumed     | 135.166                                 | .000 | 14.473                       | 298     | .000            | 1.687           | .117                  | 1.457                                    | 1.916 |
|                                 | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 14.473                       | 189.535 | .000            | 1.687           | .117                  | 1.457                                    | 1.917 |
|                                 | Equal variances             | 188.605                                 | .000 | 15.163                       | 298     | .000            | 1.860           | .123                  | 1.619                                    | 2.101 |

|                             |         |      |        |         |      |       |      |       |       |  |
|-----------------------------|---------|------|--------|---------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|--|
| assumed                     |         |      |        |         |      |       |      |       |       |  |
| Equal variances not assumed |         |      | 15.163 | 184.815 | .000 | 1.860 | .123 | 1.618 | 2.102 |  |
| Equal variances assumed     | 198.079 | .000 | 14.478 | 298     | .000 | 1.800 | .124 | 1.555 | 2.045 |  |
| Equal variances not assumed |         |      | 14.478 | 184.589 | .000 | 1.800 | .124 | 1.555 | 2.045 |  |
| Equal variances assumed     | 143.692 | .000 | 14.863 | 298     | .000 | 1.780 | .120 | 1.544 | 2.016 |  |
| Equal variances not assumed |         |      | 14.863 | 186.076 | .000 | 1.780 | .120 | 1.544 | 2.016 |  |
| Equal variances assumed     | 179.943 | .000 | 13.037 | 298     | .000 | 1.647 | .126 | 1.398 | 1.895 |  |
| Equal variances not assumed |         |      | 13.037 | 177.993 | .000 | 1.647 | .126 | 1.397 | 1.896 |  |
| Equal variances assumed     | 212.773 | .000 | 10.966 | 298     | .000 | 1.227 | .112 | 1.007 | 1.447 |  |
| Equal variances not assumed |         |      | 10.966 | 171.179 | .000 | 1.227 | .112 | 1.006 | 1.447 |  |
| Equal variances assumed     | 133.757 | .000 | 14.555 | 298     | .000 | 1.747 | .120 | 1.511 | 1.983 |  |
| Equal variances not assumed |         |      | 14.555 | 192.502 | .000 | 1.747 | .120 | 1.510 | 1.983 |  |
| Equal variances assumed     | 86.934  | .000 | 13.644 | 298     | .000 | 1.540 | .113 | 1.318 | 1.762 |  |
| Equal variances not assumed |         |      | 13.644 | 208.155 | .000 | 1.540 | .113 | 1.317 | 1.763 |  |
| Equal variances assumed     | 248.589 | .000 | 11.070 | 298     | .000 | 1.247 | .113 | 1.025 | 1.468 |  |
| Equal variances not assumed |         |      | 11.070 | 178.962 | .000 | 1.247 | .113 | 1.024 | 1.469 |  |
| Equal                       | 183.446 | .000 | 11.665 | 298     | .000 | 1.320 | .113 | 1.097 | 1.543 |  |

|  |                             |         |      |        |         |      |       |      |       |       |
|--|-----------------------------|---------|------|--------|---------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|
|  | variances assumed           |         |      |        |         |      |       |      |       |       |
|  | Equal variances not assumed |         |      | 11.665 | 178.654 | .000 | 1.320 | .113 | 1.097 | 1.543 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed | 208.279 | .000 | 12.680 | 298     | .000 | 1.507 | .119 | 1.273 | 1.740 |
|  | Equal variances assumed     |         |      | 12.680 | 179.737 | .000 | 1.507 | .119 | 1.272 | 1.741 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed | 114.493 | .000 | 12.945 | 298     | .000 | 1.460 | .113 | 1.238 | 1.682 |
|  | Equal variances assumed     |         |      | 12.945 | 192.946 | .000 | 1.460 | .113 | 1.238 | 1.682 |

Table 1 observes the first dimension of the study that is Organizational stressors includes other sub components. From table 1 we can analyze that the all the variables have its significant value less than significant value (0.05) thus it is clear that null hypothesis was rejected and alternate hypothesis was accepted.

**Table No. 2: Independent Samples Test (Personal factors)**

|                         |                             | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |      | t-test for Equality of Means |         |                 |                 |                       |  |       |       |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--|-------|-------|
|                         |                             | F                                       | Sig. | t                            | df      | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Differenc |       |       |
|                         |                             |   |      |                              |         |                 |                 |                       |  | Lower | Upper |
| <b>Personal factors</b> | Equal variances assumed     | 168.682                                 | .000 | 8.921                        | 248     | .000            | 1.120           | .126                  | .873                                     | 1.367 |       |
|                         | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 8.921                        | 145.241 | .000            | 1.120           | .126                  | .872                                     | 1.368 |       |
|                         | Equal variances assumed     | 186.103                                 | .000 | 10.606                       | 248     | .000            | 1.376           | .130                  | 1.120                                    | 1.632 |       |
|                         | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 10.606                       | 148.657 | .000            | 1.376           | .130                  | 1.120                                    | 1.632 |       |

Table 2 identifies the second element of the current study that is personal factors that consists other 4 variables. We can depict that all the variables have its significant value less than significance value (0.05) so that opinions are significantly different null hypothesis was rejected and alternate hypothesis was accepted because significant differences.

**Table No. 3: Independent Samples Test (Individual coping strategy)**

|                                   |                             | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |      | t-test for Equality of Means |         |                |                 |                       |  |       |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|---------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--|-------|
|                                   |                             | F                                       | Sig. | t                            | df      | Sig.(2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Differenc |       |
|                                   |                             |   |      |                              |         |                |                 |                       | Lower                                    | Upper |
| <b>Individual coping strategy</b> | Equal variances assumed     | 156.557                                 | .000 | 9.975                        | 298     | .000           | 1.113           | .112                  | .894                                     | 1.333 |
|                                   | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 9.975                        | 176.106 | .000           | 1.113           | .112                  | .893                                     | 1.334 |
|                                   | Equal variances assumed     | 141.080                                 | .000 | 13.170                       | 298     | .000           | 1.580           | .120                  | 1.344                                    | 1.816 |
|                                   | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 13.170                       | 182.618 | .000           | 1.580           | .120                  | 1.343                                    | 1.817 |
|                                   | Equal variances assumed     | 157.275                                 | .000 | 12.784                       | 298     | .000           | 1.460           | .114                  | 1.235                                    | 1.685 |
|                                   | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 12.784                       | 190.409 | .000           | 1.460           | .114                  | 1.235                                    | 1.685 |
|                                   | Equal variances assumed     | 205.143                                 | .000 | 11.555                       | 298     | .000           | 1.320           | .114                  | 1.095                                    | 1.545 |
|                                   | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 11.555                       | 186.500 | .000           | 1.320           | .114                  | 1.095                                    | 1.545 |
|                                   | Equal variances assumed     | 156.557                                 | .000 | 9.975                        | 298     | .000           | 1.113           | .112                  | .894                                     | 1.333 |
|                                   | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 9.975                        | 176.106 | .000           | 1.113           | .112                  | .893                                     | 1.334 |

Table 3 reveals the 3rd dimensions of this study that is individual coping strategies. We can analyze that the all variables in table, their significant value is less than significance value (0.05) so that alternate hypothesis was accepted null is rejected.

**Table No. 4: Independent Samples Test (Organizational coping strategies)**

|   |                             | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |      | t-test for Equality of Means |         |                 |                 |                       |  |       |
|---|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--|-------|
|   |                             | F                                       | Sig. | t                            | df      | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Differenc |       |
|   |                             |   |      |                              |         |                 |                 |                       | Lower                                    | Upper |
| <b>Organizational coping strategies</b> | Equal variances assumed     | 240.460                                 | .000 | 10.176                       | 298     | .000            | 1.180           | .116                  | .952                                     | 1.408 |
|   | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 10.176                       | 190.638 | .000            | 1.180           | .116                  | .951                                     | 1.409 |
|   | Equal variances assumed     | 283.568                                 | .000 | 10.939                       | 298     | .000            | 1.247           | .114                  | 1.022                                    | 1.471 |
|   | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 10.939                       | 171.834 | .000            | 1.247           | .114                  | 1.022                                    | 1.472 |
|   | Equal variances assumed     | 289.840                                 | .000 | 12.770                       | 298     | .000            | 1.460           | .114                  | 1.235                                    | 1.685 |
|   | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 12.770                       | 172.515 | .000            | 1.460           | .114                  | 1.234                                    | 1.686 |
|   | Equal variances assumed     | 136.935                                 | .000 | 12.063                       | 298     | .000            | 1.393           | .116                  | 1.166                                    | 1.621 |
|   | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 12.063                       | 189.396 | .000            | 1.393           | .116                  | 1.165                                    | 1.621 |

Table 4 locates the 4<sup>th</sup> dimension of the present study that is Organizational coping strategies includes other 4 variables. In table we can analyze that the all variables have their significant value less than significance value (0.05). So we can conclude null was rejected and alternate Hypothesis was accepted.

### Findings

All the above 4 tables observe the Organizational stressors, Personal factors, Individuals coping strategies and Organizational coping strategies. Analyses were done through SPSS 16 software for collected data. The significance level has taken at 5%.The significance value of all the components were lower than the significance level (0.05). All the above 4 tables indicated that the alternate hypothesis was accepted and null hypothesis has been rejected It can be summarized that there is more significant differences between different types of hospitals on the responses of stress dimensions.

### Conclusion

Stress Management has great importance in good quality of hospital services. It has balance between employees and hospital services. The present study identified that most of employees are not satisfied with all the elements. The study find out there is no proper stress management programs are followed in public and private hospitals So that management should give great deal of attention and should imply strategies to overcome from these situations.

**References:**

1. VSP RAO (2005), Human Resource Management, Excel Book, New Delhi
2. Sharma D K and Goyal R C (2018), Hospital Administration and Human Resource Management, PHI, New Delhi
3. Iglehart, J. K. (2000), Revisiting the Canadian Health Care System, New England Journal of Medicine, 342.
4. Bovier, P. A., & Perneger, T. V. (2003), Predictors of work satisfaction among physicians, European Journal of Public Health, 13, 299-305.
5. Moorhead, G., & Griffin, R. W. (1995), Organizational Behaviour: Managing People and Organization, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
6. Spence, J. D., Barnett, P. A., Linden, W., Ramsden, V., & Taenzer, P. (1999), Lifestyle modifications to prevent and control hypertension.
7. Vivek B. Waghachavare, Girish B. Dhumale, Yugantara R. Kadam, Alka D. Gore (2013), A Study of Stress among Students of Professional Colleges from an Urban area in India Sultan Qaboos University Med J, Vol. 13, Iss. 3, pp. 429-436.
8. K. Vijaya Nirmala (2015), A Study of Stress and Its Management Strategies among Nursing Staff at Selected Hospitals in South India, IJAHMS, Volume 01, No.10, ISSN NO. 2395- 0692, P. NO. 1-7.
9. Abdul Salam Munir Abu-Helalah Et el (2014), JOB STRESS AND JOB SATISFACTION AMONG HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS, European Scientific Journal, vol.10, No.32 ISSN: 1857 - 7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857- 7431.
10. Mary Ann Yeboah Et el (2014), Determinants of Workplace Stress among Healthcare Professionals in Ghana: An Empirical Analysis, International Journal of Business and Social Science Vol. 5 No. 4.
11. T. Cox (1978), Stress, Baltimore, University Park Press

**Seeing yourself as you want to be is the key to personal growth.**  
**~ Anonymous**