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Abstract
The present study examined the relationships of independent variable age with occupational stress in hotel industry employees and IT industry employees. A purposive sample of 282 from Indian five star Hotels and 278 from Indian listed IT Companies was chosen. Region of data collection was Delhi and NCR. The Shailendra Kumar’s Occupational Stress Scale was used for data collection, while Manova and Anova are used for statistical analysis. The study strongly indicates the relationship between occupational stress and demographic variable age.

Introduction
Occupational stress or job stress is known as stress at work. It occurs when there is a discrepancy between the demands of the workplace and that of individual’s (Tsutsumi et al., 2009). It has been defined as the experience of negative emotional states such as frustration, worry, anxiety and depression attributed to work related factors (Kyriacou, 2001). Occupational stress in the service professions has been a focus of study in the last decades.

In Psychophysiology, stress refers to some stimulus resulting in a deflectable strain that cannot be accommodated by the organism and which ultimately results in impaired health or behavior. The present day researchers and practitioners visualize the phenomenon of stress in a new perspective. Each individual needs a moderate amount of stress to be alert and capable of functioning effectively in an organization. Stress is inherent in the concept of creativity (Pestonjee, 1992) and entrepreneurship (Pareek, 1995).

Stress is a part of modern life; with increasing complexity of life, stress is likely to increase. Various events in life cause stress, starting with the birth of a child and ending in the death of a dear one. Several attempts have been made to measure life events as sources of stress identifying and giving weight age to different events in a person’s life like, transfer, changing house, admission of children etc. An excellent review of the life events scales developed in India, and the research conducted on life stress in India, have been provided by Sharma (1988) who has commended the stress scales developed by Dube and Singh (viz.), Dube’s Life Events Scale (1983) and Sing et. al.’s Life Events Scale (1983).

Williams and Huber (1986) define stress as "a psychological and physical reaction to prolonged internal and/or environmental conditions in which an individual's adaptive capabilities are overextended."

(p. 243). They argue that stress is an adaptive response to a conscious or unconscious threat. According to Beehr and Newman (1978), Job Stress is a condition arising from the interaction of people and their jobs and characterized by changes within people that force them to deviate from their normal functioning. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) in the U.S. defines workplace stress as the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources or needs of the worker.

Parker and Decotiis (1983) used the term ‘job stress’ to describe the feeling of a person who is required to deviate from normal self-desired functioning in the work place as a result of opportunities, constraints, or demands relating to potentially important work related results. Caplan et al. (1975) define job stress as any characteristic of the job environment which poses a threat to the individual. For Cox and Mackay (1981), a stress condition refers to an imbalance between environmental supplies and demands and personal capabilities, needs and values. Schuler (1984) defines stress as a perceived dynamic state involving uncertainty about something important. Ivancevich and Matteson (1984) define stress in terms of a person-environment relationship wherein the environmental demand is supposed to result in stress.

Jagadish and Srivastava (1989) state that Stress has become one of the major concerns of present times. People are under stress of some sort or other, most of the time. Stress at work, stemming from increasing job complexity and its divergent demands have become pervading feature of modern
organizations. A little amount of stress may be helpful from organizational and personal point of view. It is reported that stress creates as well as promotes employees inclination towards the job, thus enhances the performance and develops positive attitude among employees. However it has been more frequently observed that excessive and persistent stress is aversive for employees. Stress is commonly understood to be a work related health hazard. The National Association of Working Women (US), which has undertaken considerable research into Occupational Health, reached to the finding that – people with greatest responsibility, who make a lot of important decisions, have most stress – people bring stress with them from home into work and, if they are under stress, it is because of family or personal problems – certain people are more susceptible to stress; this is not due to the job but due to inherent characteristics of the individual. There is a misconception that only the highly paid staff is subject to the stress and its after-effects, but it affects the lower paid staff too. As automation increase, the level of stress increased, indeed in many cases the reverse too happen.

The factors that lead to stress at the workplace are categorized mainly into four by Summers et al (1994) (viz.), personal characteristics, organizational characteristics, structural and organizational characteristics, procedural and role characteristics.

The major causes of Occupational Stress enumerated by Apex (1985) are: (1) Environmental factors, (2) Job design faults, (3) Employer Employee relationships, (4) Social isolation, (5) Failure to solve grievances, (6) Fear of adverse health effects, and (7) Threat of job losses. The major dimensions of Occupational Stress identified by some of the prominent researchers are laid down for detailed understanding. Pareek (1983) listed eight major dimensions, contributing to the Organizational Role Stress. They are (1) Self-role distance; (2) Inter-role distance; (3) Role-stagnation; (4) Role ambiguity; (5) Role overload; (6) Role erosion; (7) Role inadequacy; and (8) Total role stress (overall role stress).

The occupational stress dimensions, located by Srivastava and Singh (1981) are (1) Role Overload; (2) Role ambiguity; (3) Role conflict; (4) Group and political pressures; (5) Responsibility for persons; (6) Under-participation; (7) Powerlessness; (8) Poor peer relations; (9) Intrinsic impoverishment; (10) Low status; (11) Strenuous working condition; and (12) Unprofitability.

Stress Among IT/ITeS Professionals
IT/ITeS industry in India got tremendous boost in the past decade due to factors like liberalization and globalization of the Indian economy coupled with favorable government policies (Bhatt and Verma; 2008). This sector of the sunshine industry brought a new work environment and sea changes in the employment trends. Service providers characterized this sector by adhering to strict deadlines set by their customers, working in different time zones, interdependency in teams, multitasking, increased interaction with offshore clients and extended work hours. IT/ITeS professionals are constantly under pressure to deliver the services efficiently as well as to remain cost effective. The customer expectation in terms of skills required for processing jobs keeps changing and forces professionals to upgrade/adapt very fast to their demands. At times IT/ITeS professionals are forced to change the entire paradigms amidst constant uncertainty and high risk. These working conditions lead to high stress in the professionals. Organizations have started recognizing high stress as a worthy area to address growing attrition rate prevalent in this sector. The workforce in IT/ITeS faces its unique challenges. The technological advancements in this sector come up in short span of time with significantly high efficiencies, putting them apart from technology previously/currently in use. The movement to new technology puts a lot of pressure on employees and organizations, demanding more immediate and direct changes across all functions. This sector is very volatile and faces the problem of lack of job security and constant up gradation of skills to remain marketable. The working conditions in the Information System profession is becoming very stressful (Vowler, 1995; Engler N. 1996; Sethi et.al., 1999; Thong and Yap, 2000) with average working hours extended to 50 hours per week, working on Saturdays and Sundays and not being able to take leave when sick (King, 1995). Due to long working hours and monotonous work, the call-centre jobs have been equated to 'electronic sweat shop', 'battery hens' '19th century prison' and 'Roman slave ship' (Shahnawaz, 2006). According to ComPsych Corp. survey, more than two-third of the employees feel 'high stress' in their jobs. Around 78% of the cases are related to anxiety, stress, and neurotic disorder. The survey
involved workers in the age group of 25-54 years (24-34 years, 35-44 years and 45-54 years accounted for 25.5%, 28.2%, and 24.4% of the cases respectively (Workers Health book Chart book, 2004). In another survey of Information technology professionals, 95% of all senior managers, 90% of all middle level managers, and 80% in the rank and the file describe their day as stressful (Graner, 1997). The present working style has also contributed to stress. The skills in this sector are becoming obsolete at a rate of 20% per year (Yourdon, Edward, 1994). Hadfield (2005) states that the lack of control over standardized software products and inflexible deadlines are the biggest causes of stress among IT managers. The study also reported stress as the worst hazard of their workplace and repetitive strain as the next greatest problem. Goodweni (2004) reports that increased workload, constant changes at work, reduced staff and long working hours affect not only employees but also the employers, who lose around 6.5 million working days annually to work based stress amounting to about [pounds sterling]7 billion. Rogers (2004), while studying 700 IT directors found that they were not able to maintain a healthy work-life balance. It was reported that around 83% of them were not able to sleep and 70% remained constantly worried about the instability of their IT system. The most significant stressors reported are work overload, career opportunities, role ambiguity and role conflict and working with diversified personalities (Calbon 1994). Conditions of changing technology, redundancy, and resource inadequate (Engler, 1998; Aziz 2003) also place a high demand along with financial pressure, budget constraints, and other resource inadequacy problems (Vowler, 1995; Aziz 2004). The human-computer interaction factor also has an effect on work exhaustion (Rajeshwari et, al 2005). The widespread nature of stress in IT has given rise to the term 'techno-stress', which is used to explain the phenomena of stress arising due to usage of computers. Craig Broad in early 1980's coined the term techno-stress and defined it as a 'modern disease of adaptation caused by the inability to cope with new computer technologies in a healthy manner; (Ennis, 2005). Thus, there is a strong need for systematic research on stress among IT/ITeS professionals.

Many researchers believe that stress is becoming a major contributor to negative psychological consequences on the employees and results in low employee morale, high accidents rates, high rate of absenteeism and attrition; in turn cause difficulties for employees in getting along with others resulting in decreased productivity (NASSCOM, 2005; Longenecker; et.al., 1999; Halffield et.al., 2005; Burke, 1988; Hart, 1994; Kantas, 1995; Long & Schutz 1996; O'dricoll & Cooper, 1994; Michailidis & Elwkai 2003; Selye, 1995). It also leads to insomnia which can impair work performance and cause on-the-job accidents (Akerstedt, et.al. 2002). About 45.88% people find working in ITeS as stressful (report, Jobs with Justice, October 2006). It also adversely affects their health. This sector face one of the highest rates of attrition, with attrition levels averaging around 30-35 % (30 March 2006, Financial Express). The high attrition and absenteeism shows that these professionals experience many negative psychological consequences brought about by stress that they face in their occupation (Engler 1995; Igbaria, 1992). Pestonjee DM in his working paper 'A Study of Role Stresses in Top and Middle Management' concludes that "Middle managers scored significantly higher on Inter Role Distance (IRD), Personal Inadequacy (PIn), Self Role Distance (SRD) and Resource Inadequacy (RIn). Role related stress in middle managers was found to be significantly higher than top managers". Aziz (2003) reported RIn followed by Role Stagnation and IRD were the factors that contributed highest to overall stress among IT professionals in India. For women employees in the Indian IT sector, RIn was the highest contributing factor to overall stress followed by Role Overload and Personal Inadequacy (Mohsin Aziz, 2004).

If one scans the research on work stress one discovers that attention has been given mainly to the organizational arrangements of work as stressful and less to personal characteristics and almost none to the stress process, sign and symptoms of stress, coping and changes in stress from moment to moment and encounter to encounter.

**Stress in Hotel Industry**

Although it is generally acknowledged that occupational stress can be a contributing factor in workplace illness and injury rates, little is known about the extent of occupational stress in so-called ‘less hazardous’ industries that rely on ‘emotional labor’, such as the hospitality industry. The hospitality industry encompasses a wide variety of different types of businesses and companies that make up the service sector of the workforce. The burnout rate of people employed in the hospitality
industry is one of the highest. According to the Permanent Life Situation Survey (2009), hotel and restaurant workers experience employee burnout at a rate of one in seven. Although the annual study took place in the Netherlands, the results are consistent with other findings throughout the world. The main cause of the high incidence of employee burnout in the hospitality industry is chronic stress in the workplace. Contributing factors of burnout in the hospitality industry include:

- Increasing pressure and job demands that become overwhelming
- Having little or no control over your work
- A work environment that is stressful, hostile or unpleasant
- Long hours, often late at night, resulting in a lack of sleep or rest
- Tight schedules
- A job that is monotonous, repetitive or boring
- Constantly trying to please everyone
- Lack of communication with coworkers, supervisors and management
- Being assigned job responsibilities without receiving the proper support and guidance
- Not having a job description or expectations clearly defined
- Feeling as if there is not a sense of balance between work and home life
- Working in a position with responsibilities where you are over or under qualified
- Many positions require long hours of constantly being on your feet
- Stressful interactions with customers
- Many positions have a lower rate of pay than many other industries

Turnover is one of the most prevalent, longstanding concerns in the hotel industry, which has been characterized as having a “turnover culture” (Deery & Shaw, 1997, p. 377; Wasmuth & Davis, 1983a, 1983b, 1983c). High turnover rates have an enormous effect on the industry’s bottom line. This is a critical concern, especially within the context of a shrinking skilled labor force (Pitt-Catsouphes & Smyer, 2005). For example, more than a decade ago, Marriott estimated that with each 1% increase in its employee turnover rate, the company lost between US$5 and $15 million in profits (Schlesinger & Heskett, 1991). Simons and Hinkin (2006) found that each 1% increase in employee turnover rate was associated with a mean $7,550 in lost profits at the hotel unit level. Furthermore, the health care costs associated with work-related stress have increased dramatically in recent years. Insurance premiums have increased 73% from 2000 to 2005, in comparison to an inflation rate increase of 14%. Job stress and burnout are frequently cited as antecedents of work and family stress, which together influence employee intentions to leave an organization and have implications for health care costs. Despite the paucity of research, many characteristics of jobs in the hospitality industry have long been associated with work–family conflict and stress concerns in other literatures (e.g., long hours scheduled at nonstandard times, on-call hours, emphasis on face time and geographic mobility as a prerequisite for career advancement). Moreover, there is evidence that these work characteristics are potential work stressors associated with turnover intentions (Hom, 2002). Furthermore, work characteristics are often antecedents to work–family conflict. Job factors in the immediate hotel work environment that influence stress include high demands for responsiveness and emotional control in customer service (Hochschild, 1997) and norms about the importance of “face time” (Munck, 2001). These factors may operate in an additive way such that as these risk factors increase, an employee’s ability to adapt to his or her environment is jeopardized. The need or requirement to work long, irregular, and unpredictable hours emerged consistently as the most prevalent job stressor for managers in a variety of types of hotels and locations. Managers and spouses largely agreed on this point, and entrants were well aware of these expectations. Yet there was variability across hotel occupations in these perceptions. For example, managers assigned to rooms and food and beverage reported being particularly challenged by long, nonstandard hours, including weekends and holidays. Note, however, that these operations positions are also the traditional “routes to the top.” In contrast, managers in human resources, engineering, and accounting tended to have 8 a.m. or 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. or 6 p.m. schedules that are probably more compatible with life off the job, yet these positions typically are not viewed as pathways to becoming general manager. Thus, there are clearly work–family trade-offs in each
occupational category: More upwardly mobile hotel managers must make more significant compromises in their lives outside of work. Furthermore, general managers also reported working relatively long hours, yet they enjoyed considerable flexibility and control in determining those hours.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of occupational stress (dependent variable) with age (independent variables) in IT industry employees and Hotel industry employees.

**Research question**

Does the demographic factor age have impact on occupational stress of IT employees and Hotel employees?

**Method**

The present work is a descriptive study investigating whether the occupational stress faced by the associates of IT and Hotel industry differed significantly to their level of occupational stress and demographic factor age. The sample consisted of 278 IT employees and 282 Hotel employees Delhi, NCR. Standardized questionnaire was used to collect the data. The instrument uses a five point Likert scale ranging from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). Positive key item carried a score of five if the response was in the category of “Strongly Agree” and carried a score of one if the response was in the category of “Strongly Disagree”. While the reverse pattern of scoring was followed for the negative key items. Thus in this test high score indicate low level of stress and low scores indicate higher level of stress.

**Results and Discussion**

Multivariate Analysis of Variance was applied to study the difference between the perception of employees according to their age groups in the IT and Hotel industry. The obtained results are presented below: (For Tables please refer annexure).

Table 4.1.2 shows the results of Two Way MANOVA with age and industry as independent variables and factor of occupational stress as dependent variable. The two way MANOVA revealed that age impacted significantly on the combined dependent variable occupational stressor Wilks Lambda = .55, F value (11,391) = 7.63, p value = .00 (Table 4.1.2).

MANOVA analysis revealed that age impacted significantly on the dependent variable occupational stress as p value comes out .00 means its significant.

As analysis is based on occupational stressors which are ten in number in the present study, therefore through ANOVA it’s vibrant that except one variable i.e. managerial support other variables are significant.

The further scrutiny of the ANOVA table according to each variable shows that only on managerial support all the age groups are having same opinion while opinion on all other stress factors there is a significant difference in the opinion of different age groups (Table 4.1.2a).

Findings are discussed according to variables (stressors)

**Group Cohesiveness**

An analysis of the mean table (Table 4.1.2b) and post hoc analysis shows that the age group 50 and above is significantly less stressed because of group cohesiveness than the rest of the age groups. This may be so because the people in the age group 50 and above are already on the peak of their career and hold mostly the top positions in the organizations. They become more serene in their approach and relationships and therefore are less stressed due to group cohesiveness as compared to the rest of the age groups.

**Role Clarity**

Further the result shows that the age group of 41-50 is significantly more stressed due to lack of role clarity as compared to the age groups of 21-30 and 51 & above (Table 4.1.2e). The probable reason for this could be that the associates in the age group of 21-30 are fresh in the industry and mostly unmarried. They can focus completely in the organization. The associates in the age group 51 and above are mostly settled in their life in terms of family and career. So they are relatively clear of their roles in life, which gets translated to their acceptance of their organizational goals more clearly.
However, the associates in the age group of 41-50 are almost in their mid life crisis stage, where they are confused in their life roles. Moreover in organization again, they are at the transition phase from middle management to top management, where at times they are provided with complete autonomy of the top management while at times not. So they lend up in more confused situations as to what role they are supposed to play and therefore are more stressed due to role clarity as compared to others.

Fair Compensation
The results on fair compensation emphasize that the associates in the age group of 21-30 are significantly more stressed due to lack of fair compensation as compared to associates in the age group of 41-50, and 51 & above (Table 4.1.2f). The probable reason for this could be that the associates in the age group of 21-30 are new to the industry with big aspirations; therefore they feel they are less paid. However, by the time associates reaches to the age of 41 and above, they are very clear about the industry trends and understand that they are paid according to industry norms and feel less stressed as compared to the associates from the age group of 21-30. Further the results highlights that the age group of 31-50 is significantly more stressed that the age group of 51 & above due to lack of fair compensation. This may be so because the associates in the age group of 31-50 are in the phase where they want to build assets and settle their life. So they look forward to get more compensation, while the associates in the age of 51 and above are almost settled with most of the responsibilities over. So they become satisfied with whatever compensation they are getting.

Lack of Consistent Role Demands
The results show that the associates in the age group of 41-50 are more stressed due to lack of consistent role demands as compared to the associates in the rest of the age groups (Table 4.1.2g). The probable reason for this could be that the associates in the age group of 41-50 are at the stage of their career, where they transit from middle management to top management mostly. In such a situation they may have to play many roles in the organization and thus feels that their role demands are less consistent.

Adequate Workload
Further results indicate that the associates in the age group of 21-40 are more stressed as compared to the associates above 51 years on adequate workload (Table 4.1.2h). This could be so probably because, the associates in the age group of 21-40 have to do more of the leg work, while associates in the age range of 51 and above mostly contributes to the managerial aspect, so they do not have to run around so much. Moreover by this age they are seasoned in their job understanding that this is what the job requires them to do, which is not so with the associates in the age group of 21-40.

Context Sensitiveness
A look in to the results emphasize that the associates in the age group of 51 and above feel more stressed due to lack of context sensitiveness as compared to the rest of the age groups (Table 4.1.2i). The probable reason to this could be that at their age they are not able to cope up with the technological changes are therefore may sometimes feel inferior to their young counterparts causing more stress for themselves. The scrutiny of the results shows that the associates in the age range of 41 and above feel more stressed as compared to the associates in the age group of 21-40 (Table 4.1.2j).

Job Comfort
This means that the associates in the age group of 41 and above feel that the job is taxing to their abilities and is significantly different than the requirements of the job. The probable reason for these results could be that the associates in the age group 41 and above are mostly on leading positions in the organization, where they are managing teams, taking decisions. So here they are responsible for the performance of their team and also they have to work as a mentor, counselor, conflict resolver etc. which requires lot of energy. Then they act as a linking harbor between the juniors and top management, so they remain in a sort of ethical dilemma and thus feel more stressed on the comforts of job as compared to others.

Role Autonomy
The results also focus that the associates in the age group of 21-40 feel more stressed as compared to the associates above 41 on lack of role autonomy (Table 4.1.2k). This could probably be so because they might not get the opportunity to take and implement their own styles and decisions. Further the
results also show that the associates in the age group of 41-50 are significantly more stressed on role autonomy as compared to the associates in the age group of 51 and above. These results can again be attributed to the above mentioned reasons.

The results show that the age group 21-50 are significantly more stressed as compared to the age 51 and above on overall stress score (Table 4.1.1). This could be attributed to the fact that the associates in the age range of 51 and above are mostly the top management people. They are the decision makers, policy makers. They are the ones who control the rest of the associates so definitely feel less stressed due to occupational factors of stress.

Hence it is accepted and clear that age has a significant relationship with occupational stress.

Some of the studies focusing on relationship between age and stress are as follows

Rauschenbach and Hertel (2011) conducted an empirical study to explore the general relationship of age and strain as a function of three processes: (1) older workers might experience less strain because of better coping strategies; (2) older workers might experience more strain because of higher vulnerability; or (3) age and strain might be curvilinearly related with highest strain reported by middle-age workers. Using both general and experience-based measures, strain and emotional reactivity to stressful job events were reported by 274 workers aged between 18 and 65 years. Results showed an inverted U-shaped relationship between age and strain experience. Shultz et al (2010) conducted a study using data from the Eurobarometer to examine how the demand–control model of work stress may function differently for older versus younger workers. The Eurobarometer collected data from a representative sample that included 15,986 working adults in 15 Western European Countries, with roughly 1,000 participants coming from each country. Participants in the study were in the age group of 15 to 83 (M = 38.9), with approximately 7,400 aged 40 and older. Men comprised 57% of the sample. The most prominent occupations reported included craft and related trade workers (17%), clerks (15%), service and sales workers (13%), and technicians (12%). Approximately 70% of workers were employed in the private sector. The results indicate that different controls may in fact buffer different types of job demands for younger versus older workers. The findings reveal that only the interaction between problem solving and time to complete tasks was significant for younger workers. For older workers, however, the interactions between time deadlines and having sufficient time to complete tasks, autonomy, and the interaction between problem solving and schedule flexibility are significant predictors of self-reported stress. Siu et al (2001) collected data from 3 samples of Hong Kong managers to examine mechanisms by which age would relate to work well-being. A total of 634 managers were drawn by random sampling and purposive sampling methods. The results showed that age was positively related to well-being (job satisfaction and mental well-being). Furthermore, older managers reported fewer sources of stress, better coping, and a more internal locus of control. Multiple regression analyses suggested that the relations of age with 2 well-being indicators can be attributed to various combinations of coping, work locus of control, sources of stress, managerial level, and organizational tenure.

Comparison of IT and Hotel Industry

Industry also impacted significantly on the combined dependent variable occupational stressors. Wilks Lambda = .82, F value (11,391) = 7.53, p value = .00 (Table 4.1.2). Analysis of each dependent variable, using ANOVA table shows that Role Clarity F (1,401) = 19.63 P value = .00, Consistent Role Demands F (1, 401) = 4.20, P value = .04, Adequate Workload F (1, 401) = 4.61, P value = .03, Managerial Support F (1,401) = 28.69, P value = .00, these factors are significantly different (Table 4.1.2a). Analysis of the mean table shows that hotel industry found less stressful on Group Cohesiveness, Role Clarity, Managerial Support, Context Sensitive, Job Capability Fit, Role Autonomy while IT industry found less stressful on Comfortable Job, Adequate Workload, Consistent Role Demands (Table 4.1). The probable reasons for these results are discussed earlier.

The interaction of industry and age impacted significantly on the combined dependent variable occupational stressors Wilks Lambda = .51, F value (11,391) =8.89, p value = .00 (Table 4.1.2). Analysis of each dependent variable, using ANOVA table shows that all factors are found significantly different after the interaction of industry and age (Table 4.1.2a).
The scrutiny of the means (Table 4.1.2d) show that the associates in the age group of 31 and above of hotel industry are less stressed than the associates of the IT industry while associates in the age group of 21-30 of IT industry are less stressed than those of the hotel industry on group cohesiveness (Figure 4.1.2a). The reason for this could be that the associates in the age group of 21-30 in hotel industry are striving to attain their individual positions while in IT industry these associates have to work in the groups and teams; however the trend reverses for age groups above this. In hotel industry by this time the associates become more polished and become more cohesive.

Figure 4.1.2a: Industry X Age Interaction on Group Cohesiveness

The results further emphasize that the associates in age group of 21-30 in IT are less stressed as compared to associates in Hotel industry on role clarity (Figure 4.1.2b).

Figure 4.1.2b: Industry X Age Interaction on Role Clarity

While for the rest of the age groups the trend is reversed. The reason for these results could be that the associates who are in the age group of 21-30 in IT industry starts from core development job where only technical skills are required to perform the job, gradually when they grow up in the hierarchy with age their work requires more and more conceptual and human skills, which is a different ballgame for these people and therefore they feel more stressed because by temperament managing people is not the cup of tea of IT associates who have more technical mindset. While in Hotel industry, the associates have to do people management from day one as they are exposed to the customers directly so feel...
more stressed in initial years however with time they become more polished and customary of using human skills so feel relatively less stressed.

The results further shows that the associates of Hotel industry in the age group of 21-40 are less stressed due to compensation and role demands as compared to those in IT industry while the trend is reverse for the age group 41 and above. The probable reasons for these results could be that in hotel industry to start with the pay packages are very attractive however it is not so in IT industry (Figure 4.1.2c & Figure 4.1.2d). Contrarily while moving up in the hierarchy the compensation in the IT industry improves exponentially. The compensation in the hotel industry is also good at the higher levels but when it is compared with what is paid internationally in this industry then the associates feel that they are paid less. As regards with the consistency in role demands, it can be said that the associates in the hotel industry tends to perform the same kind of job in early years while in IT industry, the associates have pressures of dealing with the various aspects of technology which may lead to more stress in them. However with moving up the career ladder and with more experience the IT associates become experts in technologies and they feel less pressure of role demands while in hotel industry the pressure of facing the customers remains which converts in to relatively more stress for associates of older ages in hotel industry. The results show that the associates of IT industry in the age range of 21-30 and 51 and above are less stressed due to workload and comfort of job (Figure 4.1.2e & Figure 4.1.2h) as compared to their counterparts in the hotel industry.

![Figure 4.1.2c: Industry X Age Interaction on Fair Compensation](image-url)

![Figure 4.1.2c: Industry X Age Interaction on Consistent Role Demands](image-url)
However the trend is reverse for the associates in the age group of 31-50. The probable reason for these results could be that the associates in IT industry in the age group of 21-30 generally involves in to technical work with which they are quite comfortable and the associates in the age group of 51 and above are generally contributing in terms of consultation so even their job is also not a rush job. However for the associates in the hotel industry their job always demands to present their best, which becomes taxing for the new entrants in the industry as they are not used to it and even for the associates in the age group of 51 and above because they want recluse from public facing always. The reason for the associates of age group 31-50 of hotel industry being less stressed due to job comfort and workload could be that this is the age group in their prime time of their contribution to their jobs and they enjoy to present themselves at their best, however in IT industry the associates in the age group of 31-50 graduates to applying conceptual and human skills which is not their forte, so they feel uncomfortable on such roles.
Figure 4.1.2g: Industry X Age Interaction on Context Sensitive

Figure 4.1.2h: Industry X Age Interaction on Comfortable Job
Figure 4.1.2i: Industry X Age Interaction on Job Capability Fit

Figure 4.1.2j: Industry X Age Interaction on Role Autonomy
The results further shows that the associates of the hotel industry in the age range of 21-50 are less stressed as compared to their counterparts in IT industry due to job capability fit, role autonomy, context sensitive and overall stress score (Figure 4.1.2f, Figure 4.1.2i, Figure 4.1.2j & Figure 4.1.2k), while the trend is reverse for the associates in the age group of 51 and above. The probable reasons for such results are discussed above.

Conclusion

The present study concludes that hotel and IT industry associates face average stress due to group cohesiveness, role clarity, fair compensation, consistent role demands, adequate workload, managerial support, context sensitive, comfortable job, Job capability fit and role. In this study it is analyzed that age has a significant impact on occupational stress. The age group of 21-50 years is significantly more stressed as compared to the age 50 and above on overall stress score. This could be attributed to the fact that the associates in the age range of 50 and above are mostly the top management people. They are the decision makers, policy makers. They are the ones who control the rest of the associates so definitely feel less stressed due to organizational factors of stress. Stress affects the efficiency of the individual. So, there is a need to provide proper conducive environment and support to employees to maintain individual stress at their workplace. Employees should be positive in facing their challenges, which will help them in improving their functional skills and reduce stress, so that their profession is not affected. It is recommended that regular assessment of stress level should be conducted for preventive measures. Direct physiological measures of stress like diagnostic tests and consultation should be conducted by the Guidance Center and Medical Clinic and Experts in this field. Besides that, the management or employer should check that, supervision, support and relationship with the employees is properly taken care of and enhanced most strongly. Management should also suggest ways, like workshops and seminars to alleviate and cope with stress.
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