



JOB STRESS AMONG MALE AND FEMALE BUS CONDUCTORS

**Sunita B. Jamanal**

Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Community Science, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad -580005 India.

**Prema Patil**

Professor and Head, Dept. of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Community Science, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad -580005 India

**Lata L. Pujar**

Dean and Professor, Community Science College Dept. of Human Development and Family Studies, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad -580005 India

**ABSTRACT**

The present study was conducted during 2021-2023 in North-West Karnataka Road Transport Corporation (NWKRTC) Hubli-Dharwad. The present study was used to assess the job stress of male and female bus conductors. Self-structured questionnaire and occupational stress index scale was used. The study revealed that less than half of male (36.5%) and female (33.5%) bus conductors had moderate level of job stress. Whereas, 9.5 per cent of male and 15.5 per cent female bus conductors had high stress level and 4 per cent male and 1 per cent female had low job stress level. Female bus conductors had high level of job stress compared to male bus conductors. However there was significant association and difference found between job stress of male and female bus conductors. There was a significant difference between male and female bus conductors and dimensions of occupational stress like role overload, role ambiguity, responsibility for persons, intrinsic impoverishment, strenuous working condition and unprofitability. Where, in the entire dimensions, female bus conductors had more job stress compared to male bus conductors. The reason could be heavy work load, extra duty during Sunday, continuous vibration of the body during bus movements, constant communication with passenger for ticket collection, responsibility of daily collecting the money and depositing in office and family tensions.

**KEYWORDS :** Job stress, bus conductors, male and female

**INTRODUCTION:**

In India, many forms of public transportation are available for passengers. Among them, buses play a significant role. The transport sector has traditionally been seen as a man's domain. Up until 1980, women stayed away from this industry. In later years, women began to work as bus conductors in various regions of India. Similarly, circumstances can be seen in road transportation industries in both KSRTC and BMTC in Karnataka. Karnataka state transportation became the first to employ female bus conductors.

A bus conductor is a public servant whose earnings are not very high. They work continuously for long hours each day. They begin their work in early morning and almost at midnight. The bus conductors perform a number of tasks when they are on duty and are on their feet the whole time. In addition to selling tickets to passengers, they are also involved in other tasks like ticket distribution, taking note of tickets sold out, collecting money and depositing it at depot, assisting the driver when passing through congested roads and junction is an additional source of stress.

**MATERIAL AND METHODS:**

**Population Of The Study:**

The population of the study comprised of male and female bus conductors working in different places of Dharwad and Hubli.

**Sample For The Study:**

The study was carried out in North-West Karnataka Road Transport Corporation of (NWKRTC) Hubli-Dharwad. The sample size for the study comprised of 200 bus conductors based on purposive sampling method (100 male and 100 female bus conductors).

**Research Tools Used For Study:**

Self-structured questionnaire and occupational stress index by Srivastav and Singh (1981)

**Methods Of Statistical Analysis:**

Frequency and percentage, chi- square test, t- test and one way ANOVA was used.

**RESULTS:**

**Table 1: Demographic Characteristics Of Bus Conductors N=200**

Characteristics	Category	Male bus conductors (n=100)	Female bus conductors (n=100)
<b>Personal factors</b>			
Age	25-35years	22 (22.00)	28 (28.00)
	36-45years	47 (47.00)	33 (33.00)
	46-55years	31 (31.00)	39 (39.00)
Locality	Rural	64 (64.00)	57 (57.00)
	Urban	36 (36.00)	43 (43.00)
Education	SSLC	29 (29.00)	40 (40.00)
	PUC	43 (43.00)	34 (34.00)
	Graduation	17 (17.00)	26 (26.00)
	Post graduation	11 (11.00)	-
Job experience	6-10years	32 (32.00)	33 (33.00)
	11-15years	54 (54.00)	50 (50.00)
	16years and above	14 (14.00)	17 (17.00)
Distance travelled	Long route	50 (50.00)	30 (30.00)
	Short route	50 (50.00)	70 (70.00)
<b>Familial factors</b>			
Type of family	Nuclear	68 (68.00)	86 (86.00)
	Joint	32 (32.00)	14 (14.00)
Number of dependents	1-3members	5 (5.00)	34 (34.00)
	4-6members	60 (60.00)	48 (48.00)
	7members and above	35 (35.00)	18 (18.00)
Spouse education	Illiterate	6 (6.00)	4 (3.00)
	Just literate but no schooling	2 (2.00)	3 (3.00)
	<primary but attended school for at list one year	-	-

	Primary pass but < 10 <sup>th</sup>	15 (15.00)	5 (5.00)
	10 <sup>th</sup> class pass but < graduation	57 (57.00)	50 (50.00)
	Graduation	19 (19.00)	35 (38.00)
	Postgraduation	1 (1.00)	-
	Professional qualifications with technical degrees or diplomas e.g. doctors, eng.	-	3 (3.00)
Spouse occupation	Private employee	28 (28.00)	42 (42.00)
	Government employee	22 (22.00)	46 (46.00)
	Not working	50 (50.00)	12 (12.00)
Marital status	Married	100 (100.00)	100 (100.00)
	Not married	-	-
Socio-economic status	Upper high	2 (2.00)	8 (8.00)
	High	6 (6.00)	16 (16.00)
	Upper middle	23 (23.00)	42 (42.00)
	Lower middle	65 (65.00)	32 (32.00)
	Poor	4 (4.00)	2 (2.00)

**Table 2: Association And Comparison Between Level Of Job Stress Of Male And Female Bus Conductors N=200**

Bus conductors	Level of job stress				<sup>2</sup> value
	Low	Moderate	High	Total	
Male bus conductors Frequency (%)	8 (4.00)	73 (36.5)	19 (9.5)	100 (50.00)	6.746*
Female bus conductors Frequency (%)	2 (1.00)	67 (33.5)	31 (15.5)	100 (50.00)	
Total Frequency (%)	10 (5.00)	140 (70.00)	50 (25.00)	200 (100.00)	

(Figures in the parentheses indicate percentage, \*significant at 0.05)

It is observed from table-2 that less than half of male (36.5%) and female (33.5%) bus conductors belonged to moderate level of job stress. Whereas, 9.5 per cent of male and 15.5 per cent female bus conductors had high stress level and 4 per cent male and 1 per cent female had low job stress. A significant association ( $\chi^2=6.746$ ) was found between male and female bus conductors and level of job stress.

**Table 3: Comparison Of Job Stress Between Male And Female Bus Conductors N=200**

Bus conductors	Mean ± SD	t-value
Male bus conductors	151.05 ± 13.48	2.044*
Female bus conductors	154.5941 ± 14.92	

(Figures in the parentheses indicate percentage, \*significant at 0.05)

Table-3 shows comparison of job stress between male and female bus conductors. Female bus conductors had higher mean score (154.59) compared to male bus conductors (151.05). A significant difference (t=2.044) was found between male and female bus conductors with regard to job stress

**Table 4: Percentage Distribution Of Male And Female Bus Conductors By Dimensions Of Job Stress N=200**

Dimensions of job stress	Levels	Bus conductors	
		Male bus conductors (n=100) (%)	Female bus conductors (n=100) (%)
Role overload	High	8 (8.00)	30 (30.00)
	Moderate	74 (74.00)	31 (31.00)
	Low	18 (18.00)	39 (39.00)

Role ambiguity	High	21 (21.00)	32 (32.00)
	Moderate	41 (41.00)	29 (29.00)
	Low	38 (38.00)	39 (39.00)
Role conflict	High	27 (27.00)	38 (38.00)
	Moderate	35 (35.00)	26 (26.00)
	Low	38 (38.00)	36 (36.00)
Unreasonable group and political pressure	High	29 (29.00)	39 (39.00)
	Moderate	37 (37.00)	26 (26.00)
	Low	34 (34.00)	35 (35.00)
Responsibility for persons	High	38 (38.00)	24 (24.00)
	Moderate	49 (49.00)	46 (46.00)
	Low	15 (15.00)	33 (33.00)
Under participation	High	18 (18.00)	34 (34.00)
	Moderate	61 (61.00)	28 (28.00)
	Low	21 (21.00)	38 (38.00)
Powerlessness	High	32 (32.00)	24 (24.00)
	Moderate	50 (50.00)	41 (41.00)
	Low	18 (18.00)	35 (35.00)
Peer group relations	High	25 (25.00)	29 (29.00)
	Moderate	59 (59.00)	47 (47.00)
	Low	16 (16.00)	24 (24.00)
Intrinsic impoverishment	High	32 (32.00)	44 (44.00)
	Moderate	50 (50.00)	35 (35.00)
	Low	18 (18.00)	21 (21.00)
Low status	High	39 (39.00)	38 (38.00)
	Moderate	46 (46.00)	35 (35.00)
	Low	15 (15.00)	27 (27.00)
Strenuous working condition	High	41 (41.00)	22 (22.00)
	Moderate	39 (39.00)	37 (37.00)
	Low	22 (22.00)	44 (44.00)
Unprofitability	High	44 (44.00)	12 (12.00)
	Moderate	39 (39.00)	64 (64.00)
	Low	17 (17.00)	24 (24.00)

Results pertaining to dimensions of job stress are presented in Table-4. With respect to role overload, majority (74%) of male bus conductors had moderate level of role overload followed by low level (18%) and high role overload (8%). In case of

female bus conductors, 39 per cent had low role overload, 31 per cent had moderate level of stress and 30 per cent had high level of role overload.

With regard to role ambiguity, less than half (41%) had moderate followed by low level (38%) and high level of role ambiguity (21%). In case of female bus conductors, 39 per cent had low stress, 32 per cent had high and 29 per cent had moderate role ambiguity.

With respect to role conflict, majority (38%) of male bus conductors had low followed by moderate (35%) and high (27%) role conflict. In case of female bus conductors, 38 per cent had high, 36 per cent had low and 26 per cent had moderate role conflict.

With regard to unreasonable group and political pressure, majority 37 per cent had moderate followed by low (34%) and high (29%) unreasonable group and political pressure. In case of female conductors, 39 per cent had high, 35 per cent had low and 26 per cent had moderate unreasonable group and political pressure.

With respect to responsibility for persons, almost half (49%) of male conductors had moderate level of job stress followed by high level (38%) and low level (15%) of job stress. In case of female bus conductors, 46 per cent had moderate level of job stress, 33 per cent had low level and 24 per cent had high level of job stress.

With regard to under participation, majority (61%) had moderate level followed by low (21%) and high (18%) under participation. In case of female bus conductors, 38 per cent had low, 34 per cent had high and 24 per cent had moderate under participation.

With respect to powerlessness, approximately half (50%) of male conductors had moderate followed by high (32%) and low (18%) powerlessness. In case of female conductors, 41 per cent had moderate, 35 per cent had low and 24 per cent had high powerlessness.

With regards to peer group relations, more than half (59%) had moderate followed by high (25%) and low (16%) peer group relations. In case of female conductors 47 per cent had moderate followed by 29 per cent had high and 24 per cent had low peer group relations.

With respect to intrinsic impoverishment, half (50%) of the male conductors had moderate followed by high (32%) and low (18%) intrinsic impoverishment. In case of female conductors 44 per cent had high, 35 per cent had moderate and 21 per cent had low intrinsic impoverishment.

With regard to low status, less than half (46%) of male conductors had moderate level of job stress followed by high (39%) and low (22%) low status. In case of female conductors, 38 per cent had high followed by 35 per cent moderate and 27 per cent had low level of low status.

With respect to strenuous working condition, majority (41%) of male conductors had high followed by moderate level (39%) and low (22%) strenuous working condition. In case of female conductors, 44 per cent had low, 37 per cent had moderate and 22 per cent had high strenuous working condition.

With regards to unprofitability, less than half (44%) of male conductors had high followed by moderate (39%) and low (17%) unprofitability. In case of female conductors, 64 per cent had moderate followed by 24 per cent low and 12 per cent high unprofitability.

**By Dimensions Of Job Stress N=200**

Dimensions of job stress	Male bus conductors	Female bus conductors	t- value
	Mean ±SD	Mean ±SD	
Role overload	21.12±2.39	22.049±1.35	3.316*
Role ambiguity	12.17±1.31	12.990±1.14	4.751*
Role conflict	16.86±1.75	17.059±1.52	0.773
Unreasonable group and political pressure	11.89±1.324	11.782±1.33	0.584
Responsibility for persons	7.72±1.00	8.079±0.82	2.767*
Under participation	14.44±1.51	14.396±1.79	0.255
Powerlessness	9.71±1.27	9.722±1.08	0.059
Peer group relations	12.54±1.59	12.514±1.92	0.200
Intrinsic impoverishment	12.92±1.61	13.643±1.24	3.444*
Low status	10.12±1.17	10.188±1.16	0.303
Strenuous working condition	13.99±1.79	14.633±1.13	2.966*
Unprofitability	7.14±1.07	6.841±0.59	2.441*

(\*significant at 0.05, \*\*significant 0.01, NS-non significant)

Table-5 clearly highlights a significant difference between job stress of male and female bus conductors in the dimensions of role overload (t=3.316), role ambiguity (t=4.751), responsibility for persons (t=2.767), intrinsic impoverishment (t=3.444), strenuous working condition (t=2.966) and unprofitability (t=2.441) and non significant difference with regard to role conflict, unreasonable group and political pressure, under participation, powerlessness, peer group relations and low status dimension.

**DISCUSSION:**

Among male and female bus conductors (table 2 and 3) significant association was observed in the levels of job stress. A higher percentage of both male and female bus conductors had in moderate level of job stress and high level of job stress respectively. The reason could be heavy work load, extra duty on holidays, continuous vibration of the body during bus movements, constant communication with passenger for ticket collection, responsibility of collecting the money and depositing in office, lack of clean wash room facilities, bad roads, giving back change to passenger, hot and cold climate etc. The results are consistent with the findings of Rahmani *et al.* (2022) who also found that most of the bus conductors had moderate level of stress due to the noise and vibration in buses as the main stressors. Similarly, Somashekar and Vinodh (2012) quoted that bus conductors had more job stress due to handling commuters as one of the challenges, over work load, dual role, lack of leave facilities, low salary, shift hours and health hazard. Vijayarani and Shakila (2022) in this study concluded that government rules and regulations, bus breakdowns, working environment, time management issues, congestions, accident fear, overcrowding in the workplace, career growth, management support contribute to job stress. There is significant difference between male and female bus conductors with job stress. Female conductors face stress due to the pressure of work and male dominance at workplace, dual work load of balancing family and work place responsibilities, over work load, shift hours of working, not allowed to avail leave, long hours of working, contact with public, misbehavior of passengers, standing during rush hours and monthly problems etc.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

- Female bus conductors had high level of stress compared to male bus conductors. A significant difference (t=2.044) was found between male and female bus conductors with regard to job stress.
- There was a significant difference between male and female bus conductors and dimensions of occupational stress like role overload, role ambiguity, responsibility for

**Table 5: Comparison Of Male And Female Bus Conductors**

persons, intrinsic impoverishment, strenuous working condition and unprofitability. Where, in the entire dimensions female bus conductors had more stress compared to male bus conductors.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Dabholkar A S, Khatib S and Dabholkar T, 2015, Psychological problems faced by Navi Mumbai bus conductors, *International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health*, 2(2):184.
2. Durgamani M K, Suresh R V and Sethuraman G, 2018, Occupational stress among private bus-drivers and conductors in Thanjavur district, *International Journal Pure Applied Mathematics*, 119:289-425.
3. Kamala H and Jayasankar R K, 2015, Organizational role stress among government degree college teachers and bus conductors of public transport in Bengaluru: a Comparative study, *International Journal of Recent Scientific Research*, 6(3):3186-3189.
4. Potdar R T and Patil R R, 2015, Effect of stress on adjustment among MSRTC bus drivers & conductors in Jalgaon district, *International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 5(4):2231-5063.
5. Sabarinathan P, Saranya P and Shanmuga, 2017, An occupational stress of TNSTC employees (A Study with special reference to Pollachi Branch), *International Journal of Applied and Advanced Scientific Research*, 2(2):299-303.
6. Srivastava A K and Singh A P 1981, Manual of the Occupational Stress Index, Department of psychology, Banaras University, Varanasi.
7. Viday A K, 2010, Occupational Stress, Mental Health and life Satisfaction of Bank Employees, Shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in./bitstream/10603/04
8. Vijayarani K and Shakila D, 2022, An occupational stress of TNSTC employees in (Kumbakonam) ltd, *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*, 14(2):1308-5581.