

Original Research Article

An Empirical Study of Stress and Stress Management among Faculties of Private Technical Institutions in Meerut District

ABSTRACT

Stress is often described as a silent killer because the effect of stress is not readily apparent and it is observed that high level of stress is found at workplace. Job is part and parcel of life. Stresses on the job affect the efficacy and efficiency of a person. Hence, if one is not satisfied with his/her job the quality of life is adversely affected. Earlier teaching profession was recognized low stress occupation as they had light workload, minimum working hours and smart perks such as participation in conference and seminar. Some recent studies concluded that the degree of stress among the faculty in private technical institutions is quite high because most of people in this profession experience some kind of frustration, tension and anxieties related to the job assigned to them in addition to their underpaid job as compared to the government institutions. The present study was conducted to assess the level and sources of stress among the faculties in private technical institution and find out the impact of the stress on the performance and health of the faculties. The questionnaire based on five point likert scale was used to extract the information. Private Institutes should provide adequate workload, clean and safer working environment. They should also arrange yoga camp, meditation camp, aerobics, entertaining programs etc. for the alleviation of the job stress among faculty.

Keywords: Faculty, Private technical institutions, Job Stress, Stress management

1. INTRODUCTION

Stress refers to the strain from the conflict between our external environment and us, leading to emotional and physical pressure. In other words, stress is the feeling one experience when he perceives a gap between want and what ones get or has, it become an excess of demand over individual ability to meet them. In contemporary world, it is impossible to live without stress, whether you are student or working adult. There is both positive and negative stress. The positive stress is viewed as motivator since in its absence, **are** lacks the 'edge' necessary for peak performance. Stress is considered negative when it is associated with heart disease, absenteeism, breakdown and physical and organizational and emotional problem. Recent researchers demonstrated that individual responses to stress differ according to the stressor and varying environmental and personal factors. Stress can either help or hinder one's effectiveness depending upon the stress level. When the level increases, personal effectiveness increases but when the stress across the optimum level, the person's effectiveness declines. High level of stress decrease efficiency of person [1].

1.1 Stress at Workplace

Stress at workplace up to optimum level activates and energizes the employees to perform well but over stress can interfere the employee's productivity and adversely impact their physical and emotion health. The nature of job itself can determine the type and degree of stress that can be induced. Many job can be considered stressful but it does not mean that it impact on an individual psychological well being. Occupational stress and its effect have been among the most people as well as lead to thickening and hardening of the heart muscle, resulting in cardiovascular disease [2] because stress is becoming a major contributor to absenteeism, low employee morale and high turnover rates. The cost of these stress consequence has become huge burden on many organization [3].

1.2 Stress in Teaching Profession

Teaching profession was recognized as low stress occupation (Fisher, 1992). Many researchers were conducted on stress among faculties. For instance, Kyriacou (1980) reported that teachers when compared to people in other professionals had highest level of occupation stress [4]. Gebrekirstos, [5] and Samira [6] demonstrated that teachers experienced high level of stress as compared to other professional.

There are various reasons responsible for high degree of stress among faculties .These included, work overload, inadequate resources and funding and students interaction [7]. Earlier studies on stress at work place warned that high level of occupational stress, if left unchecked; it will undermine the quality, productivity and creativity of employers work and employee's well being [7]. Therefore, this study extends current literature of stress in teaching profession context. The purpose of the study was to indentify the factors which contributed to stress among faculties in private technical education sector and to assess impact on stress on their physical and emotional health. Considering all the above facts and figures, we designed following objectives:

- i. To study the socio-economic characteristics of the faculties of technical institutions
- ii. To assess the level and sources of the stress among faculties.
- iii. To know the impact of stress on the performance and health of the faculties.
- iv. To find out the ways and means for amelioration of the stress among faculties in private technical institutions.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Iqbal and Kokash [8] suggested in their study that top management and University administration should focus their attention on two areas, student interaction and profession identity to reduce the stress among faculty. Jacob [9] concluded that majority of women officer in bank are experiencing moderate level of stress and satisfaction. The relationship between stress and job satisfaction is negative. Swaminathan and Kumar [10] conducted strictly to determine stress among the employees and other demographic as well as work related factors. Kaur and Sachdeva [11] observed that women is playing

dual responsibilities abide double burden of job and family. Female teachers often receive not as much of social support, less integration in the staff and even smaller amount of family support. These finding regarding gender differences were consistent with other studies i.e. Antoniou et al, Al-Mohanndi and Capel, 2007 which showed that female employed in education and related sectors experience more work stress as compared to their male counterparts [12, 13].

Phadatare and Pisal explored the causes of workplace stress and psychological effects of stress on cooperative bank employees stress level [14]. It was found that there is significant positive relationship between employees stress level and psychological effects like anger, uneasiness, nervousness and majority of cooperative bank employees were under medium stress level. Mesko et al, identified the symptom of stress strategies for coping with stress and absenteeism among Slovenian middle management. Statistical analysis showed that managers who use problem-focused coping strategies are significantly less absent from work and experience lower levels of stress than managers who use emotion-focused stress coping strategies [15]. Manzoor et al, assessed the level of stress and satisfaction through using variable like management role, workload pressure role ambiguity and performance pressure [16]. Uma Devi highlighted its facts of stress which give rise dysfunctions and diseases [17]. The focus of study was to assess the stress level among the employees and suggest suitable coping strategies. some of the stress coping strategies indentified by study included the stress management, programme and physical activities planned in job design , life style, modification , programs finding triggers and stressors, supportive organization culture, stress counseling programs, and spiritual programs etc.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research design of the study dealt with identification of the causes at work place stress and level of stress of faculty of private technical institutions. **Descriptive research design was used for this study.** Data and information was collected using the primary sources i.e. primary data regarding socio-economic profile, cause of work place stress, level of stress and effect of stress on the health of respondents have been collected through structured questionnaire. The secondary data was collected from various journals and websites. The present study was conducted in Meerut city in Uttar Pradesh in India. The study was focused on workplace stress of employers working with private technical institutions in Meerut. For the same, data was collected through structured schedule and processed by using tables, mean, standard deviation; structured questionnaire was divided in to three parts. Population for the study was finite. The population for this study is composed of faculty in private technical institutions. A total of 155 questionnaires were distributed in 15 different private technical institutions but 123 usable and answered questionnaires were returned. A response rate of 50 percent is considered adequate for analysis and reporting (Babbie 2007). Data was classified and presented in tables and analysis is done by using mean, standard deviation, percentage and rank. Data was processed using MS-Excel software and analyzed using SPSS software to test the hypothesis.

109 Ho=. Job stress doesn't affect the health of faculties

110 H1= Job stress affects the health of faculties

111

112 4. RESULT

113 4.1 Demographic Profile of Sample Respondents

114 Table-1 showed the Demographic Profile of sample respondents. Respondents have been
 115 classified according to demographic features as gender, marital Status, educational, age qualification,
 116 experience, income, designation and formation of family.

117 **Table-1 Demographic Profile of Sample Respondents (N=123)**

S.N.	Profile Particulars		No. of Respondents	Percentage
1.	Gender	Male	59	47.97
		Female	64	52.03
2.	Marital Status	Married	70	56.91
		Unmarried	52	42.28
		Widow	1	0.81
		Widower	0	0
		Separated	0	0
3.	Education	Under Graduate	7	5.69
		Post Graduate	81	65.86
		M.Phil	10	8.13
		P.hd	20	16.26
		Post Doctorate	1	0.81
		NET (UGC/ICAR/CSIR)	3	2.44
		Other	1	0.81
4.	Age (years)	Below 20 years	2	1.63
		20-29 years	81	65.85
		30-39 years	32	26.02
		40-49 years	8	6.5
		50-60 years	0	0
		Above 60 years	0	0
5.	Experience (years)	Less than 5 years	67	54.47

		6 – 10 years	41	33.33
		11 – 15 years	9	7.32
		16 – 20 years	6	4.88
		Over 20 years	0	0
6.	Income	Less than 10000	1	0.81
		10000-15000	27	21.95
		15000-25000	44	35.78
		25000-50000	43	34.96
		50000 and above	8	6.50
7	Designation	Professor	8	6.50
		Associate Professor	13	10.57
		Assistant Professor	76	61.79
		Lecturer	26	21.14
8	Formation of family	Nuclear	63	51.22
		Joint	60	48.78

(Source: Faculty Survey, 2015)

4.2 Sources of Job Stress

Table-2 shows the sources of stress among faculties due to teaching relationship with students. Counseling and teaching students individually, insuring discipline in the class and handling indiscipline was ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd with mean 3.37, 3.31 and 3.31 respectively.

Table-3 interprets the causes of stress while interacting with colleagues. Seniority complex among the senior colleagues, casual behavior of colleagues, irritating attitude of senior 1st, 2nd and 3rd having mean 3.31, 3.12 and 2.98 respectively. Respondent was given main reason for job stress is seniority complex among senior colleagues. Very less importance is given to non-cooperation of colleagues in completing job task.

Table2. Sources of stress due to teaching relationship with students

S.N.	Statement	Mean	SD	Coefficient of SD	Rank
1	Teaching students who are less interested in studies	2.81	1.31	0.47	5

2	Handling students who have poor attendance in classroom	2.85	1.21	0.42	4
3	Counseling and teaching students individually	3.37	1.52	0.45	1
4	Insuring Order and discipline in the class	3.31	2.29	0.69	2
5	Handling an indisciplined student in the class	3.02	1.56	0.52	3
	Aggregate mean		3.07		

(Source: Faculty Survey, 2015)

Table-3 Stress due to relationship with colleagues

S.N.	Statement	Mean	SD	Coefficient of SD	Rank
1	Non Cooperation of colleagues in work	2.75	1.70	0.62	5
2	Casual Behavior of Colleagues in completing the job	3.12	1.39	0.44	2
3	Immediate Senior's attitude is in appropriate and irritating	2.98	1.47	0.49	3
4	Seniority complex among the senior colleagues	3.31	1.59	0.48	1
5	Favourism done by colleagues on the basis on family relation, caste, religion, region and others.	2.86	1.74	0.61	4
	Aggregate mean	3.004			

(Source: Faculty Survey, 2015)

Table-4 Stress due to relationship with management

S. N.	Statement	Mean	SD	Coefficient of SD	Rank
1	Attitude of Chairman/Director about your working style.	2.84	1.69	0.59	5
2	Intervention by Head/Director of the institute about your routine activities.	3.23	1.64	0.51	1
3	Ever changing educational policies of	3.05	1.53	.50	2

	management.				
4	Lack of communication between the management and teachers	2.89	1.62	0.56	4
5	Reporting by head to management about routine activities	2.93	1.75	.60	3
	Aggregate mean	2.99			

(Source: Faculty survey 2015)

Table 5 Stress arising from teaching task

S.N.	Statement	Mean	SD	Coefficient of SD	Rank
1	Having excess number of students to teach in the class room	3.25	1.82	.56	2
2	Having workload more than prescribed work load by the UGC/AICTE/UPTU	3.27	1.42	.43	1
3	Delivering lectures continuously without intervals	3.03	1.59	.52	5
4	Over work time to meet work requirement	3.12	1.62	.52	3
5	Fewer holidays as prescribed by the UGC/AICTE/UPTU	3.09	1.69	.55	4
	Aggregate mean	3.15			

(Source: Faculty survey 2015)

Table-6 Stress arising from Research

S.N.	Statement	Mean	SD	Coefficient of SD	Rank
1	No provision for academic leave for participating in seminar/conference etc.	2.49	1.68	0.67	5
2	Having no time to do good quality research.	2.69	1.48	0.55	4
3	Having no provision for reduction in work load to accommodate research work	2.84	1.50	0.53	3
4	Teaching and research achievement to be considered equally in promotion procedures.	2.95	1.60	0.54	2
5	Inadequate research facilities in the institute.	3.08	1.55	0.50	1
	Aggregate mean	2.81			

(Source: Faculty Survey, 2015)

Table-7 Stress arising from administration and teaching task

S.N.	Statement	Mean	SD	Coefficient of SD	Rank
1	Execution of administrative duties with teaching and research assignment.	2.82	1.61	0.57	2
2	Making compromises in teaching and research work at the cost of excess administrative work	2.72	1.43	0.52	5
3	Inability to carry out teaching assignment to satisfaction on account of excessive workload and time shortage.	2.75	1.52	0.55	4
4	Neglecting basic things which are essential for a teacher like reading books, newspaper journals and magazines.	2.80	1.56	.56	3
5	Non attending seminar conference due to excess workload.	2.84	1.58	.56	1
	Aggregate mean	2.79			

(Source: Faculty Survey, 2015)

201

Table-8 Stress resulting from work home conflicts

S.N.	Statement	Mean	SD	Coefficient of SD	Rank
1	Inability to devote sufficient time for domestic and personal problems because of excessive work load	2.60	1.56	0.60	5
2	Seeing family member and friends less frequently	2.97	1.47	0.49	2
3	Postponing or cancelling personal appointments	2.88	1.46	0.51	4
4	Not being able to enough time to family and children	2.95	1.47	0.50	3
5	Doing household chores after reaching home	3.0	1.67	0.54	1
	Aggregate mean	2.88			

202

(Source: Faculty Survey, 2015)

203

Table-9 Stress resulting from work environment

S. N.	Statement	Mean	SD	Coefficient of SD	Rank
1	No Recognition by Head/Chairman / Director	2.84	1.732	0.61	2
2	Often being criticized by Head/Chairman / Director without any reasons	2.79	1.57	0.56	3
3	Colleagues and subordinate trying to letdown you unnecessarily.	2.47	1.66	.67	5
4	Colleagues spreading rumors	2.78	1.62	.58	4
5	Unhygienic condition at work place	2.95	1.68	.57	1
	Aggregate Mean	2.77			

204

(Source: Faculty Survey, 2015)

205

Table-10 Effects of stress on the faculty's health (n=123)

S.N.	Disease/ Disorder	YES	NO	Chi-square value	Tabulated value	Result
1	Hypertension	9(7.32)	114(92.68)	89.62	0.03	H ₀ is rejected
2	Cardio-vascular Disease	0(0)	123(100)	123	0.01	H ₀ is rejected
3	Pulmonary Disease	1(0.81)	122(99.18)	119.04	0.269	H ₀ is rejected
4	Diabetes	6 (4.87)	117(95.12)	100.17	0.003	H ₀ is rejected
5	Depression	15(12.12)	108(87.80)	70.317	0.063	H ₀ is rejected
6	Behavioral Disorder	9(7.32)	114(92.68)	70.317	0.002	H ₀ is rejected

206

(Source: Faculty Survey, 2015)

207

Table-11 Management of stress

S.N.	Statement	Mean	SD	Coefficient of SD	Rank
1	Talk to the social group	3.28	1.34	0.41	4
2	Try to think Positively	3.91	1.31	0.34	2
3	Jogging or doing exercise	3.45	1.67	0.48	3
4	Relax by doing something enjoyable	3.96	1.33	0.33	1
5	Proceed on leave	2.96	1.66	0.56	5
	Aggregate Mean	4.10			

208

(Source: Faculty Survey, 2015)

209

It is reported in the Table-4 that the causes of job stress due to relationship with management, intervention by head of the institution, the institution in your routine activities ever changing education policies of the management and reporting by head to management have ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd having mean 3.23, 3.05 and 2.93 respectively.

213

It has been shown in the Table-4 that the most workload more than prescribed by UGC/AICTE and UPTU, teaching excess number of the student in the class and overwork time have ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd having mean of 3.27, 3.25 and 3.12 respectively.

216

Table-6 depicted that inadequate research facilities, teaching and research achievement considered equally in promotion and no reduction in workload have ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd having mean of 3.08, 2.95 and 2.84 respectively.

219

The area in which faculty members felt most pressure is non attending seminar/conference due to excess workload, with a mean score of 2.84, followed by execution of administrative work with teaching and research and neglecting basic things essential for lecture like journal newspaper with a mean score of 2.82 and 2.80 respectively (Table-7). The lowest pressure core reported by faculty is making compromises in teaching and research work at the cost of excess administrative work, with a mean score of 2.09 (Table-7).

225

The result from the Table-8 showed that Doing household chores after reaching home, Seeing family member and friends less frequently and not being able to give enough time to family and children have ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd having mean 3.0, 2.97 and 2.88 respectively.

228

The Table-9 depicted the majority of stress derived from work environment: Unhygienic conditions, no recognition from head and criticized by seniors. Unhygienic condition at work place is the area in which faculty felt the most pressured, with a mean score of 2.95. Other area in which faculty felt more pressure was receiving insufficient recognition and criticized by senior, with a mean score of 2.84 and 2.79. The area where faculty felt the least pressured was letting down by colleagues, with a mean

232

score 2.47. Faculty member responded that their colleagues are supportive and they had friendly environment in their respective faculties.

It was found from the Table-10 that the calculated χ^2 values are greater than tabulated values at 5 Percent level at 1 degree of freedom which was extremely significant. Hence, null hypothesis rejected. Therefore, it was concluded that job stress affects health of faculties.

It is reported in the Table-11 that majority of the respondent released their stress through doing something enjoyable activity, think positive and involved themselves in jogging and exercises. This techniques had scored mean 3.96, 3.91 and 3.45 respectively.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

It has been observed that most of the faculties experienced stress. The results of this study affirms that majority of respondents feel stress because of teaching task and relationship with students which include more workload prescribed by UGC/AICTE/UPTU, workload provided by private institutions, overtime, excessive number of students from different stream in one class, handling undisciplined students etc. The present study also showed the adverse impact of stress on health of faculty member. High level of stress causes many disorders/diseases like hypertension, diabetes, behavioral disorder etc. among the employees. Ill health resulted in high rate of absenteeism and low turnover, industrial discontent and indiscipline, poor performance and low productivity and more accidents. In order to cope with their stresses, majority of faculty involved themselves in some enjoyable activities, think positively and exercise or Yoga. Employee's health also provides many benefits such as improved morale of employees, increased productivity of employees and also longer working period of an employee. Present study will help institutions to mitigate stress related problems of their employees by applying the above mentioned stress ameliorating measures. As most of the faculties feel that they feel stress at work, institutions should take positive steps to make their faculties free from stress so that they can work with optimum efficiency and effectiveness. Employees should be made free from not only over work load but also from several fears generating in their minds. Guidance and counseling, quality consciousness awareness programs, psychological support can be provided to employees. The Institutes should take care of employees by reducing excessive workload, so that the employees can give more time to themselves and their family and discharge other social responsibilities too. There should be arrangement of yoga camp, meditation camp, aerobic, entertaining programs etc. The working environment should be made clean and safer. There should be friendly environment among colleagues, support and encouragement from the boss.

6. LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The time period for carrying out the research was short as a result of which many facts have been left unexplored. Lack of time and other resources as it was not possible to conduct survey at very large level, 123 employees responded positively. The study is limited to the faculty of selected private technical institution of Meerut city and therefore the findings of the study cannot be extended to other areas. During collection of the data many employees were unwilling to fill the questionnaire due to lack of time. Respondents were having a feeling of wastage of time for them. Convenient sampling has been used in the study and it has its own limitations. Personal bias of the respondents might have crept in while answering a few questions. Area of present study can be increased from private technical to public and university, Sample size can be increased; other demographic details can be added in the future research and various other statistical tests can be used for comprehensive analysis and findings.

REFERENCES

1. Cox, T., Griffiths, A., & Rial-Gonzalez, E. Research on work related stress. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.2000.
2. Rozanski, A., Blumenthal, J. A. & Kaplan, J. Impact of Psychological Factors on the pathogenesis of Cardiovascular Disease and Implication for Therapy. *Circulation*. 1999; 99(16):2192-2217.
3. Ben-Bakr, K, Jefri, OA, & Al-Shammari, IS. Occupational Stress in Different Organizations: A Saudi Arabian Survey. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 1995; 10(5):24-28.
4. Kyriacou, C. Coping actions and occupational stress among school teachers. *Research in Education*. 1980; 24: 57-61.
5. Gebrekirstos, H. A. Occupational Stress among Secondary School Teachers and their Coping Strategies: The Case of Central Zone of Tigray Region. *International Journal of Academic Research in Education and Review*. 2015; 3(6):143-157.
6. Samira. Institute of Management studies and Research: HR Policies. 2012.
7. Gillespie, N., Walsh, M., Winefield, A H., Dua, J., & Stough, C. Occupational stress in universities: Staff perceptions of the causes, consequences, and moderators of stress. *Work and Stress*. 2001; 15(1):53-72.
8. Iqbal, A. & Kokash, H. Faculty Perception of Stress and Coping Strategies in a Saudi Private University: An Exploratory Study. *International Education Studies*.2011; 4(3): 137-149.
9. Jacob, K.K. Occupational Stress and job satisfaction among working women in banks. *Paradim .The Research Journal of Institute of Management Technology*. 2012; 16(1):29-38.
10. Swaminatham, P.S., & Kumar, R. Stress levels in Organisations and their impact on the employees behavior. *BVIMR Management Edge*. 2013; 6(1):79-88.

- 301 11. Kaur, S. & Sachdeva, R. Organisation role stress among college teachers in relations to Gender.
302 Gyan Management.2014; 8(1):107-110.
- 303 12. Antoniou, A.S., Polychroni, F., & Vlachakri, A.N. Gender and age differences in occupation stress and
304 professional burnout between primary and high School teachers in Greece. Journal of Managerial
305 Psychology.2006; 21(7):682-690.
- 306 13. Al-Mohannadi. & Capel,S. Stress in physical education teachers in Qatar. Social Psychology of
307 Education. 2007; 10:55-75.
- 308 14. Phadatare,R.G., and,Piscal D. S. A Study of Psychological Effects of Workplace Stress on Co-
309 operative Bank Employees in Satara City, Research Front. 2013; 1(1):25-32.
- 310 15. Mesko, M., Erenda, I., Videmsek, M., Karpljuk, D., Stihec, J., Roblek, V. Relationship between stress
311 coping strategies and absenteeism among middle-level managers, Management. Journal of
312 Contemporary Management Issues,2013; 18(1):45-57.
- 313 16. Manzoor, M.U., Usman, M., Naseem, M.A. & Shafiq, M.M. A Study of Job Stress and Job Satisfaction
314 among Universities Faculty in Lahore, Pakistan. Global Journal of Management and Business
315 Research.2011; 9:13-16.
- 316 17. Uma Devi, T. A Study on Stress Management and Coping Strategies With Reference to IT
317 Companies. Journal of Information Technology and Economic Development. 2011;2(2):30-48.
318