

## A STUDY AND EVALUATION OF STRESS ROLE ON FACULTY: AN ANALYSIS OF PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN HARYANA

Poonam Bakshi\*

Dr. Veeran Kochhar\*\*

---

### ABSTRACT

*The study on “A Study of Stress Role on Faculty: An Analysis of Professional Institutions in Haryana” was conducted on a random sample of 200 (100 each of male and female) faculty members of professional institutions of Haryana. Questionnaire for Demographic characteristic and Coping Strategies was used along with Employment Organization Sources of Stressors scale (Telaprolu and George, 2005). Frequency, percentage, t-test, correlation and step wise regression were used for analysis. Main Objective of this study was to find out the different stressors responsible for stress in faculty members of professional institutions and how these faculty members cope up with this stress.*

**Keywords:** stress, faculty members, stressors

---

\*Research Scholar, Singhania University, Rajasthan.

\*\*Assistant Professor, Maharaja Agrasen Institute of Management & Technology, Jagadhri

## INTRODUCTION

Teaching, as a profession involves a complex work environment, leading too much of stress. The job of being a faculty is both demanding and challenging. Faculty draw upon physical, emotional and intellectual resources in order to be effective in the classroom. Like all other professionals, faculty are also overwhelmed by multiple and complex challenges. They lag behind their counterparts in relations to the opportunities for self development and professional enhancement. In many parts of the world, faculty are rarely provided with the resources they need to meet the high demands and expectations placed on them. The long hours at work (as they supervise students' projects, evaluate students' work, prepare lessons and conduct the examination) coupled with pressures of their job environments eventually lead to debilitating health problems (Vaghn, 1990). Furthermore, the problems and hazards of society and particularly education system are aggravating factors that may cause, and as a consequence, faculty may prone to experience stress.

Within the context of occupational stress, faculty stress has undoubtedly become an area of major interest to educationists and education policy makers throughout the world. Teaching has many intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for people entering the pedagogical arena. However, teaching is not without its inherent problems. Problems associated with job related stress remain at the top of many faculty's list. The wealth of research published on faculty stress has indicated that it is the number one health problem amongst faculties (e.g., Fimian & Fastenau, 1990). Historically, the duties and responsibilities of faculty have been viewed as demanding. Duties such as instructional planning, managing of students, behavior, interacting with other faculties and administrators professionally have continued to increase in both complexity and accountability. Accompanying stressors such as meeting with parents, grading and evaluating students, and administrative paper work requirements can produce a great amount of stressful situations for the faculties

## TYPES OF STRESS

There are different types of stress, good and bad. Most people think that stress is always bad. Nothing can be far from truth! A little stress is absolutely necessary for our survival in this highly competitive world! Thus, we can classify stress into two groups the good stress or 'Eustress' or the bad stress or 'Distress'

Eustress is the good stress which helps us to improve our performance. For example, if there is no stress of performing well in the exams or athletic events, students will not study harder or the athletes will not sweat it out on the tracks. A certain amount of

positive stress keeps us pepped up to meet all challenges and is necessary for our survival and progress in life.

When stress gets out of hand, it becomes bad stress or distress, which will bring out the weakness within us and make us vulnerable to fatigue and illness. If distress is continued unchecked, this will lead to all the ill effects of stress.

The research literature acknowledges difficulty in pinpointing a single definition of the term stress. A frequently cited definition of stress has been provided by Selye (1974): “the nonspecific response of the body to any demand made upon it”. The term has been further defined by Gold and Roth (1993): “a condition of disequilibrium within the intellectual, emotional and physical state of the individual; it is generated by one’s perceptions of a situation, which result in physical and emotional reactions. It can be either positive or negative, depending upon one’s interpretations”

Faculty stress is defined by Kyriacou (1987) as “the experience by a faculty of unpleasant emotions, such as tension, frustration, anxiety, anger, and depression, resulting from aspects of work as a faculty” .Faculty burnout is defined by Kyriacou (1987) as “the syndrome resulting from prolonged faculty stress, primarily characterized by physical, emotional and attitudinal exhaustion”. While there are many different occupations in the education sector, teaching is identified as a particularly stressful job (Smith et al, 2000). Stress among teachers is a contributor to illness as well as a cause for some leaving the profession (Aitken 2002, cited in Verdugo and Vere). A German study ranked the teaching professions as the occupations at highest risk of poor mental health, with teachers in schools for pupils with disabilities and those engaged in the complementary education of apprentices most at risk (Hasselhorn and Nübling 2004).

In the education sector, work-related stress should be tackled at source, with a comprehensive strategy that: identifies possible sources of work-related stress, and their underlying causes (whether the work environment, how the work is organized, or the behavior of colleagues, students, or parents); examines the potential impact of work-related stress; works with the employees to identify and develop targeted solutions; works with the staff to implement those solutions and monitor their effectiveness.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Stress is an unavoidable characteristic of life and work. In any job, there are wide variety of potential causes of stress, some of which are common to both men and women, and others are specific to each group. Occupational stress describes physical,

mental and emotional wear and tear brought about by incongruence between the requirement of job and capabilities, resources and needs of the employee to cope with job demands (Akinboye et al., 2002).

The word coping has been used mainly with two meaning- ways of dealing stress and the effort to master harmful conditions, heat or challenge (Pareek,1997).

Successful individuals demonstrate exceptionally effective interpersonal skills. Above and beyond their technical expertise, they are adept at positively influencing other people. In the work place this means understanding the underlying motivations of others, their thoughts and feelings, communicating effectively about these, which includes giving and receiving the effective feedback and enrolling people in doing what needs to be done with minimal stress, conflict and resistance.

An attempt is made to critically review the literature of the past research work in relevance to the present study.

Blix et al. (1994) conducted a study on occupational stress among university faculty members and found that faculty having less than 10 years of experience had higher stress than faculty with more than 20 years of experience.

Ryhal and Singh (1996) considered university faculty for their study comprised sample of 100 faculty members 30 professors, 31 associate and 39 assistant professors. Results revealed that those with 26-35 years experience had higher job stress than those with teaching experience of 16-25 years and 5-15 years. Those with 16-25 years experience had higher job stress than those with teaching experience of 5-15 years.

Ansari and Singh (1997) made an attempt to explore the contribution of demographic variables to the nature of stress experienced by the faculty members in an agriculture university. The study comprised sample of 235 faculty members (23 professors, 74 associate and 138 assistant professors).The associate professor's total service experience was positively related to stress.

Bhagawan (1997) conducted a study on 100 faculty members selected from 20 schools in Orissa. The sample consisted of 100 faculty members (53 male and 47 female faculty members).The study revealed that higher the teaching experience, lesser the perceived burn out.

Bhatia and Kumar (2005) studied on occupational stress and burn out in industrial employees. A sample consisted of 100 employees belonging to supervisor and below supervisor level. Their experience/length of service varied from 2-6 and 7-12 years. Industrial employees at supervisor rank and below supervisor rank with more

experience of service had more occupational stress due to more feeling of depersonalization and more emotional exhaustion.

## **DATA ANALYSIS**

Factors causing stress among the professional institutions faculty members were divided into different categories to make the results clear like

1.1 Work stressors among the professional institutions faculty members

1.2 Role stressors among the professional institutions faculty members

1.3 Personal development stressors among the professional institutions faculty members

1.4 Interpersonal relation stressors among the professional institutions faculty members

### **1.1 Work stressors among the professional institutions faculty members**

Maximum percentage (28.5%) of the faculty members of professional Institutions expressed that the complex nature of their work did not baffle them. The faculty members reported that, they experienced stress always, for the same reason they were waiting for the day to come when they could relax (14.5%) and they were fed up by keeping themselves busy all the times to meet the deadlines (14.0%). Further, the faculty members also reported that they were stressed always because, most of the time they had to force themselves to start work (9.0%). On the other hand, the faculty members stated that, they enjoyed working long hours at work (9.0%), at times they loved when their hands were full which kept them busy at their work (7.0%) and the time passed without their notice each day at their work (6.5%). Also 6.5 per cent of the faculty members reported that, they experienced stress always due to the norms and expectations put curb on their enthusiasm.

Gender wise analysis revealed that 34.0 per cent of the male and 23.0 per cent of the female faculty members did not experience stress always due to the complex nature of work. On the other hand, it was found that, 17.0 per cent of the males and 12.0 per cent of the females were stressed always because they were waiting for the day when they could relax. Moreover, 16.0 per cent of the male and 12.0 per cent of the female faculty members were fed up by keeping themselves busy all the times to meet the deadlines.

### **1.2 Role stressors among the faculty members of professional Institutions.**

The faculty members reported that, they were constrained in their role fulfillment due to lack of knowledge and skill (8.5%), at times they need to sacrifice their values in meeting their role obligations (8.0%) and felt concerned due to poor information inflow

which restricted their output (7.5%).

The gender wise analysis revealed that 19.0 per cent of the males and 12.0 per cent of the females experienced stress always because their employment organizational responsibilities interfere with their family organizational role, where as 5.0 per cent of the males and 12.0 per cent of the females were constrained in their role fulfillment due to lack of knowledge and skill.

### **1.3 Personal development stressors among the Faculty members of professional institutions.**

60.0 per cent of the faculty members reported that they experienced stress always, because they were basically lazy persons and thereby were happy with fewer responsibilities.

The extra effort they need to prove themselves in their role was the cause of stress always among 13.5 per cent of the Faculty members and they wished to achieve the top position gave them extra energy to work in their organization, was the cause of stress always among 10.5 per cent.

The gender wise analysis of the results revealed that, experience of stress always by majority of the males (66.0%) and females (54.0%), because they were basically lazy persons and were happy with fewer responsibilities. Where as 6.0 per cent of the males and 21.0 per cent of the females reported that they were stressed always due to the extra effort they need to take to prove themselves in their role put pressure on them.

### **1.4 Interpersonal relation stressors among the faculty members of professional Institutions**

23.5 per cent of the faculty members reported that affectionate behavior from their colleagues was un-imaginable to them. Nine per cent of the respondent also reported that their colleagues went out of their way to make their life easier and 2.5 per cent of faculty members reported that their colleagues could be relied on when things get tougher for them at work.

Gender wise analysis revealed that 22.0 per cent of the males and 25.0 per cent of the females reported that affectionate behavior from their colleagues was un-imaginable to them. Ten per cent of each males and females reported that they lacked the freedom to ask for any sort of help when they need from their superiors, where as extracting work from their subordinates was an ordeal for them was reported by 8.0 per cent of the males and 18.0 per cent of the female faculty members. Only 5.0 per cent of the female faculty members were stressed always due to the wall existed between their

subordinates, which lead them to a sense of loss, where as 5.0 per cent of the female faculty members reported that their colleagues were approachable.

Table 1 Gender wise difference with the different components of employment organization sources of stressors

Sl. No.	Employment organization sources of stressors	Male		Female		t –value
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
1	Work stressors	21.51	8.55	20.60	7.50	0.799 <sup>NS</sup>
2	Role stressors	17.69	8.99	18.99	9.23	1.008 <sup>NS</sup>
3	Personal development stressors	22.72	6.32	24.96	6.55	2.459*
4	Interpersonal relations stressors	19.06	6.91	21.72	7.83	2.545*

With the help of table 2 it's clear that higher percentage of the faculty members were in the low stress category (70.5%) followed by very low stress category (23.5%) and lesser per cent in moderate stress category (6.0%). None was in high stress category. Gender wise also similar trend was observed.

Table 2. Distribution of the respondents according to the level of stress

Sl. No.	Level of stress	Male		Female		Total	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
1	Very low stress (1-80)	25	25.0	22	22.0	47	23.5
2	Low stress (81-160)	73	73.0	68	68.0	141	70.5
3	Moderate stress (161-240)	2	2.0	10	10.0	12	6.0
4	High stress (241-320)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

## CONCLUSION

With the help of above discussion we can say that already stress is there in educational institutions but maximum number of faculty members low stress category. But still we have to work to cope up with this stress and to convert that energy to productive energy.

## REFERENCES

1. Bunce, D., & West, M. A. (1996). Stress management and innovative interventions at work. *Human Relations*, 49(2), 209-231.
2. Adhia Hasmukh, Nagendra & Mahadevan B, Impact of adoption of yoga way of life on the reduction of job burnout of managers, *Vikalpa*, vol 35(2), April-june 2010.
3. DeRobbio, R. A., & Iwanicki, E. (1996, April). Factors accounting for burnout among secondary school faculty. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.
4. Etzion, D. (1984). Moderating effect of social support on the stress-burnout relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 615-622.
5. Fusilier, M. R., Ganster, D. C., & Mayes, B. T. (1987). Effects of social support, role stress, and locus of control on health. *Journal of Management*, 13, 517-528.
6. sbergis, P. A., & Vivona-Vaughn, E. (1995). Evaluation of an occupational stress intervention in a public agency. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 29-48.
7. Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burnout. *Journal of Social Issues*, 30, 159-165.
8. Matt Jarvis Stress News January 2002 Vol.14 No.1
9. Aswathappa, K, *Organisational Behaviour*, 9th revised edition, 321-342.
10. Kalia, pai, Ravishankar & Dhar, 1st edition, 2001.
11. Abrol, K.K., 1990, A study of Language Strain and Coping behaviours of Teachers, *Psycholinguia*, 20: 173-178. Aditi, N. and Kumari, B., 2005,
12. Impact of personality patterns and employment status on psychological stress tolerance of women in Kerala. *Indian Psy. Rev.*, 64(2): 103-108. Agrawal,
13. U. N., Malhan, N. K. and Singh, B., 1979, Some classifications of stress and its applications at work. *Ind. J. Indus. Rel.*, 15(1 ):41 -50.
14. Akinboye, J.O., Akinboye, D.O. and Adeyemo, D.A., 2002, *Coping with Stress in Life and at Work place*. Stirlin- Hordon Publishers (Nig), Ltd.
15. V.A. and Kamble, S.V., 2004, A study on work motivation and stress coping behaviour of technical personnel at a railway work shop. *J.Com.Gui*.

Res.21(3):321-329.

16. Aminabhavi, V.A. and Triveni, S., 1998, A study on occupational stress among railways employees. *Org. Manage.*, 13(4): 45-50.
17. Aminabhavi, V.A. and Triveni, S., 2000, Variables causing occupational stress on the nationalized and non- nationalized bank employees.
18. *J. Com. Gui. Res.*, 17(1): 20-29. Angadi, A. S., 2008, Emotional intelligence and stressors among working couples.