Analysis

Workplace Stress among Technical and Management Faculty – An Investigative Study

Anil Kumar Singh[1] **Vikas Tripathi**[2] **Priyender Yadav**[3]

Abstract

In every aspect of an individual's life, Stress is an integral part. Due to the growing competition at the workplace the stress level has also increased. At workplace, as in other areas stress can play a positive role by increasing alertness among staff and mobilizing their adaptive capabilities. Therefore, to some extent, a certain level of stress has the potential to actually contribute to organizational effectiveness. But stress can become counterproductive once the excessive levels of unresolved stress begin to affect the health and productivity of work force. . In fact, occupational stress has been defined as a "global epidemic" by the United Nations' International Labor Organization. The present research paper is an attempt to examine the sources and effects of work place stress among the Management and Technical faculty members of different academic institutions in Agra-Mathura region. For this purpose the data was collected by convenience random sampling of Management and Technical faculty members. The analysis has been done using different Statistical tools with the help of SPSS. The research suggests that there is no correlation between gender and the other demographic factors (age, designation, income, Change in personal habits etc). It was also found that most of the factors related to the measurement of stress level equally effect the stress level of technical and management faculty such as

[1] Reader, GLA Institute of Technology & Management, Mathura
[2] Reader, GLA Institute of Business Management, Mathura
[3] Assit Prof., GLA Institute of Technology & Management, Mathura

absenteeism due to stress and difficulty taking vacation/holiday/time etc.

Keywords: Stress, Management and Technical Faculty.

Introduction

Stress is an unpleasant state of emotional and physiological arousal that people experience in situations that they perceive as dangerous or threatening to their well-being. The word *stress* means different things to different people. Some people define stress as events or situations that cause them to feel tension, pressure, or negative emotions such as anxiety and anger. Others view stress as the response to these situations. This response includes physiological changes—such as increased heart rate and muscle tension—as well as emotional and behavioral changes. However, most psychologists regard stress as a process involving a person's interpretation and response to a threatening event.

Selye, a pioneer in the biological research of the causes and effects of stress, described stress as "the rate at which we live at any moment. Anything pleasant or unpleasant that Speeds up the intensity of life causes a temporary increase in stress". Further, he wrote "Everybody has it, everybody talks about it, yet few people have taken the trouble to find out what Stress really is" Researched and he expected it would be for many years to come. His prediction has proven true; between 1988-

The authors owe their thanks to Ms. Sweta Gaur, MBA Final Year Student, GLA Institute of Technology & Management, Mathura for the assistance in data collection.

93 7,000 papers were produced on stress and a further 10,000 between 1993-1996.

Walter Cannon's (1935) focus on 'fight or flight' response. Will the person feel he/she can stay and face the threat (fight) or will he/she run from the danger (flight)? The body's alarm reaction to stress causes a surge of adrenalin which may result in physical changes such as: increased pulse rate; an increase in blood pressure which improves blood circulation to the muscles and stimulates the nervous system; decreased peristalsis and stomach digestion; faster blood clotting time; and raised blood sugar which supplies more energy to the muscles. Lazarus (1966) has pointed out that an important factor in the response to stress is the individual's assessment of the stressor and the manner in which he copes with it. He says coping involves acting directly toward the stressor and alleviating it.

Hiebert (1985) has reviewed the concept of stress and found the terms pressure, demands, stressors and stress are used interchangeably by many people. He differentiated between these terms by explaining that demands placed on an individual are pressures. Hiebert explains that when a situation is perceived by an individual to be beyond his coping resources the demand becomes a stressor and results in stress. A stressor may be physical or emotional. Those demands that do not invoke a stress response remain as pressures.

Hiebert found that three models of stress have been consistently presented: an environmental model (stimulus event), an individual response, and an interaction between the environment and the person. He favors' the interactional model because the individual is in a less passive role in controlling the stress.

Burnout

Burnout is a frequently used term which is often used interchangeably with stress. There is no one single definition for burnout but it appears to be a process beginning with an individual's perceived stress.

Friedman (1995**)** refers to burnout as "unmediated stress" and says that stress in teaching is "the onset of the burnout process."

Beverly Potter (1995) says that if the symptoms of burnout are ignored the individual may eventually dread going to work. Further, Potter cautions that the feelings of burnout are not restricted to work; they infiltrate all aspects of the person's life.

Workplace Stress

Meichenbaum & Fitzpatrick, (1982**)** found that Workplace stress is also costly. Stress results in health insurance outlays, burnout, absenteeism, and reduced productivity, costly mistakes in the office and on the shop floor, poor morale, high employee turnover, as well as family, alcohol and drug-related problems.

Lowe & Northcott, 1987; Cooper & Travers, 1996; Eysenke, 1996; Farazher 1996 Found in their study that people are working longer than ever and with less job security. The nature of work is rapidly changing and now, perhaps more than ever before, job stress poses a threat to the health of workers. Exposure to stressful working conditions can produce negative effects on the body (stress) and that this stress is considered a contributor to a broad variety of health problems from the common cold to cancer.

Phillips1982; Rice, 1992; Rest, 1996; Cartwright & Cooper, 1997 says that usually, a person reacts to and handles a situation and his or her body returns to normal with few side effects. What often occurs in the workplace, however, is neither a fight nor flight. Instead, depending on how the individual perceives the situation and how well he/she copes,

the body may stay in a state of elevated arousal keeping blood pressure high and heart rate elevated. Individuals may be left feeling weak, helpless, demoralized, and in some cases also feeling responsible and culpable.

Warren, 1994 found that the most common causes of workplace stress were unreasonable deadlines, conflicts with other people, no feedback on performance, unclear duties, and lack of control. Warren also found a strong correlation between workplace stress and the health of the worker. He posited that increased workplace stress can deny individuals the opportunity to realize optimum health.

Teacher Stress

Eliot, 1950 I have never worked in a coal mine, or a uranium mine, or in a herring trawler; but I know from experience that working in a bank from 9:15 to 5:30, and once in four weeks the whole of Saturday, with two weeks holidays a year, was a rest cure compared to teaching in a school.

Melhuish 1978 through its detrimental effect on the body's biochemistry,for example by an increased production of stomach acid leading to ulcers of the stomach and duodenum.

Kyriacou and Sutcliffe 1978a initially believed that how a teacher assesses the demands made upon him was dependent upon his or her personal characteristics and his/her perception of the demands. However, further research (1978b) with 257 teachers in 16 schools convinced them that the demographic characteristics (sex, qualifications, age, length of teaching experience, and position held at school) had little to do with stress appraisal. They found that personality characteristics might be a determinant and they reported that perception played a large role.

Quick and Quick 1984 also noted that stress has been identified as a contributory factor in a wide range of health problems, such as headaches, backaches and skin diseases. Stress issues do not only exacerbate health problems but also

hamper recovery.
Kyriacou's & Sutcliffe'done self-report study on the 25 teachers in England 20% described teaching as very stressful or extremely stressful. Seventeen symptoms of stress were identified, the most common being 'feeling exhausted' and 'frustrated'. These feelings of stress were in response to four particular stressors: pupil misbehavior, poor working conditions, time pressures, and poor school character. Similarly, in Hebert's study of Canadian teachers work overload (or lack of sufficient time) and student discipline were the most consistently reported stressors.On ther hand Kyriacou and Sutliffe found that a teacher's individual characteristics partly determine the ability to cope with stress. They also looked at psychological, physiological and behavioral responses of teachers and the chronic stress effects that may lead to coronary heart disease, lowered immune response and/or exhaustion.
Blase 1986 In one of the few qualitative studies on teacher stress designed the Teacher Stress Inventory (TSI), an open-ended questionnaire to "collect data from teachers that would encourage free expression of personal meanings associated with stress" the TSI was administered to 392 teachers from elementary through senior high school levels. Data was analyzed using grounded theory and constant-comparative analysis. Ten major categories of perceived sources of significant stress were identified, four of which comprised 83.1% of the responses: organizational stressors (e.g. lack of time, lack of materials, excessive paper work, role overload), students (e.g. behavior, apathy, absenteeism, poor achievement), administrative problems (e.g. unclear expectations, lack of support, harassment, poor evaluation procedures), and conflict with colleagues (e.g. lack of cooperation, negative attitude, incompetence or irresponsibility).The other six categories were: parental

interference, non-support or apathy; lack of professional in-servicing and job insecurity; professional-personal conflict; unrealistic and low standard academic programmes and negative public attitude.

Time was a significant factor in several of the stressors and Blase emphasizes the importance this plays in all aspects of teacher stress. His study also found a strong correlation between work stress and negative feelings in teachers. Clearly, the data suggested that dealing with work stress results in considerable anger toward others. Blase strongly encourages attention to the organizational orientation of schools which he discerns as "preventing productive teaching and learning"

Dollard (2001). In her research she identifies a range of theoretical approaches which seek to explain work-related stress - in terms of stimulus- response combinations, sociological or psychological paradigms, or emphasis on factors in the environment or in the individual as the source of stress. Most current theory is psychologically-based, according to Cox, Griffiths and Real-Gonzalez (2000), and "conceptualizes work-related stress in terms of a negative psychological state, and the dynamic interaction between the person and their work environment.

Reasons of Stress Among Teachers

"***I have never worked in a coal mine, or a uranium mine, or in a herring trawler; but I know from experience that working in a bank from 9:15 to 5:30, and once in four weeks the whole of Saturday, with two weeks holidays, was a rest cure compared to teaching in a school" (Eliot, 1950).***

Teacher stress has been of concern for many years.(Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1976; Kelly and Berthelsen, 1995.

In 1977 Hunter wrote "air traffic control, surgery and teaching are probably three of the most potentially stressful occupations in the world...in them people are responsible for

functioning in learned patterns yet must also possess on-their-feet, high-speed thinking and decision-making skills to handle the unexpected situations triggered by variance of humans and the caprice of nature.

Selye(1974), Hiebert(1985) and Blase(1986), Kryiacou and Sutcliffe(1978a) favor a physiological (interactive) model of stress. Within an interactive model, change precipitates an imbalance between the individual and the environment, necessitating adjustments to bring the relationship back into harmony. This interactive model portrays a clear picture of how stress invades an individual's body and is easily understood by lay persons. The teacher may feel unable to cope with the demands made of him and fear failure *or* these demands may be at variance with his/her higher order needs (needs for self-actualization).

Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1978a) initially believed that how a teacher assesses the demands made upon him was dependent upon his or her personal characteristics and his/her perception of the demands.

However, further research (1978b) with 257 teachers in 16 schools convinced them that the demographic characteristics (sex, qualifications, age, length of teaching experience, and position held at school) had little to do with stress appraisal. They found though, that personality characteristics might be a determinant and they reported that perception played a large role.

Kyriacou (1987) defines teacher stress very straightforwardly as "the experience of a teacher of unpleasant emotions such as tension, frustration, anger, and depression resulting from aspects of his work as a teacher".

Finally, the TSI was administered to 392 teachers from elementary through senior high school levels. Data was analyzed using grounded theory and constant-comparative analysis. Ten major categories of perceived sources of

significant stress were identified, four of which comprised 83.1% of the responses: organizational stressors (e.g. lack of time, lack of materials, excessive paper work, role overload), students (e.g. behaviour, apathy, absenteeism, poor achievement), administrative problems (e.g. unclear expectations, lack of support, harassment, poor evaluation procedures), and conflict with colleagues (e.g. lack of cooperation, negative attitude, incompetence or irresponsibility).The other six categories were: parental interference, non-support or apathy; lack of professional in-servicing and job insecurity; professional-personal conflict; unrealistic and low standard academic programmes and negative public attitude.

Time was a significant factor in several of the stressors and Blase emphasizes the importance this plays in all aspects of teacher stress. His study also found a strong correlation between work stress and negative feelings in teachers. Clearly, the data suggested that dealing with work stress results in considerable anger toward others. Blase strongly encourages attention to the organizational orientation of schools which he discerns as "preventing productive teaching and learning".

The Blase's(1986) findings that Time pressures emerged as the major stressor. Students, parents, interpersonal relationships, the increasing number of non-teaching tasks being designated to teachers were also reported as stressors. It is interesting to note that these participants identified concerns about inclusive classrooms and the demands this places on the teacher's role.

Dimension of Stress

Much of the research literature on the causes of teacher stress has focused on the highly interpersonal nature of teaching, and in the compulsory sector has identified disruptive

behaviour by students, dealing with parents, and conflict with colleagues to be among the major sources of stress reported by teachers.

Some researchers have argued that structural rather than interpersonal factors are responsible for teacher stress; Manthei and Solman, for example, in their 1988 study of group of New Zealand state schools, cite several other studies in support of their contention that "the major sources of stress for teachers are structural, and need to be recognised as such". As an example, they point out that reducing class size would have a significant effect on two of the major stressors reported by teachers, disruptive student behaviour and the physical working environment. In other words, organizational structures determine the extent of the impact on teachers of the interpersonal stressors inherent in their role(Dua, 1994; Winefield and Jarrett, 2001;Winefield, Gillespie, Stough, Dua, Hapuarachchi and Boyd, 2003). These findings were corroborated in the first phase of a longitudinal study of Australian university staff which employed focus group methodology to examine the causes, consequences and moderators of stress (Gillespie et al., 2001). In the U.S., Hogan, Carlson and Dua replicated in part Dua's 1994 study, with similar results. No major differences emerged in these studies between the stressors reported by academic staff, and those of other staff.

Hardie-Boys (1996) concluded similarly that institutional climate and morale, workload, interruptions to work, and management were among the major stressors for polytechnic teachers. Interestingly, in the latter study the lack of relief staffing was the most frequently-mentioned stressor; this is presumably not an issue of concern in universities, although it is mentioned in some studies of the compulsory sector. Funding and resourcing were also stressors mentioned in this survey, and a common factor, as elsewhere, was the impact of

educational and organizational change. Kinman (2001) in reviewing nine studies in the U.K. tertiary sector between 1990 and 1998, identified workload, particularly working hours; the encroachment of work into personal life; administrative work; and bureaucratic and mechanistic management styles, as among the main sources of stress. In contrast to findings in the compulsory sector, she also suggests that there is evidence that contact with students may be a positive factor in the work of tertiary teachers, rather than a stressor.

Objectives of the Study

To determine various factors that causes stress among faculty members.

To find out the difference in the stress levels among the Technical and Management the faculty member.

To determine the cause of stress on work as well as in personal life of people.

To find out the effect of stress on work as well as in personal life of people.

Research Methodology

The research is about the *"**work place stress among technical and management faculty An Investigative Research**"* **.**This study will be carried on by doing the survey of the faculty members of the technical and management institute. This is a diagnostic type of research. Survey method is adopted using questionnaires with appropriate scaling techniques. The survey was done on the faculty members of the technical and management faculty of different institutions, in Agra-Mathura region. A sample of 30 faculty members of the technical department and 30 members of the department of management studies was collected by purposive random sampling.

The collected response was processed on SPSS and Excel, Correlation and t-test is applied.

Hypothesis under Study

The following hypothesis have been examined

H_1 There is a relationship between absenteeism and stress at work place.

H_2 There is a relationship between job satisfaction and stress at work place

H_3 There is a relationship between income and stress at work place

H_4 There is a relationship between sleeping less than 8 hrs and stress at work place

H_5 There is a relationship between difficulty in making decision and stress at work place

H_6 There is a relationship between delayed at work place and stress at work place

H_7 There is a relationship between work role change and stress at work place

Results and Analysis

Reliability

The internal; reliability of the items was verified by computing the Cronbach's alpha (Nunnally,1978). He suggested that a minimum alpha of 0.6 sufficed for early stage of research. The Cronbach alpha estimated for current instrument was 0.706, which is higher than 0.6 so the instrument was therefore deemed to have adequate reliability.

Correlation Analysis

The following results were obtained by correlation analysis on some basic factors like age income etc. No correlation was found between gender and the other factors such as age, income, change in social activities, work role change, work more than 40hr a week and sleep less than 8 hr at night.

Meaning here by that the stress equally affects both male and female. A

positive and moderate correlation between age and income of the respondent an also be seen. A positive but low correlation can also be seen between the age of the respondent and work role change .Age is positively correlated with income, work role change, sleeping duration. There is a positive and low correlation between sleep and age of the respondents. Where as a low and positive correlation between sleep and income of the respondents were also found. Further for some more important factors the correlations were found as below.

Table 1 : Correlations among the different factors to analyze the stress level among the technical and management faculty members

		D.I.C.A.W.P.	D.I.M.D.	F.R. U. S.O.P.	F.I. W.D.W.	I .F.I. A.	I. F. M.G.F.	Q.W.S.D. W.P.S.	J.S.D.A.W.P.	S.H.H.P.W. P.	W.P.A.
difficulty in concentrating at workplace	**Pearson Correlation**	1	.559 (**)	.166	.065	-.085	-.014	.273 (*)	-.031	.004	.220
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.206	.621	.519	.918	.035	.816	.974	.091
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
difficulty in making decision	**Pearson Correlation**	.559 (**)	1	.166	.100	-.085	-.095	-.011	-.097	.101	.188
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.206	.447	.519	.472	.936	.463	.443	.150
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.929	.372	.194	.054	.872	.470	.944	.942	.171	.803
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60

feeling restless and unable to sit at one place	**Pearson Correlation**	.166	.166	1	.279 (*)	.006	.210	-.026	.094	.040	-.096
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.206	.206	.	.031	.963	.108	.842	.473	.764	.467
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
found impatient when delayed at work	**Pearson Correlation**	.065	.100	.279 (*)	1	-.068	.241	.078	.004	.105	.334 (**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.621	.447	.031	.	.603	.063	.555	.977	.423	.009
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
I found irritable and angry	**Pearson Correlation**	-.085	-.085	.006	-.068	1	.270 (*)	.038	.279 (*)	.165	-.005
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.519	.519	.963	.603	.	.037	.772	.031	.207	.971
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
I found myself getting frustrated	**Pearson Correlation**	-.014	-.095	.210	.241	.270 (*)	1	.170	.178	.087	-.005
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.918	.472	.108	.063	.037	.	.193	.174	.509	.967
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
the quality of your work suffered due to workplace stress	**Pearson Correlation**	.273 (*)	-.011	-.026	.078	.038	.170	1	.320 (*)	.346 (**)	.425 (**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.035	.936	.842	.555	.772	.193	.	.013	.007	.001
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
in your opinion	**Pearson**	-	-	.094	.004	.279	.178	.320	1	.420	.346

has your job satisfaction decline due to workplace stress	**Correlation**	.031	.097			(*)		(*)		(**)	(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.816	.463	.473	.977	.031	.174	.013	.	.001	.007
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
is the stress health and safety hazard/problem in your workplace	**Pearson Correlation**	.004	.101	.040	.105	.165	.087	.346 (**)	.420 (**)	1	.406 (**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.974	.443	.764	.423	.207	.509	.007	.001	.	.001
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
in your opinion has absenteeism due to stress at your workplace	**Pearson Correlation**	.220	.188	-.096	.334 (**)	-.005	-.005	.425 (**)	.346 (**)	.406 (**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.091	.150	.467	.009	.971	.967	.001	.007	.001	.
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.016	.281	.428	.076	.353	.437	.024	.011	.027	.000
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60

The above table depicts that there is a positive and moderate correlation between difficulty in decision making and difficulty in concentrating at workplace. It can also be seen that if a person is coming late he has the feeling of restlessness and is unable to sit at one place .Delaying also causes absenteeism .It has been found that irritation and anger, declining the job satisfaction due to stress. The research has also found that Quality of work suffers due to difficulty in concentration, safety and health decline in job satisfaction, absenteeism. A positive and high correlation can also be seen in Decline in job satisfaction due to work place stress and safety and work problem and also absenteeism at work place.

t-*Test Analysis*

The t-test was applied by using SPSS to test the different hypothesis and their results were obtained as

Result of Hypothesis 1
Since the value of p>0.05, i.e. 0.638, thus we **accept** the null hypothesis and conclude that there is significant relationship between in the absenteeism and the work place stress among the technical and management faculty.

Result of Hypothesis 2
As the value of p>0.05, i.e., .332 so we **accept** the null hypothesis and conclude that there is significant relationship between the decline in job satisfaction and the work place stress among the technical and management faculty. Thus it can be concluded that the job satisfaction declines as the work place stress increases.

Result of Hypothesis 3
Since the value of p>0.05, i.e. .328 , so we **accept** the null hypothesis and conclude that there is significant relationship between the income of respondent and the work place stress among the technical and management faculty. Thus one can say that as the income of respondent's changes the work place stress also changes.

Result of Hypothesis 4
Since the value of p<0.05, i.e., .044 so we **reject** the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant relationship between the sleep of less than 8 hr at night and the work place stress among the technical and management faculty.

Result of Hypothesis 5

Surprisingly since the value of p<0.05, i.e., .004 so we **reject** the null hypothesis and conclude that there is **no significant** relationship between the difficulty in making decision and stress at work place among the technical and management faculty.

Result of Hypothesis 6

Since the value of p>0.05, i.e.0 .230 , we **accept** the null hypothesis and conclude that there is **significant** relationship between being delayed and impatient and stress at work place among the technical and management faculty.

Result of Hypothesis 7

Since the value of p<0.05, i.e., .021 so we **reject** the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant relationship between role change **and** stress at work place among the technical and management faculty.

(Note: The table showing complete analysis of t-test is given in the appendix)

Conclusion

There is no correlation found between gender and the other factors such as age designation, income, Change in personal habits, change in social activities, work role change, work more than 40hr a week and sleep less than 8 hr at night. It was found that if the faculty does not get the designation suited to his/her age it increases their stress level. The faculty who do not get the salary according to their designation they were found in the stress. There is negative and moderate correlation between income and designation of the respondents. There is positive but low correlation between the work role change and

work more than 40 Hrs of the respondents. There is a positive and low correlation between sleep and age of the respondents. It was also found that most of the factors related to the measurement of stress level equally effect the stress level of technical and management faculty such as absenteeism due to stress at your work place, difficulty taking your vacation/holiday/time , how long have you been working in your current position , the stress health and safety hazard/problem in your workplace, found impatient when delayed at work, found irritable and angry, getting frustrated, quality of your work suffered due to workplace stress, your opinion has your job satisfaction decline due to workplace stress, change in personal habits, change in social activates, difficulty in concentrating at work place, sleep less than 8 hr at night.

Limitations

Like the other empirical studies, this study is not without its limitations. Our sample consists of only Agra-Mathura region so it cannot be generalized. The study can be strengthened by increasing the sample size as the data analysis results and findings may vary substantially when the sample size is increased or decreased. The other limitation was that some respondents were biased due to the influence of their peers. Thus the study was conducted with these some other limitations.

References

Abouserie R. (1996). "Stress, coping strategies and job satisfaction in university academic staff" Educational Psychology 16 (1), 49-56.

Argyle (1989) *The Social Psychology of Work*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Arroba, T and James, K.(1987**)** *Pressure At Work*, Harmondsworth, Penguin .
Bertoch M., Neilson E., Curley, J., Borg, W. (1989). "Reducing Teacher Stress" *Journal of Experimental Education, 57*, 117-128.
Blasé, J. (1986). A Qualitative Analysis of Sources of teacher Stress: Consequences for Performance. American Educational Research Journal, Vo. 23, No.1, 13-40.
Blix, A.,Cruise, R., Mitchell, B. and Blix, G. (1994).Occupational stress among university teachers. *Educational Research 36* (2), 157-169.
Boyd S. and Wylie C. (1994) *Workload and stress in New Zealand universities*. New Zealand Council for Educational Research and the Association of University Staff of New Zealand: Wellington.
Brown M., Ralph S. and Brember I. (2002) Change-linked work-related stress in British teachers. *Research in Education, 67*(1), 1-13.
Cartwright S. & Cooper, C. (1997) *Managing Workplace Stress*. Sage Publications, California.
Cooper, C. & Travers, C. (1996) *Teachers Under pressure: Stress in the Teaching.*
Cox. (1987) *Stress, Coping and Problem Solving, Work and Stress*, 1(1) *Criticize the Critic and Other Writings*. Faber & Faber, London.
Edwards, J. (1992) A cybernetic theory of stress, coping and well-being in organizations. *Academy of management review, 17*, 238-278. Cited in B. Walsh (1998) Workplace stress: some findings and strategies.
Farber B.A. (1999) Treatment Strategies for Different Types of Teacher Burnout.
Gillespie N.,Walsh M., Winefield A., Dua J. and Stough C. (2001) Occupational stress in universities; staff perceptions of

the causes, consequences and moderators of stress. *Work and Stress, 15* (1) 53-72.
Griffith, J. Steptoe A. and Cropley M. (1999). An investigation of coping strategies associated
With job stress in teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 69* (4), 517-531.
Hiebert B. (1985) *Stress and teachers: The Canadian Scene.* Canadian Education Association, Toronto.
Hogan J., Carlson J. and Dua J. (2002) Stressors and stress reactions among university personnel. *International Journal of Stress Management 9* (4), 289-310.
Kelly A. & Berthelsen D. (1995) Preschool Teachers' Experiences of Stress. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11,* 345-357.
Kelly A. & Berthelsen D. (1995) Preschool Teachers' Experiences of Stress. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11,* 345-357.
Kinman G. (2001) Pressure points: a review of research on stressors and strains in U.K. academics. *Educational Psychology, 21* (4), 474-492.
Kristi A .Dyer. (1979) *Personal and Organisational Strategies For Handling Job Stress: A Review of Research and Opinion*, Personal Psychology,32
Kyriacou C. & Sutcliffe J. (1978b). Teacher Stress: Prevalence, Sources, and Symptoms. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 48, 159-167.*
Kyriacou C. (1987). Teacher Stress and Burnout: An International Review. Educational Research, 29, 146-152.
Kyriacou C.& Sutcliffe J. (1978a). A Model of Teacher Stress *Educational Studies, 4, 1-6.*
Lazarus, R. (1966). *Psychological Stress and the Coping Process* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Toronto.
Lazarus, R. S. (2003). Does positive psychology have legs? *Psychological Inquiry, 14*, 93-109.

Malinauskene V, Theorell T, Grazuleviciene R et al. Low job control and myocardial infarction risk in the occupational categories of Kaunas men, Lithuania. J Epidemiol Community Health 2004; 58: 131–5.
Meichenbaum, D. & Fitzpatrick, D. (1982). A Constructive Narrative Perspective on Stress.
Phillips E.L. (1982) *Stress, Health and Psychological Problems in the Major Professions.University Press Of America, Washington, D.C.*
Schamer L. & Jackson M. (1996) Coping with Stress: Common Sense about Teacher Burnout. Education Canada, summer 1996.
Schermerhorn (2001) *Management* 6th Edition, Wiley .Torrington, D.Weightman, J. and Johns, K. (1985) *Management Methods*, London, IPM.
Selye H. (1983). The Stress Concept: Past, Present, and Future. In C. L. Cooper (Ed.) *Stress.*

APPENDICES

Table 2: Reliability Analysis

Case Processing Summary			
		N	**%**
Cases	**Valid**	60	100.0
	Excluded(a)	0	.0
	Total	60	100.0
A List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.			

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	**N of Items**
.706	17

Table 2: Correlations among the different factors to analyze the stress level among the technical and management faculty members.

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	**Std. Deviation**	**N**
gender of the respondent	1.42	.497	60
age group of the respondent	2.25	.571	60
designation of the respondent	3.72	.555	60
income of the respondent	2.25	.654	60
is there any change in personal habits	1.52	.651	60
change in social activities	1.47	.650	60
work role change	1.57	.789	60
work more than 40hr a week	1.70	.830	60
sleep less than 8 hr at night	1.92	.907	60

Correlations

		gender	age	designation	income	Change in personal habits	change in social activities	work role change	work more than 40hr a week	sleep less than 8 hr at night
gender	**Pearson Correlation**	1	-.075	.067	-.117	.057	-.087	-.137	-.226	-.185
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.571	.614	.372	.667	.507	.297	.082	.158
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
age	**Pearson Correlation**	-.075	1	-.575(**)	.692(**)	.194	.228	.282(*)	.161	.302(*)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.571	.	.000	.000	.138	.079	.029	.219	.019
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
designation of the respondent	**Pearson Correlation**	.067	-.575(**)	1	-.548(**)	-.151	-.191	-.092	.033	-.115
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.614	.000	.	.000	.250	.144	.487	.802	.382
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
income	**Pearson Correlation**	-.117	.692(**)	-.548(**)	1	.249	.239	.410(**)	.141	.350(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.372	.000	.000	.	.055	.066	.001	.284	.006
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
change in personal habits	**Pearson Correlation**	.057	.194	-.151	.249	1	.222	.212	.198	.275(*)
	Sig. (2-	.667	.138	.250	.055	.	.089	.103	.130	.033

	tailed)									
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
change in social activities	**Pearson Correlation**	-.087	.228	-.191	.239	.222	1	.533(**)	.233	-.077
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.507	.079	.144	.066	.089	.	.000	.074	.561
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
work role change	**Pearson Correlation**	-.137	.282(*)	-.092	.410(**)	.212	.533(**)	1	.316(*)	.162
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.297	.029	.487	.001	.103	.000	.	.014	.217
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
work more than 40hr a week	**Pearson Correlation**	-.226	.161	.033	.141	.198	.233	.316(*)	1	.124
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.082	.219	.802	.284	.130	.074	.014	.	.346
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
sleep less than 8 hr at night	**Pearson Correlation**	-.185	.302(*)	-.115	.350(**)	.275(*)	-.077	.162	.124	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.158	.019	.382	.006	.033	.561	.217	.346	.
	N	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).										
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).										

Table 3: Independent sample test - table

Group Statistics				
	department of the respondent	**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**Std. Error Mean**

in your opinion has absenteeism due to stress at your workplace	**technical faculty**	30	2.07	.740	.135
	management faculty	30	1.97	.890	.162
have you had difficulty taking your vacation/holiday/time off because of your stress level	**technical faculty**	30	2.10	.662	.121
	management faculty	30	2.10	.885	.162
have you experience any of the following health effect because of the workplace stress	**technical faculty**	30	2.30	.794	.145
	management faculty	30	2.13	1.074	.196
how long have you been working in your causes rent position	**technical faculty**	30	2.27	.740	.135
	management faculty	30	1.93	.828	.151
rank three main factors which cause stress to you.	**technical faculty**	30	4.30	1.841	.336
	management faculty	30	2.80	1.710	.312
is the stress health and safety hazard/problem in your workplace	**technical faculty**	30	2.40	.675	.123
	management faculty	30	2.07	.907	.166
found impatient when delayed at work	**technical faculty**	30	2.13	.819	.150
	management faculty	30	1.90	.662	.121
i found irritable and angry	**technical faculty**	30	2.07	.785	.143
	management faculty	30	2.27	.640	.117
i found myself getting	**technical**	30	2.10	.607	.111

frustrated	**faculty**				
	management faculty	30	2.23	.679	.124
the quality of your work suffered due to workplace stress	**technical faculty**	30	2.07	.868	.159
	management faculty	30	2.27	.785	.143
in your opinion has your job satisfaction decline due to workplace stress	**technical faculty**	30	1.77	.728	.133
	management faculty	30	1.97	.850	.155
is there any change in personal habits	**technical faculty**	30	1.67	.711	.130
	management faculty	30	1.37	.556	.102
change in social activates	**technical faculty**	30	1.57	.728	.133
	management faculty	30	1.37	.556	.102
work role change	**technical faculty**	30	1.80	.925	.169
	management faculty	30	1.33	.547	.100
work more than 40hr a week	**technical faculty**	30	1.73	.907	.166
	management faculty	30	1.67	.758	.138
sleep less than 8 hr at night	**technical faculty**	30	2.13	1.008	.184
	management faculty	30	1.70	.750	.137
difficulty in concentrating at workplace	**technical faculty**	30	2.33	.711	.130

	management faculty	30	1.93	.521	.095
difficulty in making decision	**technical faculty**	30	2.37	.556	.102
	management faculty	30	1.90	.662	.121
avoid certain situation at home and workplace	**technical faculty**	30	1.93	.828	.151
	management faculty	30	1.73	.640	.117
feeling restless and unable to sit at one place	**technical faculty**	30	2.17	.699	.128
	management faculty	30	1.80	.551	.101
gender of the respondent	**technical faculty**	30	1.43	.504	.092
	management faculty	30	1.40	.498	.091
age group of the respondent	**technical faculty**	30	2.37	.490	.089
	management faculty	30	2.13	.629	.115
designation of the respondent	**technical faculty**	30	3.70	.535	.098
	management faculty	30	3.73	.583	.106
marital status	**technical faculty**	30	1.43	.504	.092
	management faculty	30	1.57	.504	.092
income of the respondent	**technical faculty**	30	2.33	.479	.088
	management	30	2.17	.791	.145

	faculty				

Table 4: T-Test For Measurement of the Difference on the Effect of Certain Factors Between the Technical And Management Faculty

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		**t-test for Equality of Means**						
		F	**Sig.**	**t**	**Df**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	**Mean Diff.**	**Std. Error Diff.**	**95% Confidence Interval of the Diff.**	
									Lower	**Upper**
in your opinion has absenteeism due to stress at your workplace	**Equal variances assumed**	3.448	.068	.473	58	0.638	.10	.211	-.323	.523
	Equal variances not assumed			.473	56.124	0.638	.10	.211	-.323	.523

have you had difficulty taking your vacation/holiday/time off because of your stress level	**Equal variances assumed**	7.649	.008	.000	58	1.000	.00	.202	-.404	.404
	Equal variances not assumed			.000	53.714	1.000	.00	.202	-.404	.404
have you experience any of the following health effect because of the workplace stress	**Equal variances assumed**	4.892	.031	.683	58	0.497	.17	.244	-.322	.655
	Equal variances not assumed			.683	53.415	0.497	.17	.244	-.323	.656
how long have you been working in your current position	**Equal variances assumed**	.217	.643	1.645	58	0.105	.33	.203	-.072	.739
	Equal variances not assumed			1.645	57.282	0.105	.33	.203	-.072	.739
Rank three main factors which cause stress to you.	**Equal variances assum**	.077	.783	3.270	58	.002	1.50	.459	.582	2.418

	ed									
	Equal variances not assumed			3.270	57.686	.002	1.50	.459	.582	2.418
is the stress health and safety hazard/problem in your workplace	**Equal variances assumes**	2.127	.150	1.615	58	.112	.33	.206	-.080	.747
	Equal variances not assumed			1.615	53.564	.112	.33	.206	-.081	.747
found impatient when delayed at work	**Equal variances assumed**	3.655	.061	1.213	58	.230	.23	.192	-.152	.618
	Equal variances not assumed			1.213	55.542	.230	.23	.192	-.152	.619
i found irritable and angry	**Equal variances assumed**	.657	.421	-1.082	58	.284	-.20	.185	-.570	.170
	Equal variances			-1.082	55.731	.284	-.20	.185	-.570	.170

	not assumed									
I found myself getting frustrated	**Equal variances assumed**	1.894	.174	-.802	58	.426	-.13	.166	-.466	.200
	Equal variances not assumed			-.802	57.297	.426	-.13	.166	-.466	.200
the quality of your work suffered due to workplace stress	**Equal variances assumed**	.376	.542	-.936	58	.353	-.20	.214	-.628	.228
	Equal variances not assumed			-.936	57.418	.353	-.20	.214	-.628	.228
in your opinion has your job satisfaction decline due to workplace stress	**Equal variances assumed**	.797	.376	-.979	58	.332	-.20	.204	-.609	.209
	Equal variances not assumed			-.979	56.654	.332	-.20	.204	-.609	.209
is there any	**Equal**	3.19	.07	1.8	58	.074	.30	.16	-	.630

change in personal habits	**variances assumed**	0	9	20				5	.030	
	Equal variances not assumed			1.820	54.812	.074	.30	.165	-.030	.630
change in social activates	**Equal variancs assumes**	4.271	.043	1.196	58	.237	.20	.167	-.135	.535
	Equal variances not assumed			1.196	54.247	.237	.20	.167	-.135	.535
work role change	**Equal variances assumed**	25.565	.000	2.379	58	.021	.47	.196	.074	.859
	Equal variances not assumed			2.379	47.063	.021	.47	.196	.072	.861
work more than 40hr a week	**Equal variances assumed**	3.632	.062	.309	58	.759	.07	.216	-.365	.499

	Equal variances not assumed			.309	56.226	.759	.07	.216	-.366	.499
sleep less than 8 hr at night	**Equal variances assumed**	23.418	.000	1.889	58	.044	.43	.229	-.026	.892
	Equal variances not assumed			1.889	53.567	.064	.43	.229	-.027	.893
difficulty in concentrating at workplace	**Equal variances assumed**	10.506	.002	2.485	58	.016	.40	.161	.078	.722
	Equal variances not assumed			2.485	53.159	.016	.40	.161	.077	.723
difficulty in making decision	**Equal variances assumed**	.088	.768	2.957	58	.004	.47	.158	.151	.783
	Equal variances			2.957	56.328	.005	.47	.158	.151	.783

	not assumed									
	Equal variances assumed	2.079	.155	1.047	58	.299	.20	.191	-.182	.582
	Equal variances not assumed			1.047	54.534	.300	.20	.191	-.183	.583
feeling restless and unable to sit at one place	**Equal variances assumed**	1.753	.191	2.257	58	.028	.37	.162	.041	.692
	Equal variances not assumed			2.257	54.997	.028	.37	.162	.041	.692
gender of the respondent	**Equal variances assumed**	.256	.615	.258	58	.798	.03	.129	-.226	.292
	Equal variances not assumed			.258	57.992	.798	.03	.129	-.226	.292

age group of the respondent	**Equal variances assumed**	.332	.566	1.603	58	.114	.23	.146	-.058	.525
	Equal variances not assumed			1.603	54.738	.115	.23	.146	-.058	.525
designation of the respondent	**Equal variances assumed**	.022	.881	-.231	58	.818	-.03	.145	-.323	.256
	Equal variances not assumed			-.231	57.572	.818	-.03	.145	-.323	.256
marital status	**Equal variances assumed**	.000	1.000	-1.025	58	.310	-.13	.130	-.394	.127
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.025	58.000	.310	-.13	.130	-.394	.127
income of the respondent	**Equal variances assum**	1.739	.192	.986	58	.328	.17	.169	-.172	.505

	ed									
	Equal variances not assumed			.986	47.758	.329	.17	.169	-.173	.506