International Journal of Advanced Research and Development
ISSN: 2455-4030
Impact Factor: RJIF 5.24
www.advancedjournal.com
Volume 3; Issue 2; March 2018; Page No. 1266-1273

Impact of role stress on higher education structure: An empirical study

S Mufeed Ahmad[1], Ahfaq Hussain Makhdoomi[2]
[1] Director, The Business School, University of Kashmir, Jammu & Kashmir, India
[2] Research Scholar, the Business School, University of Kashmir, Jammu & Kashmir, India

Abstract
This present study has been undertaken so as to come out with some positive contribution in the field of role stress. The study focuses on the academic, research and administration activities in the universities; it tries to find the nature and the dimensions of role stress to which faculties of organization are exposed to and the intensity of stress among higher education teachers. The study covered a sample of three hundred and fifty five (355) faculties of six universities, through stratified random sampling. The sample consisted of Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors in the hierarchical levels of the universities. In order to assess the stress levels among higher education teachers Employment Organization Sources of Stressors (EOSS) scale by Telaprolu and George (2005) was used. The study found that the teachers working in Indian Universities exhibit moderate levels of stress. Women university teachers experienced more stress than male teachers on few of the job related issues.

Keywords: role stress, higher education, administration, universities

Introduction
Higher education institutions are basically HRD (Human Resource Development) agencies set up for developing human resource in a country. There has been a massive expansion of higher education throughout the world. According to Sanyal and Martin (2006) [8], the total enrolment in higher education increased from 68.6 to 110.7 million approximately between 1990-1991 and 2001-2002. The developing countries doubled their total enrolment from 29.3 to 58.3 million while the countries in transition and developed countries increased their enrolment from 8.5 to 12.2 million and from 30.8 to 40.3 million respectively. According to Muffed (2001) [2], in India a lot of expansion has taken place in higher education during the past fifty years. It has undergone rapid development in the post-independence era. He further stated that in the year 1950-51, there were in India only 28 universities, 695 colleges and 17400 students. Today we have more than 200 universities and more 8200 colleges and nearby five million students.

Stress in twenty first century is not something new, not anything unknown. Stress has been experienced since time immemorial but its toll is higher than ever before. Among the hardest parts of living in modern world is stress. With the worries about work, the environment, the economy, natural disasters, terrorism and general state of the world, it seems that there is no end to the number of things to worry about. Though we cannot control many of these things, they still weigh on our minds and cause us stress. However, despite these concerns, we should try to avoid stress.

There is a talk of trauma at the workplace. We are all aware of scores of stress busting strategies yet their application does little to mitigate stress. Today we know much more about the stress than ever before. Internet search related 25, 68,931 documents under stress on a single site (www.alltheweb.com) yet we seem to be making little headway in solving our stress related problems. When we analyze visits to doctors, 75.90% are for stress related problems (Pareek 1999). Claims for stress are twice as high as those paid for non stress physical injury at the work place, incurring an annual cost of about $200 billion (Agrawal 2001) [16, 30]. A New Delhi based NGO Vikas School of Development reported that in 1996 a total of 4,100 persons contacted its helpline for people on the verge of committing suicide (Agrawal 2001) [16, 30]. This figure definitely requires some serious thinking. Stress in India can take many forms- for example, stress among the youth, adults, unemployment stress, Job stress, marital stress, health stress etc.

What does 21st century portend for Indian youth? It is becoming increasingly clear that youth of India face tremendous pressures regarding career, parental expectations and personal identity crisis. So much so that in recent years, numerous voluntary organizations have come forward to help youth cope with stresses in life.

Stress is a subject which is hard to avoid. The term is discussed not only in our everyday conversation but has become enough of a public issue to attract widespread media attention, whether it is radio, TV, newspapers, or magazines, issue of stress figures, everywhere. Different people have different views about it as stress can be experienced from a variety of sources. With increasing concern about quality of life, concern in stress has also increased. One has to give attention to role stress and extreme negative effect of stress-the burnout phenomenon. Various researches have shown that burnout is experienced most in professions dealing with human services and teaching being one of that is facing these problems (Joshi1990).

Need for the present study
Over the past few decades, higher education institutions all

over the world have been confronted with new demands and challenges in terms of restructuring, management and maintaining standards to improve their competitiveness (Chevaillier, 2002; Gamage & Mininberg, 2003; Harman, 2002; Henkel, 2002; Reponen, 1999) [24].

While the topic of teacher stress has been widely studied, far fewer studies have been conducted on the actual coping strategies used to manage the potential stressors in their lives. This research has traditionally focused on the negative health effects of stress, which can include an increase in blood pressure and obesity, along with more health related absences from work (Goldberger & Breznitz, 1993). Although studies have been conducted into agriculture teacher occupational stress as a subset of teacher stress, very little research has been conducted surrounding the mechanisms that are employed to manage stress. A comprehensive search of available literature identified only one study in which the topic of agriculture teachers employing coping mechanisms was identified as a key component to the management of occupational stress.

Types of stress

Stress can be short term (acute) or longer term (chronic). Acute stress is the reaction to an immediate threat commonly known as the fight/flight response. The threat can be real or imaginary. Common acute stressor includes noise, crowding, isolation, hunger, danger, and imaginary threat. Chronic stress is caused by some ongoing stressful situations that are not short lived. Common chronic stressors include continuous job strain, long term strained, relationship with one or more family, persistent financial problems and loneliness etc. The Degree of Stress and Performance

Symptoms of stress

When pressure begins to build up it can cause adverse strain on person's emotions, thought processes and physical condition. When stress becomes excessive, teachers develop various symptoms of stress that can harm their job performance and health and even threaten their ability to cope with the environment. Burn out can be experienced with physical, intellectual, social psycho-emotional and spiritual adaptations. Teachers experiencing feelings of burnout show a number of symptoms in their personal and professional life. Physical signs range from fatigue, exhausting, insomnia, headaches, backaches, ulcers to hypertensions. If the syndrome persists and is uncontrolled it may lead to psychosomatic illness, abuses like alcohol and drugs, seeking counselling help for a feeling of personal failure and guilt and increased marital and family conflicts. Personal symptoms include cynics, negativism rigid thinking, increased absenteeism, illness frequency, boredom, fatigue, closed and irrational thinking, loss of idealism, decline in commitment, alienation and minimal compliance, helplessness and reduced social contacts, becoming a loner, withdrawn, showing signs of hypersensitivity and showing paranoia about colleagues and administrators.

Methodology

The present study has been completed through the descriptive method of research. This method has been the most popular and widely used method of research in social science and education. The descriptive method is designed to obtain pertinent and precise information concerning the current status of phenomena and also draw valid conclusions from the facts discovered. They are restricted not only to fact finding but may often result in the formulation of important principles of knowledge and solution significant problems concerning local, state, national and international issues.

Objectives of the study

The following objectives were formulated for the present investigation

1. to study the occupational stress and coping strategies of teachers working in sample study Universities,
2. to identify the cause of stress according to gender, occupational/ professional status and amount of experience among teachers working in sample study Universities,
3. to assess the levels of occupational stress among teachers working in sample study Universities,
4. to study the influence of secondary variables on occupational stress and coping mechanisms among teachers working in sample study Universities and
5. To study the extent of coping by teachers working in sample study Universities and to undertake a co-relational analysis between occupational stress and coping mechanisms.
6. To provide the broad guidelines, suggestions and conclusions for policy implications.

Hypotheses

For the present study, the following hypotheses were formulated

1. Teachers working in different Indian Universities experience varied levels of stress.
2. To cope with stress, teachers working in Indian Universities, employ various coping mechanisms.
3. Male and female teachers differ significantly in their occupational stress and coping strategies.
4. There is significant relationship between occupational stress and coping strategies adopted.
5. Professional/Occupational status significantly influence occupational stress and coping.

Design of the study

In the present study, 2x2 factorial design has been employed. All teachers working in various Indian universities were included in the study to assess occupational stress and coping patterns.

Population

This study as mentioned earlier was on the population of Professor, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors. The study was confined to six Indian Universities i.e., University of Kashmir, Srinagar; University of Jammu; Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), New Delhi; Delhi University; Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi and Islamic University of Science & Technology.

Sample

The study covered a sample of three hundred and fifty five

(355) faculties of six universities, through stratified random sampling. The sample consisted of Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors in the hierarchical levels of the universities. As reflected in the table below one hundred and four (104) Professors, one hundred and eight (108) Associate professors and one hundred and forty three (143) Assistant professors.

Table 1: Depicting sample subjects of selected organizations (N=355)

S. No	Universities	Professors	Associate Professors	Assistant Professors	Total
1.	University of Kashmir	20	23	25	68
2.	University of Jammu	18	20	23	61
3.	Islamic University of Science & Technology	5	2	25	32
4.	Jawaharlal Nehru University	20	19	23	62
5.	Delhi University	20	22	23	65
6.	Jamia Millia Islamia	21	22	24	67
Total		104	108	143	355

These universities were purposively selected to able selection of sample faculties working in these educational institutions. The due care has been taken in selecting the sample through random sampling in sample universities so as to represents the whole population of teaching employees effectively. Moreover, appropriate steps were taken to cover every aspect of the population to ensure quality work. It needs to be mentioned here that out of 355 sample subjects, 19 were not available, 26 respondents gave the incomplete information and 22 respondents did not provide the desired information related to the study. In this way, the sample for the present investigation was based on 288 faculty members.

Questionnaire design, development and administration

The tools for the present study were selected in a manner to achieve an optimum level of confidence by the investigator. Since the study principally contained two variables namely Organizational Role Stress, therefore, such tools were decided to be chosen as could validly and reliably measure these variables. The investigator after screening a number of available tests finally selected the following standardized tools to collect the data:

1. Employment Organization Sources of Stressors (EOSS) scale by Telaprolu and George (2005) [7, 11]

Besides the above tests, the demographic profile of each university teacher was obtained as follows:

1. Name
2. Age
3. Gender
4. Marital Status: Married / Unmarried
5. Occupational Status
6. Employment status of the respondent
   a. Name of the institution:
   b. Organization type: Govt./ Aided /Unaided
   c. Designation:
   d. Total service (in years):
   e. Monthly income (in Rs.):
7. Spouse employment
8. Family type: Nuclear/ Joint
9. Number of family members
10. Family annual income.

Employment Organization Sources of Stressors (EOSS) Scale

In the present study, the EOSS was administered for individual teachers. The scale developed by Telaprolu and George (2005) [7, 11], was adopted in the study to measure the level of stress among the degree college teachers. It consisted of 80 statements and had a five point scale such as 'always', 'frequently', 'sometimes', 'rarely', and 'never' with scoring as 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0, respectively. The range of the scores was 0 to 320. Based on the total scores, the level of stress was quantified as follows:

Category Range

0-80	Very low stress
81-160	Low stress
161-240	Moderate stress
241-320	High stress

Statistical methods employed

The data obtained was subjected to various statistical techniques like descriptive statistics, contingency coefficient test, chi-square tests, correlation, regression analysis, independent samples t –test, and one way ANOVA to test the hypotheses formulated for the study. A brief description of each of the statistical method is given below.

- Descriptive statistics
- Crosstabs (Contingency table analysis)
- Chi-Square Test
- Independent-Samples T Test
- One-Way ANOVA
- Product moment correlation

Analysis and Interpretation

In the present endeavour, the investigator has made an attempt to study the organizational role stress of professors, associate professors and assistant professors in higher education by using different tools and techniques. The information collected from the faculty members working in Indian Higher Education System was put to suitable statistical analysis in order to arrive at definite conclusions in the light of proposed objectives.

Table 2: Showing the descriptive statistics of teachers working in different Indian universities for components of occupational stress (N=288)

S. No	Components of Occupational Stress Index	Min.	Max.	Mean	S.D	Interpretation
01.	Role overload	0	12	4.70	2.10	Low
02.	Role ambiguity	5	22	11.84	3.33	Moderate
03.	Role conflict	0	8	3.14	1.69	Low
04.	Unreasonable group and political pressure	2	15	7.53	2.41	Low
05.	Responsibility for persons	9	26	17.22	3.42	High
06.	Under participation	12	32	20.47	3.82	High
07.	Powerlessness	2	20	11.11	3.38	High
08.	Poor peer relations	10	32	23.35	4.41	Low
09.	Intrinsic impoverishment	7	21	14.45	3.14	High
10.	Low status	1	12	7.35	2.25	Moderate
11.	Strenuous working Conditions	15	36	24.97	4.28	High
12.	Unprofitability	0	12	3.24	1.94	Low
	Total Occupational Stress	116	227	149.37	16.52	Moderate

The above table reveals the descriptive statistics for various components of occupational stress index, including the total scores. All the samples were considered for the analysis and descriptive statistics like mean, S.D, minimum and maximum scores were calculated. The table reveals the following results:

1. **Role overload:** The mean score of the teachers working in different universities for role overload is 4.70 with a standard deviation of 2.10. The scores ranged from 0 to 12.
2. **Role ambiguity:** The mean score of the sample subjects for role ambiguity is 11.84 with a standard deviation of 3.33.The scores ranged from 5 to 22.
3. **Role conflict:** In role conflict, the mean score of the respondents came out to be 3.14 with a standard deviation of 1.69. The scores ranged from 0 to 8.
4. **Unreasonable group and political pressure:** The mean score of the faculty members working in higher education is 7.53 with a standard deviation of 2.41. The scores ranged from 2 to 15.
5. **Responsibility for persons:** The mean score of the sample subjects for responsibility for persons is 17.22 with a standard deviation of 3.42.The scores ranged from 9 to 26.
6. **Under participation:** The mean score of the respondents for under participation is found to be 20.47 with a standard deviation of 3.82. The scores in this component ranged from 12 to 32.
7. **Powerlessness:** In this component, the mean score of the faculty members is found to be 11.11 with a standard deviation of 3.38. The scores ranged from 2 to 20.
8. **Poor peer relations:** The mean score obtained of the sample subjects for poor peer relations is found to be 23.35 with a standard deviation of 4.41. The scores ranged from 10 to 32.
9. **Intrinsic impoverishment:** The mean score obtained of the university teachers for intrinsic impoverishment is found to be 14.45 with a standard deviation of 3.14. The scores ranged from 7 to 21.
10. **Low status:** The mean score obtained of the respondents for low status came out to be 7.35 with a standard deviation of 2.25.The scores ranged from 1 to 12.
11. **Strenuous working conditions:** The mean score obtained of the faculty members for strenuous working conditions is 24.49 with a standard deviation of 4.28. The scores ranged from 15 to 36.
12. **Unprofitability:** The mean score obtained of the sample subjects for unprofitability is 3.24 with a standard deviation of 1.94. The scores ranged from 0 to 12.
13. **Total occupational stress:** The total mean score for the teachers working as Professors, associate professors and assistant professors in different Indian Universities is found to be 149.37 with a standard deviation of 16.52. The results reveal that there are individual differences in the sample. The scores ranged from 116 to 227 with the wide range of 111 scores.

Table 3: Showing the frequency and percentage of teachers falling under different categories of stress levels in various components of occupational stress index and results of chi-square tests.

Variable		Levels			Chi Square/ 'P' value
		Low	Moderate	High	
Role overload	F	80	195	13	X^2=176.52; P=.000
	%	27.8	67.7	4.5	
Role Ambiguity	F	146	125	17	X^2=99.81; P=.000
	%	50.7	43.4	5.9	
Role Conflict	F	121	163	4	X^2=141.44; P=.000
	%	42.0	56.6	1.4	
Unreasonable group and political pressure	F	44	228	16	X^2=276.33; P=.000
	%	15.3	79.2	5.6	
Responsibility for persons	F	76	160	52	X^2=67.00; P=.000
	%	26.4	55.6	18.1	
Under participation	F	85	177	26	X^2=176.52; P=.000
	%	29.5	61.5	9.0	
Powerlessness	F	42	200	46	X^2=169.08; P=.000
	%	14.6	69.4	16.0	
Poor peer relations	F	20	161	107	X^2=105.44; P=.000
	%	6.9	55.9	37.2	
Intrinsic impoverishment	F	76	163	49	X^2=73.94; P=.000
	%	26.4	56.6	17.0	
Low status	F	31	171	86	X^2=103.65; P=.000
	%	10.8	59.4	29.9	
Strenuous working Conditions	F	78	170	40	X^2=93.08; P=.000
	%	27.1	59	13.9	
Unprofitability	F	159	128	01	X^2=146.02;

	%	55.2	44.4	0.3	P=.000
Total occupational Stress	F	31	171	86	X^2=103.65; P=.000
	%	10.8	59.4	29.9	

P≤0.05 Significant; X^2 = Chi Square

A perusal of table shows the frequency and percentage of teachers working in different Indian universities falling under different categories of stress levels in various components of occupational stress index. The table also shows results of Chi-Square Tests of the occupational stress experienced by the university teachers. A brief description of the results revealed in the table is as:

1. **Role Overload:** The results reveal that 67.7% of the selected sample falls under moderate levels of stress, 27.8% of the sample experienced low levels of stress and a very small chunk i.e., 4.5% experienced high levels of stress. Further, chi-square test revealed a significant (X^2=176.52; P=.000) difference between these three categories of stress, highlighting that majority of the sample subjects had moderate levels of role overload.
2. **Role Ambiguity:** In role ambiguity, the results from the table 4.7 revealed that majority (50.7%) of the sample experienced lower levels of stress, which was closely followed by moderate levels of stress, and very few of the selected sample shown high levels of role ambiguity (5.9%). Between these groups of frequencies, the chi-square test revealed a significant difference (X^2=99.81; P=.000) having low and moderate levels of high frequencies.
3. **Role Conflict:** The Chi-square test revealed significant difference among low, moderate, and high levels of role conflict with X^2 value of 141.44 and *P* value of.000. From the table it is clear that majority of the faculty members working in Indian Universities experience moderate levels of stress (56.6%), followed by 42% of them experienced low levels of stress, and the remaining 1.4% experienced high levels of role conflict which was found to be statistically significant.
4. **Unreasonable group and political pressure:** On the whole, the results revealed that 79.27% of the faculty members fall under moderate levels of stress, 15.3% of the sample selected experienced low levels of stress, and only 5.6% of the sample subjects experienced high levels of stress. Further, chi-square test revealed a significant (X^2=276.33; *P*=.000) difference between these three categories of stress, highlighting that majority of the teachers working as professors, associate professors and assistant professors in different Indian Universities experience moderate levels of stress due to unreasonable group and political pressure/s.
5. **Responsibility for persons:** In responsibility for persons, the table shows that majority of the sample subjects experienced moderate levels of stress (55.6%), which was followed by low levels of stress (26.4%), and few of the selected sample shown high levels (18.1%) of role ambiguity. Between these groups of frequencies, the chi-square test revealed a significant difference (X2=67.00; P=.000) having low and moderate levels of high frequencies.
6. **Under Participation:** A quick look at the table again shows that 61.5% of the university teachers fall under moderate levels of stress, 29.58% of the sample experienced low levels of stress, and only 9% of the sample experienced high levels of stress. The chi-square test revealed a significant (X^2=176.52; *P*=.000) difference between these three categories of stress, highlighting that majority of the sample had moderate levels of under participation.
7. **Powerlessness:** In powerlessness component, the table shows that majority of the respondents experienced moderate levels of stress (69.4%), which was followed by high levels of stress (16.0%), and few of the selected sample shown low levels of role ambiguity (14.6%). Between these groups of frequencies, chi-square test revealed a significant difference (X^2=176.52; *P*=.000) having moderate and high levels of high frequencies.
8. **Poor peer relations:** The chi-square test revealed a significant difference among low, moderate, and high levels of frequencies on poor peer relations with X^2 value of 105.44 and *P* value of.000. From the table, it is clear that majority of the university teachers experienced moderate levels of stress (59.4%), followed by 37.2% of them experienced high levels of stress and the remaining 6.9% of them experienced low levels of poor peer relations which was found to be statistically significant.
9. **Intrinsic Impoverishment:** A perusal of the above table shows that 56.6% of the faculty members working in Indian Universities falls under moderate levels of stress, 29.9% of the sample experienced high levels of stress, and the remaining 26.4% of the sample experienced low levels of stress. Further, chi-square test revealed a significant (X^2=73.94; P=.000) difference between these three categories of stress, highlighting that majority of the sample had moderate levels of intrinsic impoverishment.
10. **Low status:** In low status, the table depicts that majority of the university teachers experience moderate levels of stress (59.4%), which was followed by high levels of stress (29.4%), and the remaining sample has shown low levels (10.8%) of low status. Between these groups of frequencies, chi-square test revealed a significant difference (X^2=103.65; P=.000) having moderate and high levels of high frequencies.
11. **Strenuous working conditions: T**he chi-square test revealed significant difference among low, moderate, and high levels of frequencies on strenuous working conditions component with X^2 value of 93.08 and *P* value of.000. From the table, it is clear that majority of the teachers in higher education experience moderate levels of stress (59%), followed by 27.1% of them experienced low levels of stress, and the remaining 13.9% experienced high levels of strenuous working conditions which was found to be statistically significant.
12. **Unprofitability:** In unprofitability component, table 4.7 shows that majority of the teachers experience low levels of stress (55.2%), which was followed by moderate levels of stress (44.4%), and few of the sample subjects show low levels of unprofitability (0.3%). Between these groups of frequencies, the chi-square test revealed a significant difference (X^2=146.02; P=.000) having low and moderate levels of high frequencies.
13. **Total occupational stress:** A look at table 4.7 shows that

majority of the sample experience moderate levels of occupational stress (59.4%), followed by 29.9% experienced high levels of stress and the remaining 10.8% of the sample expressed low amount of stress. Between these groups of frequencies, the chi-square test revealed a significant difference (X^2=103.65; *P*=.000) having moderate and high levels of high frequencies.

From these results, it can be inferred that majority of the teachers working as Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors in different universities experience a moderate level of stress. In few factors, some of the teachers experience high level of stress.

Table 4: Showing the significance of difference between the mean scores of male and female teachers working in different Indian universities various components of occupational stress

Components of occupational stress	Gender	Mean	S.D	't' Value	*P* Value
Role overload	Male	4.57	2.07	2.139	.033
	Female	5.23	2.18		
Role Ambiguity	Male	11.63	3.30	2.187	.030
	Female	12.70	3.35		
Role Conflict	Male	3.12	1.65	.443	.658
	Female	3.23	1.87		
Unreasonable group and political pressure	Male	7.52	2.43	.277	.782
	Female	7.61	2.32		
Responsibility for persons	Male	17.18	3.42	.334	.739
	Female	17.35	3.43		
Under participation	Male	20.23	3.78	2.114	.035
	Female	21.42	3.88		
Powerlessness	Male	11.08	3.45	.370	.712
	Female	11.26	3.10		
Poor peer relations	Male	23.46	4.37	.838	.403
	Female	22.91	4.56		
Intrinsic impoverishment	Male	14.52	3.08	.693	.489
	Female	14.19	3.37		
Low status	Male	7.32	2.18	.395	.693
	Female	7.46	2.51		
Strenuous working Conditions	Male	24.98	4.18	.139	.890
	Female	24.89	4.72		
Unprofitability	Male	3.20	1.97	.710	.478
	Female	3.40	1.82		
Total Occupational Stress	Male	148.81	15.47	1.172	.242
	Female	151.67	20.24		

P≤0.05 Significant and P≥0.05 Not Significant X^2 = Chi Square

A perusal of Table 4 shows the mean difference between the Male and Female Teachers in higher education. A quick look of the table reveals that Male and female teachers differ significantly on three components of occupational stress i.e., 'role overload' (t=2.139; P=.033), 'role ambiguity' (t=2.187; P=.030), and 'under participation' (t=2.114; P=.035). The results reveal that in all these three components, the female teachers experience significantly more stress than male university teachers. The results further reveal that male and female teachers did not differ significantly on 'role conflict', 'unreasonable group and political pressure', 'responsibility for persons', 'powerlessness', 'poor peer relations', 'intrinsic impoverishment', 'low status', 'strenuous working conditions', 'unprofitability', and in 'total occupational stress', male and female teachers did not differ significantly in their occupational stress scores.

Table 5: Showing the mean occupational stress scores on occupational status of occupational stress index of teachers working in different Indian universities and results of one way ANOVA

Occupational Status	Role Overload		Role Ambiguity		Role Conflict		Unreasonable group & political pressure	
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D
Assistant Professors	4.91	2.36	11.96	3.52	3.21	1.81	8.04^{B}	2.56
Associate Professors	4.63	1.79	11.86	3.29	3.06	1.72	7.12^{A}	2.15
Professors	4.57	2.17	11.72	3.21	3.16	1.56	7.51^{AB}	2.47
Total	4.70	2.10	11.84	3.33	3.14	1.69	7.53	2.41
ANOVA Results	F=.691; P=.502		F=.115; P=.892		F=.211; P=.810		F=3.618; P=.028	

Note: Mean values with different superscripts are significantly different from each other as indicated by DMRT (Duncan's Multiple Range Test, alpha=.05).

A perusal of table 5 reveals that when the stress scores were verified against the occupational status of the teachers working in different universities, significant differences existed for the stress component unreasonable group and

political pressure (F=3.618; P=.028), where highest unreasonable group and political pressure was found in the case of teachers working Assistant Professors and least stress was found among teachers working as Associate Professors, which was further confirmed by Duncan's Multiple Range Test. However, the occupational status did not have significant influence over role overload, role ambiguity and role conflict.

Table 6: Mean occupational stress scores on various components of occupational stress index of teachers working in Indian universities as assistant professors, associate professors and professors and results of one way-ANOVA

Occupational Status	Responsibility for Persons		Under Participation		Powerlessness		Poor peer Relations	
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D
Assistant Professors	17.26	3.57	20.96	4.17	11.44	3.77	23.30	4.21
Associate Professors	16.94	3.45	20.13	3.61	10.77	2.93	23.65	4.24
Professors	17.48	3.23	20.38	3.69	11.18	3.45	23.06	4.79
Total	17.22	3.42	20.47	3.82	11.11	3.38	23.35	4.41
ANOVA Results	F=.626; P=.536		F=1.164; P=.314		F=.990; P=.373		F=439; P=.645	

P≥0.05 Not Significant

A perusal of table 6 reveals that One Way ANOVA indicated non-significant differences for occupational stress components of responsibility for persons, under participation, powerlessness and poor peer relations where all the obtained p-values failed to reach the significance levels. In other words, teachers working as Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors had statistically equal stress scores on responsibility for persons, under participation, powerlessness and poor peer relations components.

Table 7: Showing the mean occupational stress scores on various components of occupational stress index of teachers working as assistant professors, associate professors and professors and dresults of one way ANOVA

Occupational Status	Intrinsic impoverishment		Low status		Strenuous Working conditions		Unprofitability		Total Occupational Stress	
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D
Assistant Professors	14.49	2.97	7.56	2.19	25.33	4.54	3.39	2.18	151.84	19.42
Associate Professors	14.84	3.19	7.01	2.47	24.89	4.20	3.11	1.94	148.01	14.28
Professors	13.98	3.22	7.54	1.99	24.70	4.14	3.24	1.70	148.52	15.73
Total	14.45	3.14	7.35	2.25	24.97	4.28	3.24	1.94	149.37	16.52
ANOVA Results	F=.1.870; P=.156		F=.1.918; P=.149		F=.528; P=.900		F=.482; P=.618		F=1.495; P=.226	

P≥0.05 Not Significant

A perusal of above table depicts that the Teachers working in Indian Universities as Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors experience similar levels of stress in components of intrinsic impoverishment, low status, strenuous working conditions, unprofitability and total operational coping. The results from the One Way ANOVA revealed non-significant differences between scores of teachers working in different types of schools.

Conclusion

1. On the whole, the selected samples experienced moderate levels of occupational stress.
2. The selected samples experienced high occupational stress among components–responsibility for persons, under participation, powerlessness, intrinsic impoverishment, and strenuous working conditions.
3. University teachers experienced moderate levels of occupational stress in role ambiguity and low status components.
4. In components like role overload, role conflict, poor peer relations and in unprofitability, University teachers experienced lower levels of occupational stress.
5. Gender-wise comparison revealed significant differences only for 3 components of occupational stress, i.e., in components of role overload, role ambiguity and under participation, where women university teachers experienced more occupational stress than their male counterparts.

Occupational/Professional level comparison of university teachers revealed that teachers working as Assistant Professors experienced more 'low status', and teachers working as Associate Professors and

References

1. Abeid AA. Job stress among teachers. Journal of King Saud University. 2007; 16(2):16-29.
2. Abel MH, Sewell J. Stress and burnout in rural and urban secondary school teachers. The Journal of Education Research. 1999; 92(5):287-293.
3. Abramson LY, Garber Ji, Teasdar, Seligman MEP. Expectancy change in depression & schizophrenia. Journal of abrenmal psychology. 1978; 87:102-109.
4. Abrol KK. A study of language strain and coping behaviours of teachers, psycho-lingua. 1990; 20:173-178.
5. Absari MR, Singh RP. A study on nature and extent of stress in teachers and impact of moderators on stress, journal of extension education, vol. 8no. z. 1997; 1623-1625.
6. Aminabhavi VA. Kamble SV, A study on work motivation and stress coping behavior and technical personal at a railway workshop. Journal of commerce guiding research. 2004; 2(3):322-329.

7. Amirtagowri R, Jhiagarajan AP. Occupational dilemmas of educational women`s - An analysis perspectives of education, Journal of school medicine. 2005; 21(3):75-183.
8. Bhattacharya, Guha. Stress and coping – A study on lady criminal lawyers of Kolkatta city. I.P.R. Special. 2006; 67:227-234.
9. Bhattacharya AK. A new horizon in trends and practice. In Ajmer Singh and S.R. Gangopadhyay, (Eds.) Trends and practices in physical education, New Delhi, Friends Publications. 1991; 1-6.
10. Bhuin PK. Is teaching stressful? A review of literature on global higher education sector. Asian Journal of Management Research. 2016; 6(3):33-39.
11. Bidlan JS. Job involvement, job frustration and occupational stress among workers of small long scale industrial units. Psy studies. 2005; 504:352-354.
12. Blix G, Cruise RJ, Blix M, Blix GG. Occupational stress among university teachers, educational research. 1994; 36:157-169.
13. Boles JS, Dean DH, Ricks JM, Short JC, Wang G. The dimensionality of the Maslach burnout inventory across small business owners and educators. Journal of Vocational Behavior. 2000; 56(1):12-34.
14. Borg M. Occupational stress in British educational setting: A review. Educational psychology. 1990a; 10:103-126.
15. Brunetto. Medicating change for public sector professionals. International journal of public sector management. 2001; 14155:465-481.
16. Brush. Everyday Philosophy (n.d) Dealing with Stress and Challenges/Body mine Awakening. Retrieve December, 2013 from http://www.bodymineawakening.com/everyday-philosphy
17. Bucher W. Foundation of physical education and sports. New Delhi: BI Publication, 1992.
18. Chaudhary A. A study of relationship between job satisfaction & role stress of bank officers. Unpublished master's dissertation Jaipur University of Rajasthan, 1990.
19. Cheng KT. The relationship among physical education teachers' job stress, coping strategies and burnout in Changhua County. Dissertation Abstracts International. 1997; 57(9):3812 A.
20. Dworkin GA, Haney AC. Fear, victimization and stress among urban public school teachers. Journal of Organizational Behaviour. 2006; 9(2):159-171.
21. Edward D. Overcoming Stress: Challenge for the Workplace. Innovative Solution. Better Health. Retrieved November 02, 2013.
22. Finlay-Jones R. Factors in the teaching environment associated with severe psychological distress among teachers. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry. 1986; 20:304-313.
23. Fisher. Factors Influencing Stress; Burnout and Retention of Secondary Teachers. Current issue in Education. 2011; 14 (1):1-37.
24. Gamage SUD, Mininberg, E. Professional perception and development of school leaders in Australia and USA. International education journal. 2003; (1):42-59.
25. Ganster DC. Schaubroeck J. Work stress and employee health. Journal of Management. 1991; 17:235-271.
26. Harrison BT, Brodeth E. Real work through real collegiality, faculty senior views on the drive to improve teaching learning journal of H.E policy and management. 1999; 21(2):203-214.
27. Harshipinder Aujla P. Socio- environmental stressors among working women and non working women. Indian J.SOC.res. 2002; 431:1-7.
28. Hipps E, Smith E. Job stress, stress related to performance - based accredited, locus of control, age and gender as related to job stress and satisfaction in teachers and principals. British Educational Research Journal. 1991; 16(6):25-28.
29. Kalia R. Stress and burnout among ni cu nurses national institute of nursing education Pgimer Chandigarh, 2009.
30. Koustelios A. Organizational factors as predictors of teachers' burnout. Psychological Reports. 2001; 88(3):627-634.
31. Lever. Guidance to work related stress spice of life or kiss of death? Luxembourg: European commission Retrieved March 5, 2013, from, 2009.
32. Murad S. Stress for teachers. Education College Magazine. 1997; 29:1-12.
33. Murphy KR. Is the relationship between cognitive ability and job performance stable over time? Human Performance. 1995; 2:183-200.
34. Selye. The stress of life. Tata Mcgraw Hill by Luise Drenet Selue printed in the United State of America, 1984.
35. Selye H. The stress of life New York, McGraw hill, 2nd ed, 1976.
36. Zingle HW, Anderson SC. Irrational beliefs and teacher stress. Canadian journal of education. 1990; 15(4):445-449.
37. Zrid Gelli S. Jong Chun Kim Sing, Chulhowy. New York state care manager survey: urban and rural differences in job activities, job stress job satisfaction, the journal of behavioural health services and research, 2004.