



RESEARCH ARTICLE

PERCEIVED SOURCES OF OCCUPATIONAL STRESS AMONG TEACHERS

***Owais Khan, Mohd Ilyas Khan, Akbar Husain, Muzafar Hussain Kawa, Faisal Hassan, Burhan Khan, Anas Ali Al-Tarawneh and Amer Mohmad Hamdan Thabnat**

Department of Psychology, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 07th February, 2016
Received in revised form
26th March, 2016
Accepted 14th April, 2016
Published online 31st May, 2016

Key words:

Perceived Sources,
Gender, Occupational Stress,
Teachers.

Copyright©2016, Owais Khan et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Owais Khan, Mohd Ilyas Khan, Akbar Husain, et al. 2016. "Perceived sources of occupational stress among teachers", *International Journal of Current Research*, 8, (05), 31733-31736.

ABSTRACT

The present study purports to assess the perceived sources of occupational stress among teachers with respect to gender. The sample of the study consists of 100 teachers (males=64, females=36) belonging to various schools of District Aligarh. Occupational stress index by Srivastava & Singh was used in the present study. The data was analyzed by using t-test. The result revealed that male and female teachers significantly differs in Role Overload(RO), Role Ambiguity(RA), Unreasonable group & Political pressure(UG & PP), Under participation(UP) Poor peer relation(PPR), Impoverishment (IMP,) Unprofitability(UF)and Overall Occupational Stress whereas no significance difference was found between male and female teachers in Role Conflict(RC), Responsible for person(PR),Powerlessness (PL),Low Status (LS) and Strenuous Working condition(SWC)

INTRODUCTION

Within the last two decades, a number of Indian psychologists are taking interest in conducting studies on the topic of occupational stress (Beehr and Bhagat, 1985; Srivastava and Singh, 1981). Stress at work has been considered as one of the most ubiquitous and imperative factors of stress. Stress related with occupation or job is labeled as occupational stress. It refers to a situation where occupation related factors interact with employee to alter and interrupt his/her psychological and physiological conditions which consequently interrupt the normal functioning of a person. The person enable to work efficiently due to stress. Occupational stress generally results from conflicting incompatible or unclear expectation that is derived from work environment. Modern world is marked as world of stress that has become a prevailing feature of human life. The ever increasing needs and aspirations, tough competition, pressure of meeting deadlines, uncertainty of future and weakened social support have made life very much demanding and highly stressful. Cooper and Marshal (1976) have reported some imperative sources of occupational stress: poor physical conditions, work overload, physical danger, role conflict, responsibility, under promotion, over promotion, lack of security, lack of training and poor relations with supervisors and subordinates.

*Corresponding author: Owais Khan,

Department of Psychology, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh

Margolis and Kores (1974) defined job stress as a condition interacting with worker characteristics to disrupt psychological and physiological homeostasis. The causal situation or conditions are job stress and the disrupted homeostasis in job-related strain. Beehr and Newman (1978) defined job stress as a "condition arising from the interaction of people and their job characteristics by changes within the people and force them to deviate from their normal functioning. Job stress consists of a poor fit in the job environment which may lead to physical, psychological or behavioral manifestation of stress. When the qualitative demand of the job is to a greater extent, an individual may be threatened by loss or the esteem of the others, which in turn results in the dwindled sense of complaints. Luthans (1995) defined stress in a simplified manner as "an adaptive response to an external situation that results in physical, psychological and behavioral deviations for organizational participants. The sources of occupational stress can be classified into two main groups: sources of stress at work and individual characteristics. Work stressors could be intrinsic to job, related to the employees 'role in the organization or to career development, relationship at work or the particular organizational structure and climate. Individual characteristics can include levels of anxiety, neuroticism and so on (Fox and Poole, 1995). Some more studies have been conducted decade ago by different Indian psychologists to investigate the influence of occupational stress on different professions. Gaur, Shubhla and Dhawan (2000) investigated

the relationship between work related stress and adaptation patterns among women professionals and found that women in all the four professions i.e. teachers, bank officers, doctors and bureaucrats reported moderate work related stress. Deostnalee, Pravin (2000) found that age has no effect on the stress experienced by engineers. However the gender as well as education has displayed significant effect on job stress. Male engineers experienced more stress than that of females whereas the higher the education the lesser the stress the engineers experienced. Recently Ansarul Hasan (2014) conducted a study of occupational stress of primary school teachers in which an attempt was made to compare teachers' occupational stress of primary government and private school teachers of Tehsil Laksar, District-Haridwar. Findings revealed that in general, the primary school teachers have found to be highly stressed. Moreover, the private primary school teachers have also found to be highly stressed in comparison to their government primary school teacher counterparts.

Objectives of the study

- To study the difference of male and female teachers on Role overload (RO)
- To study the difference of male and female teachers on Role Ambiguity(RA)
- To study the difference of male and female teachers on Role Conflict(RC)
- To study the difference of male and female teachers on Unreasonable group & Political pressure (UG & PP).
- To study the difference of male and female teachers on Responsible for person(PR)
- To study the difference of male and female teachers on Under participation(UP)
- To study the difference of male and female teachers on Powerlessness (PL)
- To study the difference of male and female teachers on Poor peer relation(PPR)
- To study the difference of male and female teachers on Impoverishment (IMP)
- To study the difference of male and female teachers on Low Status(LS)
- To study the difference of male and female teachers on Strenuous Working condition(SWC)
- To study the difference of male and female teachers on Unprofitability(UF)
- To study the difference of male and female teachers on Overall Occupational Stress

Hypothesis

- Ho1:** There is no significant difference in Role overload (RO) among teachers of District Aligarh with respect to their gender.
- Ho2:** There is no significant difference in Role Ambiguity (RA) among teachers of District Aligarh with respect to their gender.
- Ho3:** There is no significant difference in Role Conflict (RC) among teachers of District Aligarh with respect to their gender.
- Ho4:** There is no significant difference in Unreasonable Group & Political pressure (UG & PP) among teachers of District Aligarh with respect to their gender.

Ho5: There is no significant difference in Responsible for person (PR) among teachers of District Aligarh with respect to their gender.

Ho6: There is no significant difference in Under Participation (UP) among teachers of District Aligarh with respect to their gender.

Ho7: There is no significant difference in Powerlessness (PL) among teachers of District Aligarh with respect to their gender.

Ho8: There is no significant difference in Poor Peer Relation (PPR) among teachers of District Aligarh with respect to their gender.

Ho9: There is no significant difference in Impoverishment (IMP) among teachers of District Aligarh with respect to their gender.

Ho10: There is no significant difference in Low Status (LS) among teachers of District Aligarh with respect to their gender.

Ho11: There is no significant difference in Strenuous Working condition (SWC) among teachers of District Aligarh with respect to their gender.

Ho12: There is no significant difference in Unprofitability (UF) among teachers of District Aligarh with respect to their gender.

Ho13: There is no significant difference in Overall Occupational Stress among teachers of District Aligarh with respect to their gender.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sample

The sample of the present study consisted of 100 Teachers (male=64, Female=36) selected from different schools located in Aligarh District. The purposive sampling technique was used for the present study.

Tools Used

Occupational stress scale (OSI) developed by Srivastava and Singh (1981) was used for the present study. The scale had 46 items each to be rated on the five-point scale. Out of 46 items, 28 are "true keyed" and the balance 18 is "false keyed". The items relate to almost all relevant components of the job life which causes stress in some way or the other such as role-overload, role-ambiguity, role conflict, group and political pressure, responsibility for persons, under participation, powerlessness, poor peer relationship, intrinsic impoverishment, low status, strenuous working conditions and unprofitability. The reliability of the scale was measured through split half (odd-even) method and the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the scales as a whole was found to be 0.935 and 0.90, respectively.

RESULTS

The information/responses collected from the respondents were subjected to various statistical treatments. The data was analyzed by using SPSS 16.0. Statistical techniques used for analyzing data were t-test. t-test was also used to study the difference between teachers in Role overload, Role Ambiguity,

Role Conflict, Unreasonable group & Political pressure, Responsible for person, Under participation, Powerlessness, Poor peer relation, Impoverishment, Low Status, Strenuous Working condition, Unprofitability, Overall Occupational Stress with respect to their gender.

with significant difference at .01 level and on the dimension Low Status male teachers also scored higher than female teachers but with no significant difference at any level. Finally in Overall Occupational Stress male teachers have higher score than female teachers with significant difference at .01 level.

Table 1. Mean scores of male and female teachers of Aligarh District on Role overload, Role Ambiguity, Role Conflict, Unreasonable group & Political pressure, Responsible for person, Under participation, Powerlessness, Poor peer relation, Impoverishment, Low Status, Strenuous Working condition, Unprofitability, Overall Occupational Stress

Occupational Stress Variables	Gender	n	M	SD	df	t-value
Role overload (RO)	Male	64	18.31	3.78	98	1.51*
	Female	36	17.08	4.15		
Role Ambiguity(RA)	Male	64	12.14	2.33	98	2.33*
	Female	36	11.00	2.37		
Role Conflict(RC)	Male	64	15.15	2.93	98	.91 ^{NS}
	Female	36	14.61	2.72		
Unreasonable group & Political pressure(UG & PP)	Male	64	11.57	3.34	98	1.36*
	Female	36	10.69	2.66		
Responsible for person(PR)	Male	64	10.12	2.58	98	.98 ^{NS}
	Female	36	9.55	2.64		
Under participation(UP)	Male	64	12.59	2.73	98	1.67*
	Female	36	11.69	2.27		
Powerlessness (PL)	Male	64	9.68	2.50	98	.86 ^{NS}
	Female	36	9.25	2.32		
Poor peer relation(PPR)	Male	64	13.54	2.51	98	1.99*
	Female	36	12.52	2.34		
Impoverishment (IMP)	Male	64	12.42	2.52	98	1.21*
	Female	36	13.02	2.17		
Low Status(LS)	Male	64	10.00	2.03	98	.69 ^{NS}
	Female	36	9.69	2.29		
Strenuous Working condition(SWC)	Male	64	10.57	2.36	98	.48 ^{NS}
	Female	36	10.83	2.83		
Unprofitability(UF)	Male	64	6.01	2.02	98	1.25*
	Female	36	5.50	1.90		
Overall Occupational Stress	Male	64	142.15	13.41	98	2.21*
	Female	36	135.47	16.24		

Total N=100; *P<0.05 Level of Significance

The obtained findings with regards to the dimensions of occupational stress between male and female teachers have been presented in Table 1. It is evident from the table that male teachers scored higher mean on Role Overload than female teachers and the difference was found to be significant at .01 level. The mean score obtained by male teachers on Role Ambiguity was significantly higher than that of their female counterparts and the difference was also significant ($t=2.33$, $p<.01$). Male teachers obtained higher mean than the female teachers with regards to Role Conflict and t-value was not emerged significant at .01 level. Male teachers obtained higher means than female teachers with respect to Unreasonable group and political pressure with a significant difference at .01 level. Responsible for person is another dimension of occupational stress on which male teachers obtained significantly higher than that of their female counterpart and significant difference was not observed on this dimension. Male teachers obtained higher mean than their female counterparts with respect to Under participation dimension and difference is found to be significant at .01 level. Male teachers were also found to be scored higher than female teachers on Powerlessness with no significant difference at any level. It has been found that under the dimensions Impoverishment and Strenuous working condition females scored higher than their male counterparts but significant difference was found at .01 level in former and no difference was found at any level in later. Further the result revealed that male teachers scored higher than females in Poor peer relation and Unprofitability

DISCUSSION

The considerable amount of efforts has been invested by the researchers in their attempt to understand the dynamics of stress. Much of the work was motivated by a concern for motivating the teacher's quality of life and was based on the assumption that teachers stress is associated with unpleasant feelings. It can be inferred from the findings that these can affect various facets of personal as well as organizational functioning. By and large, male teachers perceived more stress than female teachers. The effects of stress on performance vary with the degree of stress and the nature of task performed. One of the most important reasons that occupational stress in male teachers may be due to poor quality of work life. It has been largely accepted by stress researchers that high and consistent occupational stress is unpleasant and dysfunctional and causes significant deterioration in physiological and psychological well-being of the persons.

REFERENCES

- Beehr, T.A. and Bhagat, R.S. 1985. Stress and cognitive in organizations: An integrated perspective, New York: John Willy and Sons. *Personnel Psychology*, 3, 665-669
- Beehr, T.A. and Newman, J.E. 1978. Job stress, employee health and occupational effectiveness: A facet analysis, model and literature review. *Personnel Psychology*, 31, 665-669

- Cooper, C.L. and Marshall, J. 1976. Occupational sources of stress: A review of the literature relating to coronary heart disease and mental ill health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 49, 11-28
- Deostnalee, P. G. 2000. A study of effect of gender, Age and educational maturity on job stress. *Psycho Lingua*, 30 (1), 57-60.
- Fax, J.L. and Pool, M.E. 1995. Occupational stress in adjustment business and professional women. *Stress Medicine*, 11, 113-122
- Gaur, Shubhla, P. and Dhawan, N. 2000. "A study of work related stress and Adaptation pattern among women professionals." *Indian Psychological Abstracts and Reviews*, 9 (2), 381.
- Hasan, A. 2014. A study of occupational stress of primary school teachers. *Educationia Confab*, 3 (4).
- Luthans, F. 1995. Organizational behavior. Singapore: McGraw-Hill. Inc.
- Margolis, B.K., Kores, W. H and Quinn, R.P. 1974. Occupational stress and strain: An A. Mc Lean (Rd.) *occupational stress*. Springfield; IL: Thomas
- Srivastava, A.K. and Singh, A.P. 1981. Construction and standardization of an occupational stress index; a pilot study. *Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 8,133-136.
