

WORKPLACE STRESS AND HARDINESS OF COLLEGE TEACHERS- AN ANALYTICAL STUDY

Ramandeep Kaur Sidhu

Associate Professor
GHG Khalsa College of Education Gurusar Sadhar, Ludhiana

Manu Chadha

Assistant Professor
GHG Khalsa College of Education Gurusar Sadhar, Ludhiana

ABSTRACT

The present study reveals the effect of workplace stress of college teachers on personality hardiness of Ludhiana city. For this study 500 college teachers were randomly selected from education and degree colleges of Ludhiana district. In this study a descriptive method was used. Workplace stress developed by investigators (2014), personality hardiness developed by Nowack (1998) is used to collect the data. Findings show that a significant interaction exists between workplace stress of college teachers with respect to different levels of personality hardiness for the total sample as well as locale.

Keywords: Workplace stress, Personality hardiness, College teachers

Workplace stress can adversely affect teachers' mental as well as physical well-being. Therefore, it is important for teachers to recognize the presence of stress and adopt effective strategies to manage it in a constructive manner. Developing a resilient and hardy personality is essential, as individuals respond to stress in ways that are influenced by their personal characteristics. Stress generally arises when individuals perceive that the demands of a situation exceed the resources available to them whether personal, familial, or social to cope with those demands, particularly when their well-being is perceived to be at risk. Pestonjee (1999) emphasized that maintaining an optimal level of stress is natural and can even be beneficial for healthy functioning. However, when stress is poorly managed, it can negatively influence performance, health, well-being, and emotional balance. In this context, Maddi (2006) described psychological hardiness as a set of three interrelated attitudes that provide individuals with the courage and motivation to transform stressful situations into opportunities for personal growth. Strengthening psychological hardiness can therefore enhance an individual's capacity to cope effectively with stress (Lambert, Lambert, and Yamase, 2003). Several researchers, including Damodaran and Paul (2014); Kaur (2014); Puri and Jyoti (2019); Sharma and Sharma (2020), have also examined the relationship between workplace stress and personality hardiness.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To study the interaction of workplace stress of college teachers with respect to different levels of personality hardiness.
2. To study the interaction of workplace stress of college teachers of urban areas with respect to different levels of personality hardiness.
3. To study the interaction of workplace stress of college teachers of rural areas with respect to different levels of personality hardiness.

METHODS

Research methodology-The current study is regarded as quantitative because the researcher has assigned numbers to observations, data was produced by counting and measuring the variables under study and statistics were used to infer the meanings that lay hidden within the data. In this study the sources of stress experienced by college teachers were identified and the relationship between stress, personality hardiness was described.

Population and sample- For this study the population constituted the teachers from education and degree colleges of Ludhiana district affiliated to Panjab University Chandigarh

Tools and techniques- In order to collect data the following tools were used: Personality Hardiness (Nowack, 1989)-Adapted by the investigator and Workplace Stress tool-Developed by investigator.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Table 1-Interaction effect of Workplace Stress of college teachers with respect to different levels of Personality Hardiness i.e. Low, Average and High.

One way ANOVA				
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	4082.339	2	2041.170	4.85 (Significant at 0.01 as well as 0.05 level of confidence)
Within Groups	209062.611	497	420.649	
Total	213144.950	499		
Post Hoc Tests for Multiple Comparisons (Tukey HSD)				
Personality Hardiness	No.	Workplace Stress		
		Mean	SD	
Low (L)	12	151.08	20.79	
Average (A)	403	161.00	19.85	
High (H)	85	167.16	23.40	
Tukey's HSD	t-ratio	Significant level		
L vs A	1.63	NS-Non Significant		
L vs H	2.47	Significant at 0.05 level of confidence		
A vs H	2.26	Significant at 0.05 level of confidence		

Table 1 shows that the value of F is 4.85 which is highly significant at 0.01 as well as 0.05 level of confidence. Thus there is significant interaction between the three levels of personality hardiness i.e. Low, Average and High in relation to workplace stress. The result shows significant interaction in the workplace stress of college teachers in relation to different levels of personality hardiness i.e. Low, Average and High. This may be due to the situational factors. As the value of F-ratio is significant the value of t-ratio was calculated for the workplace stress between the three levels of personality hardiness i.e. Low, Average and High.

The values of the t-ratio given in table 1 reveal that for workplace stress, the mean scores of low level of personality hardiness and average level of personality hardiness are 151.08 and 161.00 respectively. The value of t-ratio is 1.63, which is non significant at both the levels, thus there is no significant difference in workplace stress between low level of personality hardiness and average level of personality hardiness.

For workplace stress, scores of low level of personality hardiness and high level of personality hardiness are 151.08 and 167.16 respectively. The value of t-ratio is 2.47, which is significant at 0.05 level, so there is significant difference in workplace stress between low level of personality hardiness and high level of personality hardiness.

For workplace stress means scores of average level of personality hardiness and high level of personality hardiness are 161.00 and 167.16 respectively. The value of t-ratio is 2.26, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence, so there is significant difference in workplace stress between average level of personality hardiness and high level of personality hardiness.

Therefore Hypothesis 1 stating that “There exists significant interaction of workplace stress of college teachers with respect to different levels of personality hardiness i.e. Low, Average and High” is accepted.

Table 2-Interaction effect of Workplace Stress of college teachers of urban areas with respect to different levels of Personality Hardiness i.e. Low, Average and High

One way ANOVA				
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	3329.850	2	1664.925	3.37 (Significant at 0.05 level of confidence)
Within Groups	122088.774	247	494.287	
Total	125418.624	249		
Post Hoc Tests for Multiple Comparisons (Tukey HSD)				
Personality Hardiness	No.	Workplace Stress		
		Mean	SD	
Low (L)	5	144.20	23.04	
Average (A)	198	160.99	21.50	
High (H)	47	171.02	25.08	
Tukey's HSD	t-ratio	Significant level		
L vs A	1.61	Non Significant		
L vs H	2.45	Significant at 0.05 level of confidence		
A vs H	2.53	Significant at 0.05 level of confidence		

Table 2 shows that the value of F is 3.37 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence. Thus there is significant interaction at three levels of personality hardiness i.e. Low, Average and High in relation to workplace stress of college teachers in urban areas. The result shows significant interaction in the workplace stress of college teachers of urban areas in relation to different levels of personality hardiness i.e. Low, Average and High. This may be due to environmental factors. As the value of F-ratio is significant the value of t-ratio is calculated for the workplace stress at three levels of personality hardiness i.e. Low, Average and High.

The values of the t-ratio given in table 2 reveal that for workplace stress the means scores of low level of personality hardiness and average level of personality hardiness are 146.20 and 164.99 respectively. The value of t-ratio is 1.61, which is non-significant at both levels of confidence, thus there is no significant difference in workplace stress of college teachers of urban areas between low level and average level of personality hardiness.

For workplace stress the mean scores of low level of personality hardiness and high level of personality hardiness are 146.20 and 171.02 respectively. The value of t ratio is 2.45, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence, so there is significant difference in workplace stress of college teachers of urban areas between low level of personality hardiness and high level of personality hardiness.

For workplace stress the mean scores of average level of personality hardiness and high level of personality hardiness are 164.99 and 171.02 respectively. The value of t-ratio 2.53, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence, thus there is significant difference in workplace stress of college teachers of urban areas between average level and high level of personality hardiness.

Therefore Hypothesis 2 stating that “There exists significant interaction of workplace stress of college teachers of urban areas with respect to different levels of personality hardiness i.e. Low, Average and High” is accepted.

Table 3-Interaction effect of Workplace Stress of college teachers of rural areas with respect to different levels of Personality Hardiness i.e. Low, Average and High

One way ANOVA				
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	2530.45	2	1265.225	3.96(Significant at 0.05 level of confidence)
Within Groups	78993.691	247	319.813	
Total	81524.141	249		
Post Hoc Tests for Multiple Comparisons (Tukey HSD)				
Personality Hardiness	No.	Workplace Stress		
		Mean	SD	
Low (L)	7	148.57	20.12	
Average (A)	205	157.14	17.30	
High (H)	38	166.39	20.46	
Tukey's HSD	t-ratio	Significant level		
L vs A	1.11	Non Significant		
L vs H	2.14	Significant at 0.05 level of confidence		
A vs H	2.62	Significant at 0.01 as well as 0.05 level of confidence		

Table 3 shows that the value of F is 3.96 which is significant at 0.01 as well as 0.05 level of confidence. Thus there is significant interaction at three levels of personality hardiness i.e. Low, Average and High in relation to workplace stress of college teachers of rural areas. The result shows significant interaction in the workplace stress of college teachers of rural areas in relation to different levels of personality hardiness i.e. Low, Average and High. This may be due to environmental factors. As the value of F-ratio is significant, the value of t-ratio was calculated for the workplace stress at three levels of personality hardiness i.e. Low, Average and High.

The values of the t-ratio given in table 3 reveal that for workplace stress the mean scores of low level of personality hardiness and average level of personality hardiness are 148.57 and 157.14 respectively. The value of t-ratio is 1.11, which is non-significant at both levels of confidence, thus there is no significant difference in workplace stress of college teachers of rural areas between low level and average level of personality hardiness.

For workplace stress the mean scores of low level of personality hardiness and high level of personality hardiness are 154.57 and 166.39 respectively. The value of t ratio is 2.14, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence, so there is significant difference in workplace stress of college teachers of rural areas between low level of personality hardiness and high level of personality hardiness.

For workplace stress the mean scores of average personality hardiness and high level of personality hardiness are 157.14 and 166.39 respectively. The value of t-ratio is 2.62, which is significant at 0.01as well as 0.05 level of confidence, thus there is significant difference in workplace stress of college teachers of rural areas between average level of personality hardiness and average level of personality hardiness.

Therefore Hypothesis 3 stating that “There exists significant interaction of workplace stress of college teachers of rural areas with respect to different levels of personality hardiness i.e. Low, Average and High” is accepted.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

A significant interaction exists between workplace stress of college teachers with respect to different levels of personality hardiness. Further a significant difference exists in the mean scores of workplace stress between low level and high level of personality hardiness as well as in the mean scores of workplace stress between average level of personality hardiness and high level of personality hardiness but no significant difference exists in the mean scores of workplace stress between low level of personality hardiness and average level of personality hardiness. The present findings are in line with the findings of Kobasa, Maddi and Zola(1983) that an interaction was there between personality hardiness and workplace stress. But contradict by Schmied and Laweler(1986) that there is no interactional effect between personality hardiness and workplace stress.

A significant interaction exists between workplace stress of college teachers of urban areas with respect to different levels of personality hardiness. Further a significant difference exists in the mean scores of workplace stress between low level and high level of personality hardiness as well as in the mean scores of workplace stress between average level and high level of personality hardiness but no significant difference exists in the mean scores of workplace stress between low level and average level of personality hardiness.

A significant interaction exists between workplace stress of college teachers of rural areas with respect to different levels of personality hardiness. Further a significant difference exists in the mean scores of workplace stress between low level of personality hardiness and high level of personality hardiness as well as in the mean scores of workplace stress between average level of personality hardiness and high level of personality hardiness but no significant difference exists in the mean scores of workplace stress between low level and average level of personality hardiness.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The present study revealed that workplace stress of teachers can be reduced using various coping styles and approaches of personality hardiness. Thus the study has implications for workers of various professional institutions. Knowing this, it is vital that teachers are able to recognize stress so that they can take the appropriate steps to deal with it in a positive manner.

- College authorities should develop strategies to deal with the needs of those teachers who experience less commitment towards their workplace. Proactive attention to this should demonstrate a preparedness on the side of college heads to address teacher concern and thereby reduce absenteeism and attrition rates amongst teachers.
- Training must be provided to reduce experience of job burnout by coping mechanisms to stay energized, positively engaged with their students. Personality development, Yoga classes after college time can help teachers.
- Educational policies should be framed in order to reduce stress among teachers. There should be time to time promotional activities, rewards and recognitions for teachers. Workplaces can provide some advanced psychology courses or counseling courses or work alternatives, such as job rotation, job enrichment, or continuing education.

REFERENCES

1. Damodaran, D.K., Paul, V.K.(2014). What do adolescents say about their stress and stressors? Asian Journal of Nursing Education and Research ; 4(1):92-95. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1543042413?accountid=28367>
2. Kaur, R.(2014). Study of work place, coping styles and psychology hardiness on college teachers (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Panjab university, Chandigarh, India, 2014.
3. Kobasa, S.C., Maddi, S.R. and Zola, M.A. (1983). Type A and hardiness. Journal of Behavioral Medicine 6 (1),41–51. Doi: 10.1007/BF00845275. Retrived on dated August 01,2013 at 02.04pm from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6876154>.
4. Lambert, V.A., Lambert, C.E., Yamase, H. (2003). Psychological hardiness, workplace stress and related stress reduction strategies. Nursing and Health Sciences; 5(2):181-184. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1442-2018.2003.00150.x>
5. Maddi, S.R. (2006). Hardiness: The courage to grow from stresses. Journal of Positive Psychology; 1(3):160-168. doi:10.1080/17439760600619609.
6. Nowack, K. M. (1989). "Coping style, cognitive hardiness, and health status". Journal of Behavioral Medicine. 12 (2): 145–158. doi:10.1007/BF00846548. PMID 2760920
7. Pestonjee, D.M. (1999). Stress and coping: The Indian experience. New Delhi: Sage.
8. Puri, P & Jyoti (2019). Psychological Hardiness: A Comparative Study of Males and Females. The International Journal of Indian Psychology; 7 (3), DOI: 10.25215/0703.037
9. Sharma, S & Sharma (2020). Relationship between stress and psychological hardiness among secondary school students in Chandigarh. International Journal of Applied Research; 6(6): 168-172.