



## Stress in Teaching Profession at Tribhuvan University

By Dr. Jitendra Prasad Upadhyay

(Associate Professor, Tribhuvan University)

### **Abstract**

**Background** -Stress refers to the pressure or tension people feel in their life. It could be something physical, emotional, fear of losing job or being embarrassed in the workplace

**Objectives** –The objective of the study is to analyze the causes of stress related to personal factors and organizational factors among the faculties of Tribhuvan University

**Methodology** – Due to the specific nature of the research objectives, descriptive cum analytical research design has been used.

**Findings** – Faculties of the university have been felt stress during their work life.

**Keywords** – Stress, personal factors, organizational factors, constituent campus and affiliated campus.

**Paper Type** – Research paper.

### **Introduction**

“Stress is a dynamic condition in which an individual is confronted with an opportunity, constraint or demand related to what he or she desires and for which the outcome is perceived to be both uncertain and important”(Schular R. S. 1980).It refers to the pressure or tension people feel in their life. It could be something physical, emotional, fear of losing job or being embarrassed in the workplace. Stress existseverywhere, whether it is within the family, business organization or any other social or economic activity. Right from the time of birth till the last breath draws, an individual is invariably exposed to various stressful situations. Stress is experienced by every person of any age and gender.Stress affects the behavior of employees in the organizations. It has far reaching impact on motivation and satisfaction of employees. The productivity of employees and overall productivity of organization is affected by levels of stress and motivation. Stress causes various psychological problems like

---

anger, depression, anxiety, irritability and tension and this influences the motivation of employees to a considerable extent.

Stress affects the employee's performance that eventually impacts the organization survival such that when employees are inefficient and perform poorly, the company loses healthy shares in an increasingly competitive market and may even jeopardize their survival (Kazmi,2008). It is therefore, an essential task for management to deal effectively and prevent workplace stress. It is the responsibility of management to fight against the stress at work, to identify the suitable course of action and solve them. Stress management and prevention positively contributes to enhanced health and wellbeing of workers and generates great organization productivity and contribution (Sharmila, 2012).

Stress related with a job is called occupational stress which is generally defined in terms of relationship between a person and his environment. Occupational stress refers to a situation where occupation related factors interact with employee to change i.e. disrupts or enhances his / her psychological and or physiological conditions such that the person is forced to deviate from normal functioning. There is potential for stress when an environmental situation is perceived as presenting demand which threatens to exceed the person's capabilities and resources for meeting it. Every occupation has some stress, which may differ in its degree (Bhatt, 2013).

### **Stress in Teaching Profession**

Stress is an increasing problem in every organization in the world. Positive stress leads to drive and productivity meanwhile negative stress leads to loss for the organization in the long run. The advent of new technological revolution spread through all walks of life coupled with globalization, privatization policies has drastically changed the conventional patterns in all fields. Occupational stress is becoming progressively more globalized and affects all countries, all professions and all categories of employees, as well as families and societies in general. Globalization and privatization led policies have compelled the education sector to reform and adjust the development of competitive edge and cope with multinationals led environment (Upadhyay,2018).

“The teaching profession is particularly associated with stress influencing people in the industry. Tension occurring in a workplace can interfere with teaching and educational process, undermining the efforts of both, students and teachers,” (Wogny, Polowezyk& Zygmunt, 2015).

In the current situation, there are many expectations for the roles the teacher must play in the university. Students expect the teachers to be knowledgeable, up to date, well prepared and articulate. Colleagues expect the teacher to be a "productive scholar", engaged in research of some significance. The administration of the university requires the teacher to take part in the committee work of his/her department /university and carry his/her share of administrative work. The teachers' professional associations expect his/her interest, participation, and adherence to their standards. The community and society expect the teacher to make his/her expertise available when it is sought.

How do the academics at the higher education manage these apparently differing roles? What does teaching at the University really entail? Not only are traditional notions of teacher professionalism being reframed, the role of teachers in managing educational institutions is being moved away from managing the curriculum towards managing tasks and systems. As responsibility for designing one's own curricula and one's own teaching & created, responsibility over technical tasks and management concerns come to the force. All this pushes the teaching profession away from its traditional concern and activities towards a new direction (Singh & Bora, 2017)

### **Objectives of the study**

The main objectives of the study are:

1. To analyze the causes of stress related to personal factors among the faculties of Tribhuvan University
2. To analyze the causes of stress related to organizational factors among the faculties of Tribhuvan University

### **Methodology Used**

This study has followed both descriptive and analytical approaches of research. There are 11 universities in Nepal (Economic Survey, 2018), which constitute the population of the study (Tribhuvan University, Pokhara University, Purbanchal University, Far-western University, Kathmandu University, Lumbini Bouddha University, Mid Western University, Agriculture and Forestry University, Nepal Sanskrit University, RajarsiJanak University and Nepal Open University). For this study, only one university, i.e. Tribhuvan University (TU) has been selected as sample. Selection of sample was made on judgmental basis. A questionnaire survey has been conducted for getting the answer of research questions. The questionnaire

survey includes seventeen questions. Questionnaires were distributed to 120 faculties 60 each from both types of campuses i.e. 30 each from ‘two constituent campuses’ and ‘two affiliated colleges’. Focus was given on including professors, associate professors, lecturers, teaching assistance and part-time faculties. In order to increase the reliability and number of responses, personal visits to each and every respondent were made to distribute and collect the questionnaire. Primary data has been analyzed using different statistical tools, like means, standard deviation, and coefficient of variance. Five scales Likert Scale has been used for analysis in which 1 indicates strongly disagree and 5 indicate strongly agree.

Cronbach’s Alpha test has been done to test the reliability of data. Each and every variable has been tested and it was found that every variable reliability test was above 88%.

### Respondent’s Profile

In this section, characteristics of respondents have been presented (gender wise and designation wise)

**Table 1**

Faculties	Constituent Campuses			Affiliated Campuses			Grand Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
<b>Permanent Group</b>									
Professors	4	2	6	2	1	3	6	3	9
Associate Professors	4	2	6	3	3	6	7	5	12
Lecturers	12	6	18	8	4	12	20	10	30
<b>Temporary Group</b>									
Teaching Assistants	9	3	12	12	6	18	21	9	30
Part Time Faculties	12	6	18	15	6	21	27	12	39
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>120</b>

Table 1 explains the characteristics of the respondents’ gender wise and designation wise. Majority of respondents were males, i.e. 81. But female respondents were also satisfactory in number, i.e. 39 out of 120. The reason behind low number of female respondents is that the university has high number of male teachers. Highest numbers of respondents were part time faculties followed by 30 respondents each in lecturers and teaching assistants group. Very few respondents were seen in professor level i.e. only 9 in total.

## Analysis and Findings

### Causes of Stress

Different reasons related to causes of stress among university faculties have been examined from personal factors and organizational factors.

### Personal Factors

Different issues have been analyzed under personal factors they are:

**Table 2**

**a. Low Self Esteem**

Categories	Constituent Campuses		Affiliated Campuses		Total	Average of Mean
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	
Permanent	3.2	0.29	3.3	0.35	6.5	3.25
Temporary	3.8	0.45	3.9	0.57	7.7	3.85
Total	7.0		7.2		14.2	7.1
Average of Mean	3.5		3.6		7.1	3.55

Table 2 clearly explains that 'Low Self Esteem' causes stress and the performances of the respondent decreases as the value have been more than 3 in all cases. Respondents from Temporary Group of both types of campuses have been feeling more stress compared to respondents of Permanent Group i.e. the value 3.85 is higher than the value 3.25.

**Table 3**

**b. Uncertainty of Job**

Categories	Constituent Campuses		Affiliated Campuses		Total	Average of Mean
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	
Permanent	3.0	0.22	3.5	0.25	6.5	3.25
Temporary	3.8	0.42	4.2	0.43	8.0	4.0
Total	6.8		7.7		14.5	7.25
Average of Mean	3.4		3.85		7.25	3.625

Table 3 clearly shows that 'Uncertainty of Job' causes stress as the value has been more than 3 in all cases. Respondents from Temporary Group of both types of campuses have felt more

stress due to uncertainty of their job compared to respondents of Permanent Group as the value of 4 is higher than the value of 3.25. Respondents of Permanent Group of Affiliated Campuses have also felt more stress on their job.

**Table 4**

**c. Low Self Efficacy**

Categories	Constituent Campuses		Affiliated Campuses		Total Mean	Average of Mean
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Permanent	3.3	0.21	3.7	0.27	7.0	3.5
Temporary	3.9	0.36	3.9	0.89	7.8	3.9
Total	7.2		7.6		14.8	7.4
Average of Mean	3.6		3.8		7.4	3.7

Table 4 clearly defines that ‘Low Self Efficacy’ caused stress to faculties working in the different campuses. Values more than 3.4 in both groups supports that the ‘Low Self Efficacy’ cause stress to all of them. Respondents of Temporary Group in both types of campuses felt more stress than respondents of Permanent Group. Similarly respondents of Permanent Group of Affiliated Campuses have more stress than Constituent Campuses.

**Table 5**

**d. Interpersonal Conflicts**

Categories	Constituent Campuses		Affiliated Campuses		Total Mean	Average of Mean
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Permanent	3.6	0.13	3.6	0.30	7.2	3.6
Temporary	3.7	0.15	4.0	0.12	7.7	3.85
Total	7.3		7.6		14.9	7.45
Average of Mean	3.65		3.8		7.45	3.725

Table 5 clearly elucidates that ‘Interpersonal Conflicts’ causes stress as the value has been more than 3.5 in all cases. Respondents from Temporary Group of both types of campuses have felt more stress due to ‘Interpersonal Conflicts’ which is cleared from value i.e. 3.85 is higher than 3.6. Respondents of Permanent Group of both types of Campuses have similar feeling of stress as its value has been 3.6 in both.

**Table 6****e. Family & Work Life Relation**

Categories	Constituent Campuses		Affiliated Campuses		Total	Average
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	of Mean
Permanent	3.9	0.22	3.9	0.32	7.8	3.9
Temporary	4.2	0.15	4.4	0.50	8.6	4.3
Total	8.1		8.3		16.4	8.2
Average of Mean	4.05		4.15		8.2	4.1

Table 6 clearly explains that ‘Family & Work Life Relation’ causes stress to all the respondents from both group and both types of campuses. It is indicated by value more than 4 in all cases. Inability to manage work and family life properly has led to stress in their life.

**Table 7****Overall Personal Factors**

Issues	Constituent Campuses		Affiliated Campuses	
	Permanent	Temporary	Permanent	Temporary
<b>Low Self Esteem</b>	3.2	3.8	3.3	3.9
<b>Uncertainty of Job</b>	3.0	3.8	3.5	4.2
<b>Low Self Efficacy</b>	3.3	3.9	3.7	3.9
<b>Interpersonal Conflicts</b>	3.6	3.7	3.6	4.0
<b>Family &amp; Work Life Relation</b>	3.9	4.2	3.9	4.4

Table 7 shows that ‘Family & Work Life Relation and Interpersonal Conflicts’ have more than 3.5 mean values, which clearly explains that these two issues have been responsible for high stress compared to other issues. Values of all other issues of stress have also been more than 3 which indicate that faculties of the university have faced stress with all issues of stress.

This fact is also supported by the value of Standard Deviation less than ‘1’ in all issues.

Similarly, stress in Temporary Group has been high compared to stress in Permanent Group in both types of campuses.

**Organizational Factors**

Different issues have been analyzed under organizational factors they are:

**Table 8****a. Problematic Students' Relation**

Categories	Constituent Campuses		Affiliated Campuses		Total	Average
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	of Mean
Permanent	4.2	0.79	4.3	0.65	8.5	4.25
Temporary	4.5	0.95	4.4	0.77	8.9	4.45
Total	8.7		8.7		17.4	8.7
Average of Mean	4.35		4.35		8.7	4.35

Table 8 clearly indicates that significant majority of respondent have agreed that 'Problematic Students' Relations' is a main source of stress in their job. Value of 'Problematic Students' Relations' in all cases has been more than 4 which indicates that every respondent has felt that this is a main cause of stress.

**Table 9****b. Working Condition (Load and Pressure)**

Categories	Constituent Campuses		Affiliated Campuses		Total	Average
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	of Mean
Permanent	3.0	0.24	3.3	0.55	6.3	3.15
Temporary	3.2	0.48	3.1	0.69	6.3	3.15
Total	6.2		6.4		12.6	6.3
Average of Mean	3.1		3.2		6.3	3.15

Table 9 explains that 'Working Condition' also causes stress to the faculties of the university. Value of 'Working Condition' in all cases has been more than 3 which indicate that every respondent have been felt that this is a main cause of stress. For both Permanent Group and Temporary Group of both types of campuses have the same feeling regarding 'Working Condition'.



**Table 10****c. Co-workers Relations**

Categories	Constituent Campuses		Affiliated Campuses		Total Mean	Average of Mean
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Permanent	3.4	0.68	3.6	0.97	7	3.5
Temporary	3.7	0.86	3.8	0.43	7.5	3.75
Total	7.1		7.4		14.5	7.25
Average of Mean	3.55		3.7		7.25	3.625

Table 10 clearly defines that ‘Co-worker’s Relations’ caused stress to all the faculties working in the campus. All respondents have totally agreed that the lack of support from colleagues and poor interpersonal relationship can cause stress and they feel demotivated to work with them. This is supported by the fact that value of ‘Co-worker’s Relations’ for all has been more than 3.4.

**Table 11****d. Opportunities for Promotion and Career Prospects**

Categories	Constituent Campuses		Affiliated Campuses		Total Mean	Average of Mean
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Permanent	4.1	0.21	4.2	0.25	8.3	4.15
Temporary	4.6	0.24	4.8	0.23	9.4	4.7
Total	8.7		9		17.7	8.85
Average of Mean	4.35		4.5		8.85	4.425

Table 11 clearly elucidates that majority of respondents have agreed that ‘Opportunities for Promotion and Career Prospects’ is another main source of stress in their job. Value of ‘Opportunities for Promotion and Career Prospects’ in all cases has been more than 4 which indicates that this is a main cause of stress.

**Table 12****e. Administrative Support**

Categories	Constituent Campuses		Affiliated Campuses		Total Mean	Average of Mean
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Permanent	3.6	0.19	3.8	0.28	7.4	3.7
Temporary	3.7	0.35	3.8	0.27	7.5	3.75
Total	7.3		7.6		14.9	7.45
Average of Mean	3.65		3.8		7.45	3.725

Table 12 clearly explains that ‘Administrative Support’ causes stress to all the respondents of both types of campuses. Value more than 3.5 in all cases has showed every respondent has agreed that lack of administrative support cause stress.

**Table 13****Overall Organizational Factors**

Issues	Constituent Campuses		Affiliated Campuses	
	Permanent	Temporary	Permanent	Temporary
<b>Problematic Students’ Relation</b>	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.4
<b>Working Condition (Load and Pressure)</b>	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.1
<b>Co-Workers Relations</b>	3.4	3.7	3.6	3.8
<b>Opportunities for Promotion &amp; Career Prospects</b>	4.1	4.6	4.2	4.8
<b>Administrative Support</b>	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.8

Table 13 shows that ‘Problematic Students’ Relation and Opportunities for Promotion & Career Prospects’ have more than 4 mean values, which clearly explains that these two issues have been responsible for high stress compared to other issues. Values of all other issues of stress have also been more than 3 which indicate that faculties of the university have faced stress with all issues of stress. ‘Organizational Factors’ causes similar stress to all the faculties of both types of campuses. This fact is also supported by the value of Standard Deviation less than ‘1’ in all issues.

## Conclusion

Stress is an increasing problem not only in education institutes, but also in every organization. It affects the employees' work life & performance, their perception, their behavior and their family life as well. All Faculties of university of both types of campuses have faced high stress due to which their performance has been impacted.

Family & Work Life Relation, Interpersonal Conflicts, Problematic Students' Relation and Opportunities for Promotion & Career Prospects are the main causes of stress in the university.

Universities must facilitate policies focused on employee wellbeing and create suitable environment to minimize the stress related to 'Personal Factors and Organizational Factors'.

Similarly, university should try to encourage and motivate their faculties by providing opportunities for their career development while improving the work environment.

## References

Bhatt, R. J. (2013). *A Case Study of Job Satisfaction among Employees of leading Nationalized*

*Banks of Gujarat State*

David, M. (1998). *Motivational and Stress Management*. Harvard Business School Publishing, Boston, Massachusetts, USA.

Deshwal, S. (2015). *Occupation Stress in Banking Sectors*, International Journal of Applied Research

Economic Survey, Nepal (2018)

Imtiaz, S. & Ahmad, S. (2009). *Impact Of Stress On Employee Productivity, Performance and Turnover; An Important Managerial Issue*. International Review of Business Research Papers, Vol. 5

Jamshed, K. K., Muhammad A. K., Haq, A. U., Muhammad, A. & Minhas, A. A. (2011). *Occupational Stress and Burnout in Pakistan's Banking Sector*, African Journal of Business Management, 5

Jungwee, P. (2007). *Work Stress and Job Performance. Perspectives on Labour and Income*, 8, Labour and Household Surveys Analysis Division, Statistics Canada.

Kahn, R.L. & Quinn, R.P. (1970). *Role Stress: A Framework for Analyses*, In: A. McLean (Ed.),

Occupational mental health. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Kayastha, R. & Adhikary, P. R. (2012). *An analytical study of occupational stress on*

*executive officers of Nepal*. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences 2

- Kazmi, A. (2008) *Strategic Management and Business Policy 3rd ed*, New Delhi, Tata McGrawHill Publishing Company Limited.
- Kiran, U. V. (2014). *Occupational Stress among Banking Employees*, European Academic Research.
- Materson, I. (1980). *Stress at Work: A Managerial Perspective*. Human Stress Press, Inc.
- Rubina, K., Amjad, S. & Khan, D. (2008). *Occupational Stress and its Effects on Job Performance; A Case Study of Medical House Officers of District Abbotabad*. J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad, 20
- Schuler, R. S. (1980). *Definition and Conceptualization of Stress in Organization*, Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 25
- Sharmila, A. (2012). *A Study on Employee Stress Management in Selected Private Banks in Salem*. International Business Management, Elixer
- Singh, R.R. & Bora, P. (2017). *Stress in Higher Education Teachers*, International Journal of Management, IT and Engineering
- Upadhyay, J. P. (2018). *Stress in Bank Employees*. Upahar Magazine of Economics and Management, Rastriya Banijya Bank Ltd.
- Wozny, K.W., Polowezyk, L.S. & Zygmunt, A. (2015). *Stress in the Teaching Profession*, Journal of Education, Health and Sport.