

A Comparative Study on Various Types and Dimensions Stress Among Teacher Professionals

*Dr. M. Julias Ceasar, Research Supervisor

**P. Berline Kingcy, (Reg. No: 12087) Part time Research Scholar

Research Department of Commerce, St. Xavier's College (Autonomous) Palayamkottai.

(Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapattai - Tirunelveli).

Tamilnadu – South India.

Abstract - Research studies shows that conflicting demands cause confusion among professionals and lead to the creation of stressful situations that even affect their job and job roles. The Multiple pressures (or) pressures that unremitting or prolonged may also form the cause for role stress in a person. The five aspects related to stressors identified that are intrinsic to work like, boredom, physical working conditions, time pressure and deadlines, work demands, job design and technical problems. The present era is considered as an era of strain, frustration, conflict, tension, depression, psychometric diseases and anxiety which have become regular features of life. The specific stress experienced by people, often depends on the nature and demands of the setting in which people live or the type profession they are attached. Thus, teachers experience different types of stress to different degrees. The outcome of the statistical analysis reveal that there are personal, health, family, work and environmental stress among teacher respondents beyond gender, sector of profession, education, type of family, duration of job and income. It is the responsibility of the teachers to cope with it and ensure a balanced professional practice that may make him / her and the stakeholders interacting with them happy.

Key words: role stress, depression, teachers, coping.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is a fact of modern day that every one live with stress, the work expectations, family obligations, financial strains and chronic shortage of time seem to lurk at every turn of life through creating a stressful situation. Stress has been experienced since time immemorial but its toll is higher than ever before due to changing situation and work culture. Over the past few decades stress is emerging as an increasing problem of the employees and professionals besides their regular routine. Stress is vigorous state in which a person is confronted with an opportunity, demand (or) resource related to what the individual wishes and for which the outcome is perceived to be both vague and vital. Selye (1936) first introduced the idea of stress into life science, he defined stress as the force, pressure (or) tension subjected upon an individual who resists these forces and attempt to uphold its true state. Today work place stress among the professionals is becoming a major issue and a matter of concern for the professionals.

Research studies shows that conflicting demands cause confusion among professionals and lead to the creation of stressful situations that even affect their job and job roles. The Multiple pressures (or) pressures that unremitting or prolonged may also form the cause for role stress in a

person. The five aspects related to stressors identified that are intrinsic to work like, boredom, physical working conditions, time pressure and deadlines, work demands, job design and technical problems. The present era is considered as an era of strain, frustration, conflict, tension, depression, psychometric diseases and anxiety which have become regular features of life.

The specific stress experienced by people, often depends on the nature and demands of the setting in which people live or the type profession they are attached. Thus, teachers experience different types of stress to different degrees. The professional role is extremely demanding because they serve the society where one has to interact with the other person in one form or the other. Stress disturbs the equilibrium of the body and it affects people physically, emotionally, and mentally. When individuals experience stress or face demanding situation, they adopt ways of dealing with it, as they cannot remain in a continued state of tension. How the individual deals with stressful situations is known as 'coping' which could otherwise be called as positive reaction or adjusting with it. The two major ways of coping with stress is changing ourselves or changing our environment. Coping refers to a person's active efforts to resolve stress and create new ways of

handling new situations at each life stage (Erikson, 1959). The goals of coping include the desire to maintain a sense of personal integrity and to achieve greater personal control over the environment. Then he/she modifies some aspects of the situation or the self in order to achieve a more adequate person-environment fit. Coping thus, is the behaviour that occurs after the person had a chance to analyze the situation, take a reading of his or her emotions and to move to a closer or more distant position from the challenge.

Statement of the problem: Stress has a major impact on the performance, attitude and mental health of the professionals as it has become an inevitable part of modern lives. In order to face the prevailing competition from within the group of members, there is a compulsion worldwide that warrants the members to work beyond their schedule. As a result the professionals are being affected by stress; this creates the research question as to the level of stress on professionals with particular reference to teachers.

Significance of the study: Stress is an extreme pressure exerted on the individual especially in a work place whether it is job or a profession. Stress occurs to the people who are work and money focused, overloaded with work and have over enthusiastic yearning for superior's appreciation, fear over their approval, low frustration statements, and stress occurs due to pent up emotions. Professionals have started participating actively in jobs particularly in the professional jobs of teaching in Tirunelveli district. In the light of these aspects it is considered to be more relevant to make a focused study on the work or job related stress among professionals in their service sectors, the stressors and their effects.

Importance of the study: Generally stress has negative consequences. It denotes the presence of optimum level of stress in an individual which contributes positively and to his / her role and performance. This may lead working employees to new and better ways of doing their jobs. Distress denotes the presence of high-level of stress in an individual which affects job performance in maximum. High level of job stress causes physical, psychological and behavioral problems. These ailments have a drastic effect on the individual, their families and organization. High level of stress may be accompanied psychological reactions such as anger, anxiety, depressions, nervousness, irritability, tension and boredom. The effects of psychological reactions of employees may be changes in mood and other emotional states, lowered self-esteem resentment of supervision, inability to concentrate and make decisions and job dissatisfaction. The professionals feel that they are affected by stress in one form or other due to stress mostly when they discharge their duty as professionals. Thus, an attempt is made by the researcher to study and find the ways and means of stress that affect their professional practice.

Over all objectives: An attempt is made by the researcher in this study to examine various levels of stress forged on Teacher professionals in the study area.

Objectives of the study

1. To explore and find-out various types and sources of stress among teacher professionals.
2. To identify the causes of stress and the most affecting type of stress.
3. To offer suggestions for all the pitfalls identified and to make them understand the reality of professional challenges.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Methodology prepares the investigator to adopt techniques and tools to neutralize the description, explanation and justification of various methods of continuing research. In this section of study the researcher attempts to study the level of stress among professionals in Tirunelveli District. The study explains the various stages through which it was carried out, objectives of the study, tools of data collection, samples, limitations of the study and the other required aspects.

Population (Research universe): The teacher professionals in Tirunelveli district is considered as the universe of the study.

Sampling: The sampling population of this research includes 233 teacher professionals employed in various schools and colleges. A simple random sampling technique was adopted and the required data for the study were collected with the help of a questionnaire.

Statistical tools: The data collected from the respondents have been analyzed with the help of the following statistical tools namely the frequency distribution, rank correlation, chi-square and factor analysis with the use of SPSS package.

Data: Both primary data and secondary data have been used in this study. The primary sources of data for the study were collected from the respondents with the help of a structured questionnaire that cover all the required components to study the stress of professionals.

Secondary data were collected from the books, journals, magazines, and government publications, documents of the department of health, professional documents and publications.

III. TEACHERS STRESS

As we see stress is common for human being, but the stress in teaching professional is high because of various factors involved such as personal factor, family factor, health factor, work situation factor and the work environment factor. Teachers in particular have stress due to all these

factors and hence these factors are analyzed and presented in the below table

Hypothesis-1: There is no significant difference among the teachers in encountering various levels of stress based on

the following variables namely the Gender, Sector of profession, Educational level, Type of family, Duration of job and Income.

Table 1. Gender Vs Types of Stress

Type of stress	Gender	Number	Mean	S.D	T	Df	Statistical inference
Personal	Male	110	28.32	4.280	-1.054	231	.293>0.05 NS
	Female	123	28.88	5.341			
Family	Male	110	47.21	6.108	.486	231	.628>0.05 NS
	Female	123	46.87	6.257			
Health	Male	110	47.37	5.757	-.924	231	.356>0.05 NS
	Female	123	47.98	5.447			
Work	Male	110	43.77	5.484	-.376	231	.707>0.05 NS
	Female	123	44.02	5.841			
Environmental	Male	110	18.86	3.404	.702	231	.483>0.05 NS
	Female	123	18.58	3.483			

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on gender and personal stress.

It is observed from the above table the male teacher respondents have the mean score of 28.32 with standard deviation 4.280 and female teacher respondents have mean score of 28.88 with standard deviation 5.381. The ‘t’ value obtained for male and female teachers is -1.054. The level of significance is 0.293 which is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted that there is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on gender and personal stress. However, it is found from the table that the female respondent teachers mean score is higher than the male teacher respondent’s mean score. It is inferred that the male and female teachers do not differ in personal stress.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on gender and family stress.

The ‘t’ test analysis indicates that there is no significant difference in encountering stress at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of male teacher respondents is found greater than that of their counterparts and also the SD of the male teacher respondents is found less than that of their counterparts. Hence it is inferred that there is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on gender and family stress.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on gender and health stress.

In case of gender and health stress it is found that the mean value of male teacher respondents is 47.37 and the standard deviation is 6.231. and the mean value of female teacher respondents is 47.97 and the standard deviation is 5.757. It is also found that the ‘t’ value is -0.924, the degree of freedom is 231 and the level of significance is 0.356 which is higher than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted there is no significant difference in the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on gender and health stress is accepted.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on gender and work stress.

The ‘t’ test analysis indicates that the male and female teacher respondents do not differ significantly in encountering stress based on gender and work related stress at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of the female teacher respondents (43.77) is greater than that of male teacher respondents (44.02). There is significant correlation between male and female teacher respondents in encountering work related stress. It also indicates the work related stress among male and female teacher respondents is almost the same and which shows that these two groups are balanced with reference to work related stress.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on gender and environmental stress.

It is seen that the ‘t’ value 0.702 is not significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that there is no significant difference among the teacher respondents with respect to their gender and environment related stress. Male and female teacher respondents are having similar level on the environment related stress. Hence the framed hypothesis is accepted.

Table 2. Sector of profession Vs Type of Stress

Type of stress	Sector of profession	Number	Mean	S.D	T	df	Statistical inference
Personal	Public	163	28.55	4.610	.222	231	.824>0.05 NS
	Private	70	28.46	4.381			
Family	Public	163	47.31	5.793	.825	231	.410>0.05 NS
	Private	70	46.85	5.998			
Health	Public	163	47.23	6.231	-1.344	231	.180>0.05 NS
	Private	70	47.97	5.557			
Work	Public	163	43.83	5.319	-.084	231	.933>0.05 NS
	Private	70	43.87	5.664			
Environmental	Public	163	18.49	3.443	-1.170	231	.242>0.05 NS
	Private	70	18.85	3.207			

1. Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on the sector of profession and their personal stress.

It is observed that stress for public have the mean score of 28.55 with standard deviation 4.610 and the stress private sector have mean score of 28.46 with standard deviation 4.381. The ‘t’ value obtained for the public and private sector job stress is 0.222. The level of significance is 0.824 which is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted that there is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on the public and private sectors of profession and their personal stress. However, it is found from the table that the mean score for public sector profession is higher than that of the mean score of the private sector professions. It is inferred that public and private sector as profession do not differ in their personal stress.

2. Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on the sector of profession and their family stress.

The ‘t’ test analysis indicates that there is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on the sector of profession and their family stress at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of public sector is found greater than that of private sector and also the SD of the public is found less than that of private sectors. Hence it is inferred that there is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on the sectors of profession and their family stress

3. Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teachers based on the sector of profession and their health.

In case of sector of profession and health it is found that the mean value of home is 47.23 and the standard deviation is 6.231. And the mean value of private sector is 47.97 and the standard deviation is 5.557. It is also found that the ‘t’ value is -1.344, the degree of freedom is 231 and the level of significance is 0.180 which is higher than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis there is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on the sectors of profession and their health stress.

4. Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teachers based on the sector of profession and their work

The ‘t’ test analysis indicates that the public and private sector professionals do not differ significantly based on the sectors of profession and their work at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of the public sector (43.87) is greater than that of private sectors (43.83). There is significant correlation between public and private sector in relation to work stress. It also indicates that the stress public sector and private sector is almost the same and which shows that these two groups are balanced with reference to work stress.

5. Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teachers based on the sector of profession and their environmental stress.

It is seen that the ‘t’ value -1.170 is not significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that there is no significant difference among the teacher professionals with respect to their sectors of profession and environmental stress.

Public and private sectors are having similar level of stress among the women professionals. Hence the framed hypothesis is accepted.

Educational level: The level of education or the educational qualification of teacher professionals have impact over various types of stress and hence the data relating to the educational qualification are gathered and presented in the below table

Table 3. Table Education Vs Types of stress

Type of stress	Qualification	Number	Mean	S.D	T	df	Statistical inference
Personal	UG	172	28.51	4.558	.080	231	.936>0.05 NS
	PG	60	28.47	4.286			
Family	UG	172	47.08	5.714	.053	231	.958>0.05 NS
	PG	60	47.04	6.435			
Health	UG	172	47.72	5.774	.594	231	.553>0.05 NS
	PG	60	47.34	6.231			
Work	UG	172	43.59	5.426	-1.751	231	.081>0.05 NS
	PG	60	44.61	5.659			
Environmental	UG	172	18.53	3.329	-1.639	231	.102>0.05 NS
	PG	60	19.11	3.275			

1. Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on their educational level and their personal stress

It is observed that the UG level educational qualifications have the mean score of 28.51 with standard deviation 4.558 and PG level educational qualifications have the mean score of 28.47 with standard deviation 4.286. The 't' value obtained for UG and PG level of education is 0.80. The level of significance is 0.936 which is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted that there is no significant difference in the teacher professionals and their educational level. However, it is found from the table that the UG mean score is higher than the PG mean score. It is inferred that the UG and PG level education of the teacher professionals do not differ in their personal stress.

2. Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on their educational level and their family stress

The 't' test analysis indicates that there is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on their educational level and their family stress at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of UG teacher professional is found greater than that of their counterparts and also the SD of the UG teacher professionals are found less than that of their counterparts. Hence it is inferred that there is no significant difference among the teacher professional based on their educational level and their family stress.

3. Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on their educational level and their health stress

In case of educational level and health stress it is found that the mean value of UG teacher professionals are 47.72 and the standard deviation is 5.774. And the mean value of PG teacher professionals are 47.34 and the standard deviation is 6.231. It is also found that the 't' value is 0.594, the degree of freedom is 231 and the level of significance is 0.553 which is higher than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis there is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on their educational level and their health stress is accepted.

4. Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on their educational level and their work stress

The 't' test analysis indicates that the UG teacher professionals and PG teacher professionals do not differ significantly in their work stress at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of the UG teacher professionals (43.59) are greater than that of PG teacher professionals (44.61). There is significant correlation between UG teacher professionals and PG teacher professionals in relation to work stress. It also indicates that the work stress among the UG teacher professionals and PG teacher professionals are almost the same and which shows that these two groups are balanced with reference to work stress.

5. Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on their educational level and their environmental stress

It is seen that the ‘t’ value -1.639 is not significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that there is no significant difference among the teacher professionals with respect to their qualification and environmental stress. UG and PG teacher professionals are having similar levels of environmental stress, hence the framed hypothesis is accepted.

Type of family: The type of family is the positive and negative feature to teacher professional to encounter stress and hence the data relating to the type of family are gathered and presented in the cross **Table 4. Type of family Vs Type of stress**

Type of stress	Type of family	Number	Mean	S.D	T	Df	Statistical inference
Personal	Nuclear	173	28.53	4.448	.295	231	.768>0.05 NS
	Joint	60	28.38	4.635			
Family	Nuclear	173	47.12	6.049	.357	231	.721>0.05 NS
	Joint	60	46.88	5.376			
Health	Nuclear	173	47.29	6.140	-2.285	231	.023<0.05 S
	Joint	60	48.78	4.768			
Work	Nuclear	173	43.98	5.408	.927	231	.355>0.05 NS
	Joint	60	43.41	5.809			
Environmental	Nuclear	173	18.63	3.284	-.647	231	.518>0.05 NS
	Joint	60	18.87	3.459			

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on their type of family and their personal stress.

It is observed from the above table that the nuclear family teacher professionals have the mean score of 28.53 with standard deviation 4.448 and joint family teacher have mean score of 28.38 with standard deviation 4.635. The ‘t’ value obtained for nuclear family teacher and joint family teacher is 0.295. The level of significance is 0.768 which is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted that there is no significant difference in the teacher professionals and their type of family. However, it is found from the table that the nuclear family mean score is higher than the joint family means score. It is inferred that the nuclear and joint family of the teacher professionals do not differ in their personal stress.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on type of family and family stress.

The ‘t’ test analysis indicates that there is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on their educational level and their family stress at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of nuclear family teacher professional is found greater than that of their counterparts and also the SD of the nuclear family professionals are found higher than that of their counterparts. Hence it is inferred that there is no significant difference among the teacher professional based on their type of family and their family stress.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on type of family and health stress.

In case of type of family and health stress it is found that the mean value of nuclear family teacher professionals are 47.29 and the standard deviation is 6.140. And the mean value of joint family teacher professionals are 48.78 and the standard deviation is 4.768. It is also found that the ‘t’ value is -2.285, the degree of freedom is 231 and the level of significance is 0.023 which is lesser than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and there is a significant difference among the teacher professionals based on their type of family and their health stress is accepted.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on type of family and work stress.

The ‘t’ test analysis indicates that the nuclear family teacher professionals and joint family teacher professionals do not differ significantly in their work stress at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of the nuclear family teacher professionals (43.98) are greater than that of joint family teacher professionals (43.41). There is significant correlation between nuclear family teacher professionals and joint family teacher professionals in relation to work stress. It also indicates that the work stress among the nuclear family teacher professionals and joint family teacher professionals are almost the same and which shows that these two groups are balanced with reference to work stress.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on type of family and environmental stress.

It is seen that the ‘t’ value -0.647 is not significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that there is no significant difference among the teacher professionals with respect to their family type and environmental stress. Joint and nuclear family teacher professionals are having similar levels of environmental stress, hence the framed hypothesis is accepted.

DURATION OF JOB

As the research is focused on stress there is every scope for the professionals to encounter stress based on the duration of work and hence the question relating to the duration of job is gathered and presented in the table based on the type of stress.

Table 5: Duration of Job Vs Type of stress

Type of stress	Duration of job	Number	Mean	S.D	T	df	Statistical inference
Personal	Less than 8 hours	104	28.58	4.612	.358	231	.720>0.05 NS
	More than 8 hours	129	28.43	4.391			
Family	Less than 8 hours	104	47.44	5.782	1.223	231	.222>0.05 NS
	More than 8 hours	129	46.77	5.987			
Health	Less than 8 hours	104	47.43	6.007	-.618	231	.537>0.05 NS
	More than 8 hours	129	47.77	5.801			
Work	Less than 8 hours	104	43.82	5.426	-.117	231	.907>0.05 NS
	More than 8 hours	129	43.88	5.565			
Environmental	Less than 8 hours	104	18.44	3.328	-1.378	231	.169>0.05 NS
	More than 8 hours	129	18.87	3.311			

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference in the Teacher professionals in the duration of job and their personal stress.

The teacher professionals working for less than 8 hours have the mean score of 28.58 with standard deviation 4.612 and the teacher professionals working for more than 8 hours have mean score of 28.43 with standard deviation 4.391. The ‘t’ value obtained for both the the case of professionals is 0.358. The level of significance is 0.720 which is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted that there is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on the duration of job and their personal stress. However, it is found from the table that the mean score of teacher professionals who work for less than 8 hours have higher mean score than the teacher professionals working for more than 8 hours. It is inferred that both the segment of teacher professionals do not differ in their personal stress.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on Duration of Job and family stress.

The ‘t’ test analysis indicates that there is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on their working hours and their family stress at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of the teacher professional working less than 8 hours is found greater than that of their counterparts and also the SD of the teachers working less than 8 hours are found less than that of their counterparts. Hence it is inferred that there is no significant difference among the teacher professional based on their duration of work and their family stress.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on Duration of Job and health stress.

In case of duration of job and health stress it is found that the mean value of teacher professionals working less than 8 hours are 47.43 and the standard deviation is 6.007. And the mean value of teacher professionals working more than 8 hours are 47.77 and the standard deviation is 5.801. It is also found that the ‘t’ value is -0.618, the degrees of freedom is 231 and the level of significance is 0.537 which is higher than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted and there is no significant difference among the teacher professionals based on their duration of work and their health stress is accepted.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on Duration of Job and work stress.

The ‘t’ test analysis indicates that the teacher professionals working less than 8 hours and teacher professionals working more than 8 hours do not differ significantly in their work stress at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of the teacher professionals working less than 8 hours (43.82) is lesser than that of teacher professionals working more than 8 hours (43.88). There is significant correlation between teacher professionals working less than 8 hours and teacher professionals working more than 8 hours in relation to work stress. It also indicates that the work stress among the teacher professionals working less

than 8 hours and teacher professionals working more than 8 hours are almost the same and which shows that these two groups are balanced with reference to work stress.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on Duration of Job and environmental stress.

It is seen that the ‘t’ value -1.378 is not significant at 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that there is no significant difference among the teacher professionals with respect to their duration of work and environmental stress. Teacher professionals working more than 8 hours and less than 8 hours are having similar levels of environmental stress, hence the framed hypothesis is accepted.

Income As the research is focused on stress there is every scope for the teacher professionals to encounter stress based on the income and hence the question relating to income is gathered and presented in the table based on the type of stress.

Table 6 Income Vs Type of stress

Type of stress	Source of variation	SS	Df	MS	df	Statistical inference
Personal	Between Groups	67.57	4	16.89	.838	.501>0.05 NS
	Within Groups	9268.67	115	20.14		
	Total	9336.24	114			
Family	Between Groups	237.88	4	59.47	1.719	.145>0.05 NS
	Within Groups	15915.04	115	34.59		
	Total	16152.92	114			
Health	Between Groups	78.87	4	19.71	.566	.687>0.05 NS
	Within Groups	16014.51	115	34.81		
	Total	16093.38	114			
work	Between Groups	177.24	4	44.31	1.472	.210>0.05 NS
	Within Groups	13850.80	115	30.11		
	Total	14028.04	114			
Environmental	Between Groups	26.51	4	6.62	.599	.664>0.05 NS
	Within Groups	5092.74	115	11.07		
	Total	5119.25	114			

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on income and personal stress.

The ‘F’ value obtained for income of teachers on personal stress is 0.838 and the level of significance is 0.501 at 5 percent significant level, which is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted and there is no significant mean difference in the teacher professionals’ personal stress and income.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on income and family stress.

The ‘F’ value obtained for income of teachers on family stress is 1.719 and the level of significance is 0.145 at 5 percent significant level, which is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted and there is no significant mean difference in the teacher professionals’ health stress and income.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on income and health stress.

The ‘F’ value obtained for income of teachers on health stress is 0.566 and the level of significance is 0.687 at 5 percent significant level, which is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted and there is no significant mean difference in the teacher professionals’ health stress and income.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on income and work stress.

The ‘F’ value obtained for income of teachers on work stress is 1.472 and the level of significance is 0.210 at 5 percent significant level, which is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted and there is no significant mean difference in the teacher professionals’ work stress and income.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference among the teacher respondents in encountering stress based on income and environmental stress.

It is observed that the ‘F’ value obtained for income of teachers on environmental stress is 0.599 and the level of significance is 0.664 at 5 percent significant level, which is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted

and there is no significant mean difference in the teacher professionals' environmental stress and income.

IV. CONCLUSION

The world without stress is scarcely imaginable but there is always a scope for minimizing the stress that one encounters. The stress of teachers and the factors of stress are analyzed with various kinds namely the gender, sector of profession, educational level, type of family, duration of job and income. The outcome of the statistical analysis reveal that there are personal, health, family, work and environmental stress among teacher respondents beyond gender, sector of profession, education, type of family, duration of job and income. It is the responsibility of the teachers to cope with it and ensure a balanced professional practice that may make him / her and the stakeholders interacting with them happy.

V. BOOKS AND JOURNALS REFERRED

- [1] McGrath J E, (1976) Stress and Behaviour in Organisations, Hand Book of Industrial and Organisational Psychology. Rand McNally College Publishing, Dunnett M D (Ed) Chicago.
- [2] Albrecht K, (1979) Stress and the Manager, Englewood Cliffs, N J, Prentice Hall of India.
- [3] French W L, Kast F E and Rosenzweig J E, (1985) Understanding Human Behaviour in Organisations, Harper and Row, New York.
- [4] Hans Seyle, (1956) The Stress of Life, McGraw Hill Book Company, New York.
- [5] Adams, John (1979) Understanding and Managing Stress: a workbook in changing life style.
- [6] Luthans, Fred (1998) Organizational Behavior, New York: Irwin Mc Graw Hill Publishing.
- [7] Pestonjee, DM (1992) Stress and Coping: the Indian experience, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- [8] Gulati, Uma (2005) Managing of Organizational Stress, New Delhi: New Century Publications.
- [9] Unknown (August 2005) Stress Management, Readers Shelf, A Monthly Magazine of Commercial Management and Legal Issues, Vol.1, No:11, Pp. 22-24.
- [10] Pareek, Understanding Organizational Behaviour, pp. 209 – 224.
- [11] Coleman J C (1976), Abnormal Psychology and Modern Life (Indian Reprint), Taraporewalla Press, Bombay.