

A Study of the Organizational Stress in Public and Private Sector Secondary School Teachers

Faheem Huma Gulzar* and Khalid Rashid**

Abstract

The aim of the study was to determine the nature of the organizational stress being encountered by school teachers and the effect of stress on the performance of school teachers. The study was related to the secondary schools of both public and private sector in Punjab which comprises nine divisions. The study delimited to private and public secondary schools of Lahore division. The study adopted the descriptive survey design using a sample of 1000 teachers drawn from 100 secondary schools from both public and private sector in Lahore division. From each school 10 teachers were randomly selected. Two rating scales were developed to collect data for the study. The percentage, mean, standard deviation and t-test were applied as descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the collected data. Based on the study, it may be recommended that unwanted sounds and noise may be minimized in the school environment, training be imparted to the staff, workload should be equally distributed and necessary facilities should be provided at the schools.

Keywords: Organizational stress, private sector, public sector, performance.

* PhD Scholar Dept of Education, University of Lahore, Lahore.

Email: faheemrana27@gmail.com

** Associate Professor, Department of Education, University of Lahore, Lahore.

Email: drkhalid454@gmail.com

Introduction

Stress is a feeling of emotional or physical tension. Stress is often described as a feeling of being overloaded, wound-up tight, tense and worried. In our daily life, everybody faces stress. Stress is basic to life, no matter how prosperous, powerful, good looking happy employed or unemployed is someone. Stress is experienced by all in their everyday lives in a wide variety of situations and settings in the family, in school and on the job. Specifically, it is the pressure and strain that result from demand in change that require some kind re-adjustment in individual. Conflict, deprivation and anxiety could also produce stress. In an age of rapid escalation in the rates of general occupational stress teaching is one of the most stressful occupations (Kyriacou, 2001). In another study, it was proposed that teacher stress is associated with student misbehavior (Hastings & Bham, 2003).

Teacher stress can be brought about from different circumstances. Stress regularly occurs when teachers have trouble discussing different parts of connections with students (Hepburn, 2001). Reasons of teacher's stress can be separated into organizational and individual stressors. Many stressors can be found in the workplace and incorporate unfavorable working situations, extreme workloads, authoritative issues, and scarcity of assets, absence of support as well as self-sufficiency, and basic leadership. The workplace can include physical stressors, for example, noise at workplace, swarming, large size of class, youth brutality, and additionally managerial pressures (Hastings & Bham, 2003). Personal stress can be linked with the compatibility among individual and instructive values, aspiration to succeed, affectability edge, intensity, and flawlessness (Bachkirova, 2005). A major factor of teacher stress can be specifically ascribed to the pupils. Through the response of the survey and interview, most of the teachers refer to student behavior as being responsible for their stress (Bham, 2003).

Now a days, stress has turned into a typical and difficult issue confronted by nearly everybody. This issue has turned out to be so regular both in developed and developing nations that individuals have called it "the third wave plague". There is presently authentic proof of witness to what numerous educational institutions have known for quite a long time: teaching is a stressful occupation. In fact, the profession of teaching all over the world is known as a stressful occupation (Kinman, 2001). Many studies demonstrate that the training area is one of the stress ridden work settings (Cooper, 2007).

Research Objectives

Research Questions

The main purpose of this study is to obtain from teachers their perceptions about major sources of organizational stress being faced by them. Another purpose of this study is to compare the factors that create stress among public and private secondary school teachers. This is achieved by controlling for the selected background variables of gender, age, level of education, grade level taught, years of teaching experience, size of the school, and perceived personal life stress. The research questions guided this study are below:

1. What is the nature of the organizational stress being encountered by public sector secondary school teachers?
2. What is the nature of the organizational stress being encountered by private sector secondary school teachers?
3. What is the effect of organizational stress on the performance of public and private secondary school teachers?
4. What are the factors which create stress among teachers in the school?

Significance of the Study

This study would be helpful in identifying the effects of organizational stress on the performance of public and private secondary school teachers. Stress in the work place reduces productivity, increases management pressures and make people ill in many ways, evidence of which is still increasing. Workplace stress affects the performance of brain, including functions of work performance memory, concentration and learning. This study would be helpful for principals and management of public and private schools to recognize where stress is becoming a problem for the staff and to take action to reduce stress. It would also be helpful for teachers in providing a stress free work environment encouraging them to achieve their targets which stimulate them to work day and night in a stress and burnout free work environment at public and private schools.

Teacher is responsible for training and character building of new generation and if a teacher is contented, he/she may perform his/her role in a better way. But if a teacher is depressed, consequently, the youth may be frustrated and under stress. This study may provide us information about what is stress, what are the stressors and the effects of organizational stress of private and public sector on the performance of secondary school teachers.

Methodology

Research Design

It is basically a descriptive research based on the survey of the opinions of teachers about the organizational stress of public and private sector secondary school teachers. A five point Likert type rating scale was devised for the collection of the data. In this study, two rating scales were developed to find out the facts of organizational stress including, nature, factors and effect on the performance of teachers. The quantitative mode pursued to measure the responses of the teachers.

Sampling

The study relates to the private and public secondary schools both male and female in Punjab. The population of the study was composed of all the public and private secondary school teachers in Punjab, currently teaching secondary classes. There are 9 divisions and 36 districts in Punjab. This study is delimited to the public and private school teachers of Lahore division. Lahore division was selected by the researcher as the sample of the study. There are three district of Lahore division, Lahore, Kasur and Shekhupura. Lahore division is very populated area of the Punjab Province of Pakistan. In Lahore there were 1495 secondary schools both private and public. There were 285 secondary schools in Kasur both private and public. In Shekhupura there were 267 secondary schools both private and public. For the purpose of the study at the first stage randomly 50 governments and 50 private secondary schools were selected. These schools were selected from both rural and urban areas of Lahore division. Stratified sampling was used for the male and female teachers 50% male and 50% female teachers were selected. After that 10 teachers were randomly selected from each school. 500 government secondary school teachers and 500 private secondary school teachers constituted the sample. In total 1000 teachers formed the sample of the study.

Development of the rating scale

The instruments used in this study were developed based on two rating scales. Validity and reliability of the instruments were developed through expert opinion and Cronbach Alpha as well. The rating scales were administered to 1000 secondary school teachers. One of the rating scales consisted a total of 35 questions devised on; 5 point Likert type scale items relating to organizational stress factors. The item scores ranged from a one strongly disagree to a five, strongly agree. The rating scale related to stress was divided into five scales; role of management that cause stress; work conditions, work relations with pupils and staff, school policy and ethos that mitigate stress, and general factors that create stress. The second rating scale consisted of a total of 27 question related to the common organizational stressors. The rating scale related to nature of stress was divided into 5 scales; tasks assigned, attitude, administration support, job satisfaction and anxiety.

Pilot testing of the rating scale and its reliability

The rating scales were applied to a segment of population comprising a sample of 100 respondents 50 from public Secondary School and 50 from private Secondary School not included in the sample of the study. The reliability was got determined through SPSS by computing Chronbach Alpha which was .79 and .94.

Data Collection

The data was collected through both the rating scales. Rating scale was delivered to the teachers personally as well as by the class fellows where feasible. Gray (2004) recommends using the rating scale for realization of the reasonable objectives. Rating scale proves helpful in managing the large sample of the study.

Data analysis

Data analysis was conducted using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) software. t-test was used to compare the organizational stress of private and public secondary school teachers. The target population was consisted of 1000 working secondary school teachers of private and public sector in Lahore division. Demographic information like age, experience, qualification and gender were included in quantitative survey.

In this study 1000 participants participated out of them 592(59.2%) were male and 408(40.8%) female. In regard to age 349(34.9%) were between 20-30 years, 197(19.7%) were between 31-40 and 454(45.4%) were having age 41 or above 41. Highest qualification of 140(14.0%) participants were B.Ed., 810(81.0%) were having MA or M.Sc. and 50(5.0%) of the participants were M.Phil. & Ph. D.

Table 1

T-test statistics showing the difference of mean between public and private sector school teachers.

	Employee	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test	P-value
1. Role of management	Public	785	26.19	7.605	7.066	<0.001
	private	215	22.07	7.360	7.70	
2. Work conditions	Public	785	26.13	7.307	7.76	<0.001
	private	215	21.74	7.451	7.67	
3. Work relations	Public	785	19.19	5.224	5.70	<0.001
	Private	215	16.93	4.903	5.91	
4. School policy	Public	785	22.59	5.494	1.13	<0.259
	Private	215	22.12	5.554	1.12	
5. General factors	Public	785	19.62	5.056	1.52	<0.130
	private	215	19.05	4.301	1.66	
6. Total factors	Public	785	113.72	25.341	6.14	<0.01
	Private	212	101.91	23.272	6.38	

Table 1 presents that mean score of management role of participants working in public institutions was 26.19 ± 7.605 and score of Private institutions was $22.07 \pm 7.7.360$. The difference was statistically significant (p-value < 0.001). Mean score of work conditions of participants working in Public institutions was 26.13 ± 7.307 and score of Private institutions was 21.74 ± 7.451 . The difference was statistically significant (p-value < 0.001). Mean score of work relations of participants working in Public institutions was 19.19 ± 5.224 and score of Private institutions was 16.93 ± 4.903 . The difference was statistically significant (p-value < 0.001). Mean score of school policy of participants working in Public institutions was 22.59 ± 5.494 and score of Private institutions was 22.12 ± 5.554 . The difference was not statistically significant (p-value 0.259). Mean score of general factor of participants working in Public institutions was 19.62 ± 5.056 and score of Private institutions was 19.05 ± 4.301 . The difference was statistically significant (p-value 0.130). Total mean score of participants working in Public institutions was 113.72 ± 25.341 and score of Private institutions was 101.91 ± 23.727 . The difference was statistically significant (p-value < 0.001)

Analysis of rating scale for stressors as Severe, Moderate and mild/weak

A scale which was developed following the procedural formalities focused on the prerequisites for the administration of the rating scale. i.e. validity and reliability, Validity was determined through expert opinion, for reliability Cronbach Alpha was computed for Tasks assigned (.294), Attitude (.500), Administration support (.444), Job satisfaction (.266) and Anxiety (.583). These were five variables which were put before the respondents to exercise their choice for rating the parameters of the variables. The parameters to be rated upon were as Severe, Moderate and Mild/weak. A profile of variables is being presented variables wise. The number of Male/ Female and Public / Private schools stand equal.

Table 2

Profile of Tasks assigned taken as severe, moderate and weak stressor

Sr. No.	Statement	Severe	Moderate	Mild/Weak
1.	Less time is given to accomplish the assignments	520(52.0)	336(33.6)	144(14.4)
2.	Tasks are assigned irrespective of potential	461(46.1)	367(36.7)	172(17.2)
3.	Entrust more of extra duties	373(37.7)	276(27.6)	351(35.1)
4.	Exposure to time lined schedule	225(22.5)	704(70.4)	71(7.1)
5.	Human potential not considered before implementation of the policies	127(12.7)	422(42.2)	451(45.1)

Table 2 shows that there were three severe stressors in the 'Tasks assigned' on the top is the parameter; less time is given to accomplish the assignments as the responses are 520(52.0%) next parameter is; Tasks are assigned irrespective of potential as the responses are 461(46.1%) and on the lowest level of severe stressor is; Entrust of more extra duties as responses are 373(37.3%). The moderate stressor is only one which is; Exposure to time lined schedule, the responses are in favor 704(70.4%). There is one mild stressor; Human potential not considered before implementation of the policies, the supporting response is 451(45.1%).

Table 3

Profile of Attitude revealed as severe, moderate and weak stressor

Sr. No.	Statement	Severe	Moderate	Mild/Weak
1.	Entrust of responsibilities without choice	617 (61.7)	229 (22.9)	154 (15.4)
2.	Harsh attitude of the boss	473 (47.3)	374 (37.4)	153 (15.3)
3.	No reward of labour and hard work	148(14.8)	491 (49.1)	361(36.1)
4.	Non-cooperation of the seniors	313 (31.3)	437 (43.7)	250 (25.0)
5.	People don't learnt to cope with stress	114 (11.4)	413 (41.3)	473 (47.3)
6.	Unrealistic demands of the stakeholders	266 (26.6)	337 (33.7)	397 (39.7)

Table 3 shows that in the realm of 'Attitude' two parameters could be found to be the severe stressors on the top falls; entrust of responsibilities without choice which was supported by 617(61.7%) responses. Second in sequence comes; Harsh attitude of the boss for which the responses could be counted as 473(47.3%). Likewise, the moderate stressors are two on the top is; No reward of labour and hard work supported by 491(49.1%) respondents. Second in line moderate stressor is; Noncooperation of the superiors, supported by 437(43.7%) respondents. In the realm of 'Attitude' the mild/weak parameters are two which include at first level; People don't learn to cope with stress supported by 473(47.3%) at the second level is placed; unrealistic demands of the stakeholders being supported by 397(39.7%) respondents.

Table 4

Profile of Administration support understood as severe, moderate and weak stressor

Sr. No.	Statement	Severe	Moderate	Mild/Weak
1.	Opinion not given weightage	70 (7.0)	617 (61.7)	313 (31.3)
2.	Unnecessary noise at workplace	118 (11.8)	609 (60.9)	273 (27.3)
3.	Work load most of the times goes irrational	400 (44.0)	523 (52.3)	77 (7.7)
4.	Long working hours	412(41.2)	523(52.3)	65(6.5)
5.	Policies remain uniform for defaulter and others	154 (15.4)	298 (29.8)	548 (54.8)
6.	No fun and no recreation	246 (24.6)	232 (23.2)	522 (52.2)

Table 4 presents that in the realm of 'Administration support' no parameter lies in the category of severe stressors. The parameters that lie in the realm of moderate stressors are; Opinion not given weightage 617(61.7%), Unnecessary noise at work place 609(60.9%), Workload most of the times goes irrational 523(52.3%) and long working hours is supported by 523(52.3%) respondents.

The mild/weak parameters are two the first on the top is; policies remain uniform for defaulters and others supported by 548(54.8%) responses the second parameter is; No fun and no recreation supported by 522(52.2%) respondents.

Table 5

Profile of Job satisfaction considered as severe, moderate and weak stressor

Sr No.	Statement	Severe	Moderate	Mild/Weak
1.	Matters not resolved on merit	114 (11.4)	618 (61.8)	268 (46.6)
2.	Performance evaluation does not match the ground realities	71 (7.1)	601 (60.1)	328 (32.8)
3.	Not accommodated in time table when need arises	250 (25.0)	416 (41.6)	334 (33.4)
4.	Casual leave mostly denied	123 (12.3)	351 (35.1)	526 (52.6)
5.	Students misbehavior not attended to	160 (16.0)	358 (35.8)	482 (48.2)

Table 5 shows that there are three moderating stressors in the realm of 'Job satisfaction' on the top falls matter not resolved on merit supported by 618(61.8%) respondents. Second in line is the parameter; Performance evaluation does not match the ground realities because of being supported by 601(60.1%) respondents. Third inline is the moderate stressor; Not accommodated in time table when need arises because of being supported by 416(41.6%) respondents. The mild/weak stressors are two including, casual leave mostly denied supported by 526(52.6%) responses. The next mild stressor is, student's misbehavior not attended because of being supported by 482(48.2%).

Table 6

Profile of Anxiety factors taken as severe, moderate and weak stressor

Sr. No.	Statement	Severe	Moderate	Mild/Weak
1.	Incompetence of the boss	154 (15.4)	639 (63.9)	207 (20.7)
2.	Humanitarianism is kept aside while entrust of tasks	336 (33.6)	491 (49.1)	173 (17.3)
3.	Stock taking is not done after the maturity of events	120 (12.0)	463 (46.3)	417 (41.7)
4.	Public opinion not given weightage	111 (11.1)	386 (38.6)	503 (50.3)
5.	Feeling of stress is an attitude	119 (11.9)	414 (41.4)	467 (46.7)

Table 6 shows that in the realm of 'Anxiety' there is no severely acting stressor. There are three moderate stressors on the top lies; Incompetence of the boss supported by 639(63.9%) responses. Second inline is; Humanitarian is kept aside while entrust of tasks is supported by, 491(49.1%) respondents, the third parameter is; Stock taking is not done after the maturity of events because of being supported by 463(46.3%) responses

The mild/weak parameters are two the first on the top is; Public opinion not given weightage by 503(50.3%) responses. The second parameter is; Feeling of stress is an attitude supported by 467(46.7%) respondents.

Discussion

Many factors contribute to an impression of organizational stress. Auston, Shah, and Muncer (2005) inspected reasons for work environment stress among secondary school teachers, and recognized reasons for stress, for example, inordinate workload, planning and hours worked outside of school. Extra investigations recognized similar factors of stress for general training and special education teachers (Anhorn, 2008). The past researchers are similar with the findings of this study.

Conclusions

According to the responses of the teachers and as per the findings of the research with the help of two rating scales, it was found that extreme work load, large class size, lack of necessary facilities, noise at work place, working during vocations, and unnecessary paper work are the major factors which create stress among teachers. It was explored that misbehavior of the students, noncooperation of the colleagues and head teacher, interference of politicians and parents, low professional status and low salary effect the performance of the teachers and create stress. Lack of technology, meeting of time line and poor working relationship with students and staff make the teacher's feel more stressed.

With reference to the tables No (2, 3) under this research study, it was found that less time is given to accomplish the assignments, tasks assigned irrespective of potential, entrust more of extra duties, entrust of responsibilities without choice and harsh attitude of the boss were the severe stressors.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made as a result of study:

Unwanted sounds and noise may be decreased in the school environment and schools should be the calm areas. Arrangement of light in the classroom and ventilation in the school environment should also be improved. There should be such strategies that may

lower the probability of conflicts with other fellow teachers, head of the school and others staff. School management process should be improved and head should involve all teachers in decision making process. Trainings be imparted to the staff enabling them to better cope with the staff rather to burst out. Work load should be equally distributed and possibly decreased and necessary facilities should be provided at the schools

References

- Anhorn, R. (2008). The profession that eats its young. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 15-26.
- Austin, V., Shah, S., & Muncer, S. (2005). Teacher stress and coping strategies used to reduce stress. *Occupational Therapy International*, 12(2), 63-80.
- Bachkirova, T. (2005). Teacher stress and personal values: An exploratory study. *School Psychology International*, 26(3), 340-352.
- Chang, M. L. (2009). An appraisal perspective of teacher burnout: Examining the emotional work of teachers. *Educational Psychology Review*, 21, 193-218. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0034654308321455>
- Hepburn, A., & Brown, S. (2001). Teacher stress and management of accountability. *Human Relations*, 54(6), 691-715.
- Hastings, R., & Bham, M. (2003). The relationship between student behaviour patterns and teacher burnout. *School Psychology International*, 24(1), 115-127.
- Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review*, 53, 27-35. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131910120033628>
- Kinman, G. (2001). Pressure points: A review of research on stressors and strains in UK academics. *Educational Psychology*, 21, 473-492.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2011). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging, and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 1029-1038. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.11.001>
- Stoeber, J., & Rennert, D. (2008). Perfectionism in school teachers: Relations with stress appraisals, coping styles, and burnout. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping: An International Journal*, 21, 37-53. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10615800701742461>