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ABSTRACT

Teaching profession involves imperative and lofty place in the society and basically in the management education. With the evolving financial situation and expanding joblessness, the estimations of educator and their expert concerns and increasing unemployment, the values of teacher and their professional concerns associated with the job have undergone a change, increasing stresses and hassles of teachers. In concurrence with the ascertained importance of faculties role in the Management Education system, the present research is an attempt to study the level of Occupational Stress of Business School faculty members with respect to age, gender, qualification, designation and income. The sample of 545 Business School faculty members from various macro and micro cities of India has been selected adopting convenient sampling technique. Faculty members occupational stress was accessed with the help of Teacher Stress Scale developed by Dr. K. S. Mishra. The descriptive survey method was adopted for the study. The data, which has obtained from that survey, has been analysed using SPSS software, T-test and one-way ANOVA. The study reveals that a significant difference exists between age, gender, qualification, designation, income and Occupational Stress of the faculty members with special reference to Business Schools in India.
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INTRODUCTION:

Work related Stress is stress at work. Word Occupational stress has become increasingly common in teaching profession largely because of increased occupational complexities and increased economic pressure on individuals. A noteworthy wellspring of distress among teachers is result of failure of the institute to meet the social needs and job demands of the teachers. In the Management institutes the faculty members are over burdened with regular teaching load as well as the additional bureaucratic work and they complain that they are not sufficiently paid. Teachers in B-schools need to do lots of non-teaching work such as election duties, duty in census, populations counting etc which created additional burden on the faculty members. In general, occupational stress arises from the working conditions and environment of a system, when we talk of stress among teachers.

It has been contended that when instructors feel that they in-vest more in students, colleagues, and school than they get from them, at that point they will probably confront emotional, psychological and occupational difficulties (Van Horn, Schaufeli, & Taris, 2001). The sources of stress experienced by a particular teacher are
unique to him or her and depend on the interaction between personality, values and skills and the circumstances. All mentioned stressors have been shown to lead to teachers’ burnout. The burnout syndrome is described as emotional exhaustion which is the result of chronic stress and particularly occurs in people who are in contact with other people professionally. It comprises three components: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and lack of personal accomplishment/achievement (Montgomery & Rupp, 2005), in this manner to remember the negative outcome of stress like burnout and week mental and physical wellbeing it is important to examine the level of Occupational Stress among the Faculty Members with Special Reference to Business Schools in India.

NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY:

Stress experienced by teachers is a subject of extreme enthusiasm for late years. In connection to the profession of teaching, teachers are seen as distributors of learning however they work in a steady socially confined situations encompassed by hostile views and sometimes threat of physical abuse, and at the same time under a constant fear and threat of accountability for each and every action of both own self and that of the pupil. This by itself can be an adequate reason for stress in an individual. But in the case of a teacher it is multiplied by other factors as well. Although Most people never realize the amount of stress that teachers deal with on a daily basis but truly speaking in Management Institutes teaching has now turned into an exceptionally demanding occupation with a lot of stresses for a teacher who has a lot of deadlines to meet and a lot of responsibilities to shoulder, therefore because of the negative outcomes associated with occupational stress, this study is an endeavour to better comprehend the marvel of occupational stress among the faculty members with special reference to Business Schools in India as it relates to education. This may urges the instructive organizations to start some adjustment in condition, so as to diminish the level of occupational stress among the B School faculty members at their foundation.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Aziz, M. (2004) conducted the research which finds “differences in the level of stress between married and unmarried employees on several role stressors”. Lawless. (1992) found “similar results except that there was no significant difference between married and unmarried workers. However single women with children were more likely to burn out than married women with children”. Genmill et. al. (1972) reported that “internals” had more job satisfaction and perceived their jobs as less stressful than "externals". They also found that “a managers perceived stress was unrelated to education, length of time in their career, or their level in the hierarchy”. Kantas (2001) research in Greece indicated that “female teachers experience higher levels of stress and greater job dissatisfaction that usually comes from negative classroom conditions, pupils’ behaviour and the work and family interaction”. Anitha Devi (2006-7) in her study on occupational stress: A comparative Study of Worker in different Occupations” describes “identifying the degree of life stress and role stress (LS & RS) experienced by professional women. It also studies the effect of life stress and role stress on various demographic variables like age, experience and income”. Ryan (1996) found that “male LPCs had significantly higher stress scores than females, with males scoring higher on Role Ambiguity and Responsibility”. Rajeswari et. al. (1992) in her study on “Employee Stress: A Study with Reference to Bank Employees” found “significant negative relationship between age and stress and also between experience and stress. This study also found negative correlation between number of members in the family and stress. The level of stress did not differ between different levels of workers namely officers, and clerks”. Lawless (1992) reported that “women suffered fifteen percent more stress related illnesses than men. They also thought about quitting their jobs more often, and reported a higher incidence of burnout. Lawless proposed that this is the result of unequal pay scales and a failure of organizations to adopt policies sensitive to family issues”. Richard et. al. (1989) also found gender differences, however they found that “women in higher occupational ranks experience more strain than men when they controlled for age, stress, and coping”. Billings et. al. (1984) in their study on “Coping Stress and Social Resources among Adults with Unpopular Depression” explain the roles of stress, social resources, and coping among men and women entering treatment for depression. They found that “work stressors had greater impact of women than men”. Singh et. al (1995) in their study on “Men and Women in Transition: Patterns of Stress, Strain and Social Relations” highlight the patterns of stress and strain among men and women as well as single and dual career couples. They found that “male and female managers did not differ significantly on various stress dimensions”.
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OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

The following are the objectives of the study:
To Study the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of Business Schools with respect to age.
To Study the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of Business Schools with respect to gender.
To Study the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of Business Schools with respect to qualification.
To Study the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of Business Schools with respect to designation.
To Study the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of Business Schools with respect to income.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY:

The following are the hypotheses of the study:

Null Hypotheses \( H_{01} \): There is no significant difference in the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of Business Schools with respect to age.
Null Hypotheses \( H_{02} \): There is no significant difference in the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of Business Schools with respect to gender.
Null Hypotheses \( H_{03} \): There is no significant difference in the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of Business Schools with respect to qualification.
Null Hypotheses \( H_{04} \): There is no significant difference in the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of Business Schools with respect to designation.
Null Hypotheses \( H_{05} \): There is no significant difference in the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of Business Schools with respect to income.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

Universe: Faculty members working with public and private Business Schools in macro and micro cities of India are taken in to consideration.
Research Type: The descriptive survey method is adopted for the study.
Sampling Unit: Faculty members working with public and private Business Schools in India.
Sample Size: 545 Male and Female faculty members.
Sampling Technique: Convenient sampling technique.
Tool for data collection: Primary data is collected through Teachers Stress scale developed by Dr. K. S. Mishra, Reliability of the scale is .922 and by conducting an unstructured interview with the faculty members working with Public and Private Business Schools in India. For the collection of secondary data books, journals, magazines, articles and internet is used.
Tool for data analysis: In this study, after collecting the data, the raw scores are tabulated and SPSS and correlation test is used for data analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

Normality Test: The Kolmogorov- Smirnov Statistic tests the hypothesis that the data is normally distributed. After conducting this test, it was found that the assumption holds good for the data. The data is normality distributed (3.606) (see in table no. 1).
Reliability: Reliability of data is (.948) , which is excellent. (see in table no. 2).
Objective 1: To Study the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of Business Schools with respect to age.
Result: Since \( P =.000 \) (see in table no. 3) which is lower than the significant level of .05 which means the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance. Therefore \( H_{01} \) (There is no significant difference in the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of B - Schools with respect to age) is rejected. The outcomes proposed that faculties have differences in their Occupational Stress level according to the different age groups.
Discussion: This findings are similar to the research findings of Holeyannavar et al. (2010), Poloski N. et al.
Holeyannavar et al. (2010) reported that “the stressors as well as overall stress of teachers had negatively and highly significant relationship with age and work experience”. Poloski N. et al. (2007) study revealed that “older people perceive significantly higher levels of stress”. Khurshid et al (2011) indicated an inverse relationship between the age and occupational role stress. Interestingly, they also reported “a gradual increase in level of occupational role stress with the increase in age of teachers (N=500) of both public and private sector universities. They observed that the senior teachers of the private sector universities experience more occupational role stress than senior teachers of public sector”.

**Objective 2:** To Study the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of Business Schools with respect to gender.

**Result:** Since P = .000 (see in table no. 6) which is lower than the significant level of .05 which means the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance. Therefore $H_{00}$ (There is no significant difference in the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of B - Schools with respect to gender) is rejected. The findings inferred that both male and female employees have difference in the level of their Occupational Stress. The result of testing shows that the level of Occupational Stress of female employees is higher than male employees. It might be on the grounds that dual roles of female faculty members as spouses and moms and also instructors, is a noteworthy wellspring of stress. Research showed that while husbands go to clubs and other relaxation centres to unwind, the female lecturer goes home to work and attend domestic chores and care for the children. He posited that stress and stress related outcomes do have serious consequences on individual’s mental, psychological and physical health. Especially on the part of females, thereby making them nagging mothers, difficult and not cooperating with co-workers and highly intolerant to everyone.

**Discussion:** This findings are similar to the research findings of Burke et al. (2008), Arnten et al. (2008), Sharma et al. (2010) and Kashif Ali (2013), Ravichandran et al. (2007) and Greenglass et al. (1988).

Research by Burke et al. (2008) reported that “female managers are experiencing more stress than male ones due to the family-work conflict”. Arnten et al. 2008 and Sharma et al. 2010 revealed that “female participants exhibited greater anxiety, work-related stress and psychosocial stressors as compared to men”. According to Kashif Ali (2013) Female primary school teachers were found “to have more stress as compared to male primary school teachers of District Budgam”. Ravichandran et al. (2007) administered Teacher’s Stress Inventory on 200 higher secondary teachers and indicated “a gender difference on perceived personal stress. Female teachers reported more stress in their study as compared to their male counterpart”. Greenglass et al. (1988) conducted a study with 555 teachers investigating the relationship between work stress, social support and role conflict. The role-conflict scales were used and it was found that “role- conflict was significantly higher in women than in men. The results suggested that job stress was related to role-conflict more often for women than for men”.

**Objective 3:** To Study the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of Business Schools with respect to qualification.

**Result:** Since P = .000 (see in table no. 8) which is lower than the significant level of .05 which means the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance. Therefore $H_{00}$ (There is no significant difference in the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of B - Schools with respect to qualification) is rejected. The findings concluded that both post graduated employees and employees having Ph.D have difference in the level of their Occupational Stress. The result of testing demonstrates that the level of Occupational Stress of employees having Ph.D is very much higher than post graduated employees. It is primarily because of large number of teachers being churned out of the teacher education institutes, which had resulted in large number of more qualified teachers getting jobs lower to their qualification therefore educated employees are more exposed to stress than the ones, who are less educated. Also, being a slow career advancement opportunities in teaching career develops the feeling of stagnation among teachers.

**Discussion:** This findings are similar to the research findings of Khurshid et al. (2011), Singh (2012), Mondal et al. (2011) and Khurshid et al. (2011).

Khurshid et al. (2011) The results showed that “the master’s degree holder exhibit less occupational role stress than the Ph.D. degree holders”. Singh (2012) also showed “undergraduate teachers to be less occupationally stress than the post graduate secondary teachers”. Mondal et al. (2011) study found that “postgraduate teachers were having significantly less job satisfaction on job role item than the Undergraduate and Graduate teachers”. Khurshid et al. (2011) states that “higher qualified teachers reported higher occupational stress than lower qualified teachers”.

**Objective 4:** To Study the level of Occupational Stress among the faculty Members of Business Schools with
have learnt certain stress coping tactics from the investigation that Male and female imminent, qualification, curriculum, thereby amenities and services, all of which can contribute to reduce the stress and to provide a healthy life.
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ANNEXURE

Annexure No 1:

Table No. 1 : Showing Normality Statistics

| One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test | VAR00001 |
|-------------------------------|----------|
| N                             | 545      |
| Normal Parameters a           |          |
| Mean                          | 106.5009 |
| Std. Deviation                | 24.31670 |
| Most Extreme Differences      |          |
| Absolute                      | .154     |
| Positive                      | .154     |
| Negative                      | -.084    |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z          | 3.606    |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)        | .000     |

a. Test distribution is Normal.

Annexure No : 2

Table No. 2 : Showing Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Statistics

| Reliability Statistics        |       |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Cronbach's Alpha              | .948  |
| N of Items                    | 49    |

Annexure No : 3 : One Way ANOVA for testing hypothesis 1

Table No 3: Showing the ANOVA RESULT

| VAR000001 | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F   | Sig.  |
|-----------|----------------|----|-------------|-----|-------|
| Between Groups | 43516.281      | 4  | 10879.070   | 21.110 | .000  |
| Within Groups  | 278290.581     | 540| 515.353     |      |       |
| Total          | 321806.862     | 544|             |      |       |

Table No 4 : Showing The Post HOC ANOVA RESULT

| Multiple Comparisons |
|----------------------|
| Dependent Variable: VAR000001 |
| (I) VAR000002 | (J) VAR000002 | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval |
| Tukey HSD     | Up to 25 years | 26-35 years | 36-45 years |
|               |                | 2.89548    | 3.69214     | 0.935 | -7.21 | 13.0009 |
|               |                | 8.21437    | 3.57893     | 0.148 | -1.5812 | 18.01 |
Multiple Comparisons  
Dependent Variable: VAR00001

| (I) VAR00002 | (J) VAR00002 | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval |
|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------|------|------------------------|
|              |              |                       |            |      | Lower Bound             | Upper Bound          |
| 46-55 years  | 56-65 years  | 21.80000              | 3.932      | 0    | 11.0381                | 32.5619              |
| Up to 25 years |              | -2.89548              | 3.69214    | 0.935| -13.0009               | 7.21                 |
| 26-35 years  | 36-45 years  | 5.31889               | 2.41383    | 0.18 | -1.2878                | 11.9256              |
| 46-55 years  | 56-65 years  | 18.90452              | 2.91771    | 0    | 10.935                 | 26.8741              |
| Up to 25 years |              | 8.21437               | 3.57893    | 0.148| -18.01                 | 1.5812               |
| 36-45 years  | 46-55 years  | -5.31889              | 2.41383    | 0.18 | 6.0128                 | 21.1584              |
| 56-65 years  |              | 13.58563              | 2.76681    | 0    | 12.0557                | 35.0591              |
| Up to 25 years |              | -8.21437              | 3.57893    | 0.148| -18.01                 | 1.5812               |
| 46-55 years  | 56-65 years  | 21.80000              | 3.932      | 0    | 11.0381                | 32.5619              |
| Up to 25 years |              | -21.80000             | 3.932      | 0    | -32.5619               | -11.0381             |
| 26-35 years  | 36-45 years  | 5.31889               | 2.41383    | 0.18 | 6.0128                 | 21.1584              |
| 46-55 years  | 56-65 years  | 13.58563              | 2.76681    | 0    | 12.0557                | 35.0591              |
| Up to 25 years |              | -2.89548              | 3.69214    | 0.935| -13.0009               | 7.21                 |
| 36-45 years  | 46-55 years  | 18.90452              | 2.91771    | 0    | 10.935                 | 26.8741              |
| 56-65 years  |              | 28.87628              | 4.2991     | 0    | 17.1096                | 40.643               |
| Up to 25 years |              | -8.21437              | 3.57893    | 0.148| -18.01                 | 1.5812               |
| 46-55 years  | 56-65 years  | 13.58563              | 2.76681    | 0    | 12.0557                | 35.0591              |
| Up to 25 years |              | -8.21437              | 3.57893    | 0.148| -18.01                 | 1.5812               |
| 26-35 years  | 36-45 years  | -5.31889              | 2.41383    | 0.18 | -11.9256               | 1.2878               |
| 46-55 years  | 56-65 years  | 23.55740              | 4.20228    | 0    | 12.0557                | 35.0591              |
| Up to 25 years |              | -8.21437              | 3.57893    | 0.148| -18.01                 | 1.5812               |
| 36-45 years  | 46-55 years  | -13.58563             | 2.76681    | 0    | 12.0557                | 35.0591              |
| 56-65 years  |              | 9.97176               | 4.50677    | 0.177| -2.3633                | 22.3069              |
| Up to 25 years |              | -3.71776              | 5.04624    | 0    | -45.5834               | 17.9601              |
| 46-55 years  | 56-65 years  | -18.90452             | 2.91771    | 0    | -26.8741               | -10.935              |
| Up to 25 years |              | -3.464                | 418.135    | 0.001| -7.48529               | 2.16091              |
| 26-35 years  | 36-45 years  | -28.87628             | 4.2991     | 0    | -40.643                | -17.1096             |
| 46-55 years  | 56-65 years  | -23.55740             | 4.20228    | 0    | -35.0591               | -12.0557             |
| Up to 25 years |              | -3.464                | 418.135    | 0.001| -7.48529               | 2.16091              |

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Annexure No 4: T test for testing hypothesis 2

Table No 5: Group statistics on Occupational Stress with respect to gender among the faculty Members of B - Schools

| VAR00002 | N    | Mean       | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|----------|------|------------|----------------|-----------------|
| VAR00001 | Male | 332        | 1.0352E2       | 23.05915        |
|          | Female | 213      | 1.1101E2       | 25.56309        |

Table No 6: Independent sample test on Occupational Stress with respect to gender among the faculty Members of B - Schools

| Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| F          | Sig.    | t        | df  | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
| VAR00001   |         |          |     |                |                |                        |       |
| Equal variances assumed               | 3.894 | 0.049   | 543 | 0              | -7.48529        | 2.11288                  | -11.6357 | 3.33487 |
| Equal variances not assumed            | -3.464 | 418.135 | 0.001 | -7.48529 | 2.16091 | -11.7329 | -3.2377 |

Annexure No 5: T test for testing hypothesis 3

Table No 7: Group statistics on Occupational Stress with respect to qualification among the faculty Members of B - School.

| VAR00002 | N    | Mean       | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|----------|------|------------|----------------|-----------------|
| VAR00001 | Post graduation | 277     | 1.1271E2       | 22.78543        |
|          | Ph.d | 268        | 99.9739        | 24.2086         |
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Table No 8: Independent sample test on Occupational Stress with respect to qualification among the faculty Members of B - Schools

| Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
|---|------|---|----|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|------|-------|
| Equal variances assumed | 0.059 | 0.809 | 6.33 | 543 | 0 | 12.74092 | 2.01294 | 8.78682 | 16.69503 |
| Equal variances not assumed | 6.323 | 538.314 | 0 | 12.74092 | 2.01495 | 8.78279 | 16.69905 |

Annexure No 6: One Way ANOVA for testing hypothesis 4

Table No. 9 : Showing the ANOVA RESULT

| (I) | VAR00001 | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----|-----------|---------------|----|-------------|---|------|
| (J) | VAR00002 |               |    |             |   |      |
| Between Groups | 45111.612 | 2 | 22555.806 | 44.183 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 276695.251 | 542 | 510.508 |
| Total | 321806.862 | 544 |

Table No 10 : Showing the Post hoc ANOVA RESULT

| (I) | VAR00001 | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
|-----|----------|-----------------------|------------|------|----------------------------------------|
| (J) | VAR00002 |                       |            |      | Lower | Upper |
| Assistant Professor | Associate Professor | 6.90481* | 2.16985 | 0.004 | 1.8053 | 12.0043 |
| Professor | Associate Professor | 25.21739* | 2.68267 | 0 | 18.9127 | 31.5221 |
| Associate Professor | Assistant Professor | -6.90481* | 2.16985 | 0.004 | -12.0043 | -1.8053 |
| Professor | Assistant Professor | 18.31258* | 2.83504 | 0 | 11.6498 | 24.9754 |

Tukey HSD

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Annexure No 7: One Way ANOVA for testing hypothesis 5

Table No 11: Showing the ANOVA RESULT

| (I) | VAR00001 | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-----|----------|---------------|----|-------------|---|------|
| (J) | VAR00002 |               |    |             |   |      |
| Between Groups | 61891.941 | 2 | 30945.971 | 64.532 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 259914.921 | 542 | 479.548 |
| Total | 321806.862 | 544 |
Table No 12: Showing the Post hoc ANOVA RESULT

| Multiple Comparisons | (I) VAR00002 | (J) VAR00002 | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig.  | 95% Confidence Interval | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------|-------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Tukey HSD             | Up to 30,000/m | 31,000 to 50,000/m | 12.28451*             | 2.04043    | 0     | 7.4892                 | 17.0799     |             |
|                       | 51,000/m and above | 33.23769    | 2.96108    | 0     | 26.2787                   | 40.1967     |             |
|                       | 31,000 to 50,000/m | Up to 30,000/m | -12.28451*            | 2.04043    | 0     | -17.0799                | -7.4892     |             |
|                       | 51,000/m and above | 20.95318*   | 2.86065    | 0     | 14.2302                   | 27.6762     |             |
|                       | 51,000/m and above | Up to 30,000/m | -33.23769*            | 2.96108    | 0     | -40.1967                | -26.2787    |             |
|                       | 31,000 to 50,000/m | 31,000 to 50,000/m | -20.95318*            | 2.86065    | 0     | -27.6762                | -14.2302    |             |

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.