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Abstract

The main objective of the present investigation is to examine the stress management among teaching and non teaching staff. A sample of 30 participants (15=Teaching & 15 Non Teaching) was drawn randomly drawn from the population. Stress Management Scale (SMS) by Dr. Pushpraj Singh & Anjali Srivastava was used for data collection. Data was collected by face to face interview method from the target population from different education institute of Ghaziabad city. Mean, standard deviation and t-test were calculated for the analysis of data. Results indicate that there is no significant difference among Teaching and Non-teaching staff participants in relation to stress management. Result revealed that Non teaching participants have higher mean score on stress management in compare to teaching participants. In simple terms it can be said that Non teaching participants have higher stress management.
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Introduction

People experience lot of stress in their life and also at work place. Kyriacou (2001) define stress as an ‘unpleasant emotional state fraught with tension, frustration, anxiety and emotional exhaustion’. Stress is very unpleasant state which brings lot of tension frustration and irritation which is affects on work, relationships and daily life style. Lazarus (1999) defines “transactional approach to stress incorporating an interactive relationship between the person and the environment”. Stress is silent killer which does not allow people to have good bond between the people and the environment. People feel their surrounding is burden to them, which become difficult to manage. Stress as the psychological, physiological and behavioral response of an individual seeking to adopt and adjust to both the internal and external pressures (Olley; 1999). Various departments, groups and external environment factors affect individual behavior. Minimal level of stress is required for organizations to operate effectively.
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Excessive stress is harmful for the individual as it causes mental and physical disequilibrium and subsequently leads to physical and mental disturbance e.g.; suffer from high blood pressure, heart attack when stress is beyond control of the human beings. It is therefore necessary to identify causes of stress and modify behavior.

Stress can be easily managed by Stress Relief Strategies such as Body relaxation exercises like breathing techniques guided imagery. In today’s world people believe Physical exercise like yoga, workout routine and meditation is a best way to take away stress and that individual give time to themselves. If person has faced stress due to any trauma or any other situation and they are facing difficulty to handle and feeling that life has no meaning than they should realize their stress by counseling talking therapy and life coaching. There are many coping styles that people use and some may prove more effective than other, depending on the nature of the stressful situation and the person who is employing them.

**Objectives of the Study**

The main objective of the present study is to examine the stress management among teaching and non-teaching participants.

**Hypothesis of the Study**

- There is no significant difference among teaching and non-teaching participants in relation to stress management.
- Non teaching participants have higher stress management in compare to teaching participants.

**Research Methodology**

**Sample:**

In the present study a sample of 30 participants (15=Teaching & 15 Non Teaching) was drawn randomly drawn from the population. Participants were selected from different colleges of Ghaziabad city. The age range of the participants was 25-35 years.

**TABLE I**

| Sr. No. | Group       | N  | ∑  |
|---------|-------------|----|----|
| 1.      | Teaching    | 15 | 30 |
| 2.      | Non Teaching| 15 |    |
Tool Used:

In the present study Stress Management Scale (SMS) developed by Dr. Pushpraj Singh & Anjali Srivastava was used for data collection. This scale has 30 items. Reliability of the scale is 0.79 and the validity of the scale is 0.83.

Procedure of data collection:

Data collection was done using random sampling. In the first phase all the participants were briefed about how to fill up the questionnaire in the scale. The inventories were distributed to participants. The general instructions were given to participants to complete the inventories. Filled questionnaires were collected from participants for statistical analysis of data.

Statistical Analyses:

Mean, standard deviation and t-test were calculated for the analysis of data.

Statistical Analyses and Interpretation

The main objective of the present investigation is to examine the stress management among teaching and non teaching staff participants. Mean, S.D and t-test was applied for statistical analysis of data. All the calculations were calculated manually.

TABLE II

Mean, S.D., t-value of Teaching & Non-teaching participants

| Sr. N. | Group                  | N  | Mean  | S.D.  | t-value | Sig |
|--------|------------------------|----|-------|-------|---------|-----|
| 1.     | Teaching Participants  | 15 | 108.13| 10.39 |         |     |
| 2.     | Non-Teaching Participants | 15 | 111.4 | 10.55 | 0.85    | NS  |

The result from table II shows that Non-teaching participants mean is 111.4 and S.D. is 10.55 while teaching participants mean is 108.13 and S.D. 10.39. Teaching staff have lower score than Non -teaching staff. The t-value is 0.85. In simple terms it can be said that Non teaching group have high stress management in compare to teaching group.
DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

The results show that non teaching participants have higher stress management. It may be due to have a multitasking type of work conditions. Organizational stress affects the teacher's psychological, physical and behavioral responses. It is therefore appropriate that teachers and the senior management teams of schools study to understand themselves and others better through a greater awareness of the stress involved in teaching (Hayward, 1993). Dunham (1984) specify how employers have a statutory duty to make sure that working environments in schools do not adversely affect employee’s health. According to the Guardian (2002) and recent appeals to reduce awards for stress at work, employees feeling under pressure have a responsibility to inform their employees. non-teaching staff have many responsibility ,the special focus are laid on observation of working condition, pay scale , working hours, over work, monotonous state of work, expertise and skill required to deliver for their work time. Studies indicates that they have pressure although they enjoy their teaching work, if they are getting bore in teaching than they can’t teach properly. In conclusion we can say that there is high stress management in non teaching conditions. It may be due to have a multitasking nature of work conditions.

LIMITATIONS OF CURRENT STUDY:

1. Sample of the present study has been taken very short; it should be replicate on a large sample.
2. More variable should be analyse in furthered research such as organizational setting, age, gender, types of working schedule etc.
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