International Journal of Scientific Research and Management (IJSRM)
||Volume||11||Issue||04||Pages||EM-2023-4823-4832||2023||
Website: www.ijsrm.in ISSN (e): 2321-3418
DOI: 10.18535/ijsrm/v11i04.em05

Snooping Job Related Organizational Stress of Selected Faculty Members in Higher Education Institutions

Mary Joy P. Dueñas, PhD.

College of Business and Management, Northern Negros State College of Science and Technology, Sagay City 6122, Philippines.

Abstract
This study was conducted to determine the organizational stress of selected faculty members in higher education institutions. Using descriptive research designs, the study involved 256 selected full time regular faculty members in selected private and public colleges and universities in Negros. The survey questionnaire consisted of two parts: the demographic profile of the respondents and the level of stress mechanisms taken form COPE instrument by Carver (2013). Statistical tools included frequency counts, percentage distribution, mean ratings and standard deviation. Most faculty members belonged to age bracket of 39–47 years and were considered as middle adults. These are faculty members who had been in the institution for 1– 8 years. The majority of them were male and married that are caught in the midst of all these responsibilities from work and family and most of them were instructors. Among the organizational stressors, *nature of work* obtained the highest mean score and interpreted as *moderately stressed* as experienced by faculty members. *Relationship with supervisors* ranked second with the mean score of 2.56 interpreted as *moderately stressed*; *co-curricular activities* had a mean score of 2.50 interpreted as *moderately stressed*. Furthermore, *time spent in school* obtained a mean score of 2.28 interpreted as *slightly stressed*; *relationship with the students* got a mean score of 2.26 interpreted as *slightly stressed* and *relationship with peers*, ranked lowest with a mean score of 1.80 interpreted as *slightly stressed*. Taken all together, the survey obtained a mean of 2.36, which is interpreted as *slightly stress*. Based on the results of the study, the following initiatives to mitigate the effect of stress are proper delegation of work assignment and effective stress management program with the support from school administration to make the faculty members feel that they are valued and taking care of.

Introduction

Faculty members in academic institutions have numbers of obligations to fulfil. Aside from their primary duties as faculty members in higher education institutions they are also face in various challenges such as conducting researches as well as modification of curriculum and instructions. Faculty members are the fundamental component to the quality of higher education institution. Aside from teaching, mentoring students, and preparing class presentation for lectures , the academic functions of faculty members are comprehensive, apart of primary obligations, faculty members have to deals with other tasks outside professional commitments like family and social life (Tan, J. S. T. ,2017).Thus, teaching has become a highly stressful profession and no longer merely hard work. Presently, faculty members encounter difficulties relating to the varied needs of students and performance condition. The habitual overwhelming burden subsequently leads faculty members to experience conflict and stress (Meng, Q., & Wang, G., 2018).

According to Colacion-Quiros, H., & Gemora, R. B., 2016) Stress is characteristically termed as negative or a positive condition that influence an individual‘s mental and physical well-being. Unfortunately faculty members are susceptible to stress due to underlying condition of work. Stress consumed the mind, body and emotions. Stress may result to poor health condition that may lead to absenteeism, sky rocket turnover, and inferior productivity that affects the performance of faculty members. Furthermore, untreated stress causes serious illness that make those individual suffers in life.

One of the key aspects of higher education institution and consequently the success of the students. is the wellbeing of higher education teachers (Teles, R., Valle, A., Rodríguez, S., Piñeiro, I., & Regueiro, B, 2020). The researcher opted to determine the job related organizational stress in selected faculty members in higher education institutions to address the underlying causes of stress in college instructors to have exemplary work performance and produce high caliber graduates.

Research Problem

This study was conducted to determine the job related organizational stress of selected faculty members in higher education institutions.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the participants in terms of age, sex, job tenure, faculty classification, civil status, academic rank, and classification of higher education institution?
2. What is the level of stress experienced by the participants in terms of nature of work, relationship with peers, relationship with superiors, relationship with students, time spent in school; and co-curricular activities?

Statement of Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated in relation to the issues under investigation

1. There is no significant difference in the demographic profile of the participants in terms of age, sex, job tenure, faculty classification, civil status, academic rank, and classification of higher education institution?
2. There is no significant difference in the level of stress experienced by the participants in terms of nature of work, relationship with peers, relationship with superiors, relationship with students, time spent in school, and co-curricular activities?

Materials and Methods

The research instrument administered in the study was based on related literature questionnaire. The survey questionnaire consisted of two parts, the demographic profile of the respondents and the level of stress taken from COPE instrument by Carver (2013). Descriptive research was used with 256 randomly selected regular faculty members in selected private and public colleges/university in Negros Occidental. Frequency count and percentage was used to determine the demographic profile of the participants. On the other hand, mean rating and standard deviation was used in level of stress experienced by the participants.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 summarizes the profile of the participants. As can be seen, 27.70% of the faculty members belonged to age bracket 39-47 years. The other participants in the different age brackets were 22.30% for ages 30-38 years; 22.30% for age bracket of 48-56 years; 17.60% for age bracket between 21-29 years; and 10.20% for a higher age bracket of 57-65 years. This finding is consistent with the study conducted by Galeon (2015). Results revealed that 42.5 was the mean age of college faculty members, indicating that most of the faculty members were middle adults.

In terms of sex, a majority (62.10%) of the participants were male and 39.90% were female. However, based on the data of the Commission on Higher Education, the total number of faculty by sex in academic year 2018-2019 in the country was 136,186. The female faculty consisted of 51.74% (70,466) and 48.26% (65,720) male faculty in State Colleges and Universities (SUCs), Local Colleges and Universities (LCUs), other government schools (OGS, CSI, Special HEIs), and Private Higher Education Institution. The study conducted by El Shikieri and Musa (2012) showed that a large number of participants were above 30 years, and most of them were male, while a large sum of them comprised of officials and lecturers.

On job tenure, 55.10% had been with the institution for 1-8 years; 21.10% for 9-16 years; 10.90% for 17-23 years; 8.20% for 24-31 years; and 4.70% for 32-39 years. The results imply that most of the faculty members are in the early stage of their teaching profession.

As for classification of faculty members, 56.30% were full time; 25.00% had other assignments like being club adviser, research coordinator, technical working group and so on. Only18.80% had administrative work. This implies that a large number of faculty members are concentrated in the area of instructions.

On civil status, 61.30 % faculty members were married, 32.40% were single, and 4.70% were widowed. The result is consistent with the study conducted by Galeon (2015) in that it highlighted that college faculty

members in the university where the study was conducted were mainly married. The college faculty members were merely 25% single, while 75 percent were married.

In terms of academic rank, most of the faculty members were instructors at 52.70%; 25% were assistant professors; 14.10% were associate professors; and 8.20% were professors. The descending result shows that instructor rank is the pathway to achieve promotion in academic position.

As for the classification of higher education, 67.20% were faculty members from state colleges, while 32.80% were from private universities. Based on the data of the Commission on Higher Education, there were 42,167 full time faculty members in State Colleges and Universities and 43,959 full time faculty members in private institution in academic year 2018-2019.

Table 1 : Profile of the Participants

Variables	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Age		
21 – 29	45	17.60
30 – 38	57	22.30
39 – 47	71	27.70
48 – 56	57	22.30
57 – 65	26	10.20
Sex		
Male	159	62.10
Female	97	37.90
Job Tenure		
1 – 8 years	141	55.10
9 – 16 years	54	21.10
17 – 23 years	28	10.90
24 – 31 years	21	8.20
32 – 39 years	12	4.70
Faculty Classification		
Full Time (FT) Faculty	144	56.30
FT Faculty with Admin Work	48	18.80
FT Faculty with Other Assignment	64	25.00
Civil Status		
Single	83	32.40
Married	157	61.30
Widowed	12	4.70
Others	4	1.60
Academic rank		
Instructor	135	52.70
Assistant Professor	64	25.00
Associate Professor	36	14.10
Professor	21	8.20
Classification of HEI		
State College	172	67.20
Private University	84	32.80
TOTAL	**256**	**100.00**

Table 2 shows the level of stress experienced by the participants in terms of nature of work. “I have excess workload” ranked highest with a mean score of 2.94 interpreted as *moderately stressed*. “Deadline are unrealistic making me feel rushed” ranked second with a mean score 2.81 interpreted as *moderately stressed.* “Confusion over priorities, time frame and standards “had a mean score of 2.75 interpreted as *moderately stressed*. “Inadequate or unclear procedure “got a mean scare of 2.73 interpreted as *moderately stressed.* “Confusion over, or too much responsibility for other” ranked lowest with a mean score of 2.68 interpreted as *moderately stressed.*

The finding is similar to the study conducted by Colacion-Quiros and Gemora (2016). It was revealed that paperwork, research, organizing meetings, and conferences were the main sources of the high level of stress among faculty members when taken as a whole. Another study conducted by Shrivastava and Shukla (2017) also revealed that "Additional responsibilities and involvement in non-teaching work" was rated highest, with a mean score of 2.85, which implies that faculty members felt the high agreeability for this reason. In the study conducted by El Shikieri and Musa (2012) from a large number of administrators and lecturers, results showed that workload gained the highest degree of job stress with 75.3% of the employees complained from workload by an overall mean score of 2.29.

The above finding denotes that most of the participants have experienced stress due to heavy workload and other school related responsibilities. This may cause fatigue that affects their quality of teaching.

Table 2: Level of Stress in terms of Nature of Work

Nature of work	***SD***	***Mean***	***Interpretation***
I have excess workload	1.13	2.94	Moderately Stressed
Deadlines are unrealistic making me feel rushed.	1.07	2.81	Moderately Stressed
Confusion over, or too much responsibility for other	1.06	2.68	Moderately Stressed
Confusion over priorities, time frame and standards	1.07	2.75	Moderately Stressed
Inadequate or unclear procedure	1.11	2.73	Moderately Stressed
Overall Mean		**2.78**	**Moderately Stressed**

Table 3 shows the level of stress in terms of relationship with peers. "I can work well with my peers" ranked highest with a mean score of 1.97 interpreted as *slightly stressed.* "There is mutual respect between me and my peers" obtained a mean score of 1.95 interpreted as *slightly stressed*. "I have a poor relationship with peers" got a mean score of 1.72 interpreted as *slightly stressed*. "I experienced being bullied or harassed by my peers" had a mean score of 1.69 interpreted as *slightly stressed*. "I dislike my peers and feel leaving the workplace" ranked lowest with a mean score 1.65 interpreted as *slightly stressed.*

The above result is similar to the study conducted by Delello et al. (2015), pointing out that relationship with colleagues is also beneficial to being a professor. Professors with affirmative relations and support from their fellow faculty and administration appreciate the relationships with colleagues as demonstrated by their replies: "We have an extraordinary level of collegiality in our department" and "an outstanding relationship with department chairmen and colleagues."

The result entails that the participants have good relationship with their fellow teachers, thus creating friendship and teamwork.

Table 3: Level of Stress in terms of Relationship with Peers

Relationship with peers	***SD***	***Mean***	***Interpretation***
I have a poor relationship with peers	.99	1.72	Slightly Stressed
I experienced being bullied or harassed by my peers.	1.10	1.69	Slightly Stressed
I can work well with my peers.	1.25	1.97	Slightly Stressed

There is mutual respect between me and my peers.	1.11	1.95	Slightly Stressed
I dislike my peers and feel like leaving the workplace.	1.01	1.65	Slightly Stressed
Overall Mean		**1.80**	**Slightly Stressed**

Table 4 shows the level of stress in terms of relationship with superiors experienced by the participants. "I always receive feedback from my immediate supervisor which helps me improve my work" ranked highest with a mean score of 2.86 interpreted as *moderately stressed*. "I receive coaching or mentoring from my immediate supervisor" ranked second with a mean score of 2.82 interpreted as moderately stressed. "My immediate superior is a source of inspiration" had a mean score of 2.72 interpreted as *moderately stressed*. "I receive recognition from my immediate supervisor" gained a mean score of 2.68 interpreted as moderately stressed. 'I have an unsupportive supervisor" ranked lowest with a mean score of 1.73 interpreted as slightly stressed.

The above finding is similar to the study conducted by Delello et al. (2015). That is to say, the benefits identified by participants of being a professor are both intrinsic and extrinsic. "I am able to 'start over' every semester to improve my performance, try new things, and experience new people" were reported as intrinsic benefits, while "optional teacher retirement and social security' were considered extrinsic. A study conducted by Thomas (2016), which is a cross-case analysis in relationship with superiors, revealed that both faculty and supervisors suggested increase mentorship and opportunities for personal growth. The participants wanted to have more productive feedback that would allow them to grow and improve professionally, rather than repeated negative interactions with co-workers and supervisors.

The result indicates that participants are willing to learn and try new things that give them opportunity to nurture their skills.

Table 4 : Level of Stress in terms of Relationship with Superiors

Relationship with Superiors	***SD***	***Mean***	***Interpretation***
I always receive feedback from my immediate supervisor which helps me improve my work.	1.03	2.86	Moderately Stressed
I receive coaching or mentoring from my immediate supervisor.	1.00	2.82	Moderately Stressed
I receive recognition from my immediate supervisor.	1.00	2.68	Moderately Stressed
My immediate supervisor is a source of inspiration.	1.12	2.72	Moderately Stressed
I have an unsupportive supervisor.	1.07	1.73	Slightly Stressed
Overall Mean		**2.56**	**Moderately stressed**

Table 5 presents the level of stress experienced by the participants in terms of relationship with students. "I connect emotionally with my students" ranked highest with a mean score of 3.17 interpreted as *moderately stressed*. "I get mad easily when students do not perform in class" ranked second with a mean score of 2.13 interpreted as *slightly stressed.* "Students' negative behavior is a burden to me" attained a mean score of 2.07 interpreted as slightly stressed. "My mood for the day is influenced by my students' behavior" got a mean

score of 2.00 interpreted as *slightly stressed*. "My students are a source of stress rather than as inspiration" ranked lowest with a mean score of 1.91 interpreted as *slightly stressed.*

The finding is similar to the study conducted by of Delello et al. (2015). The researchers highlighted that working with students was prominent as an incentive of being a professor. A majority of professors join the academe to create a change in the lives of their students. Educators that work with driven students found collaboration with their students as an advantage. "My students are the reason I love my job "and "love working with my students. [It is] very rewarding to see their growth" were some of the proven comments reflected in An Interdisciplinary Journal of Arts & Sciences 47. Furthermore, the study conducted by Gramas (2013) revealed that faculty members view teaching as a relationship while acknowledging that students at times have social, academic, financial, and other personal needs, hence these faculty members preferred to provide referrals and maintained what they refer to as professional boundaries. Several participants stated that they personally assisted and counselled students who struggled with academic aspects of the program. Many of the participants indicated a deep caring for their students. At times that student experienced an extreme personal crisis, these faculty members provided extra support and assumed a mother-like role in the lives of students.

The result indicates that the participants are sensitive not just to the emotional needs of learners, thus this may lead to a better academic performance and confident students.

Table 5: Level of Stress in terms of Relationship with Students

Relationship with Students	***SD***	***Mean***	***Interpretation***
My students are a source of stress rather than as inspiration.	.99	1.91	Slightly Stressed
Students' negative behavior is a burden to me.	1.00	2.07	Slightly Stressed
I connect emotionally with my students.	1.13	3.17	Moderately Stressed
I get mad easily when students do not perform in class.	.94	2.13	Slightly Stressed
My mood for the day is influenced by my students' behavior.	1.06	2.00	Slightly Stressed
Overall Mean		**2.26**	**Slightly Stressed**

Table 6 shows the level of stress in terms of time spent in school. "I work for long hours, working at average of 10-12 hours a day" ranked highest with a mean score of 2.67 interpreted as *moderately stressed*. "I work under unsocial hours, working even on weekends and holidays" ranked second with a mean score of 2.48 interpreted as *slightly stressed.* "I end the day with work-related neck pain due to long hours of work" had a mean score of 2.22 interpreted as *slightly stressed*. "I have difficulty sleeping due to work fatigue" acquired a mean score of 2.09 interpreted as *slightly stressed*, "I frequently skip lunch due to the demands of my job" ranked lowest with a mean score 1.95 interpreted as *slightly stressed*.

The finding is similar to the study conducted by Kumari (2019), which revealed that factors causing maximum stress were lack of regular breaks (85%) and long working hours (83%). In the study conducted by Tan (2017), it was shown that full-time faculty members were likely to spend additional hours to teach a class with the biggest possible number of students and to make outputs associated with the areas of service and research. Another study conducted by Smith (2012) also revealed that teachers that devote extra time on teaching and other tasks associated with teaching were more probable to use confrontative coping to handle occupational stress.

The result implies that most of the participants work longer hours than the standard time. This is probably due to the fact that they tend to finish work in school, thus extending working hours.

Table 6: Level of Stress in terms of Time Spent in School

Time Spent in School	***SD***	***Mean***	***Interpretation***
I work for long hours, working at average of 10-12 hours a day.	1.17	2.67	Moderately Stressed
I work under unsocial hours, working even on weekends and holidays.	1.10	2.48	Slightly Stressed
I end the day with work-related neck pain due to long hours of work.	1.06	2.22	Slightly Stressed
I frequently skip lunch due to the demands of my job.	1.00	1.95	Slightly Stressed
I have difficulty sleeping due to work fatigue.	1.05	2.09	Slightly Stressed
Overall Mean		**2.28**	**Slightly Stressed**

Table 7 shows the level of stress experienced by the participants in terms of co-curricular activities. "I am a well-rounded person due to the co-curricular activities I do in school" ranked highest with a mean score of 2.83 interpreted as *moderately stressed*. "Co-curricular activities hone my skills" ranked second with a mean score of 2.57 interpreted as *moderately stressed*. "I build better relations with others due to my involvement in co-curricular activities" obtained a mean score of 2.45 interpreted as *slightly stressed*. "I hardly have time to relax and unwind due to too many co-curricular activities" got a mean score of 2.38 interpreted as *slightly stressed*. "I have too many committee work to do" ranked lowest with a mean score of 2.28 interpreted as *slightly stressed.*

The finding is similar to the study conducted by Lyons (2015). One of the findings emerged that the experiences of the participant are mutually beneficial for the students involved and for them as faculty advisors. Participants have easily identified positive learning and development outcomes demonstrated by the students while also articulating some personal benefits for them to spend a significant amount of time with students in the co-curricular setting as faculty advisors. The participants believed that it is an integration of teaching and service.

The result implies that participants involved in co-curricular activities have gained experiences that enhance their skills.

Table 7: Level of Stress in terms of Co-Curricular Activities

Co-curricular activities	***SD***	***Mean***	***Interpretation***
I have too many committee work to do.	1.07	2.28	Slightly Stressed
I hardly have time to relax and unwind due to too many co-curricular activities.	1.06	2.38	Slightly Stressed
I am a well-rounded person due to the co-curricular activities I do in school.	.95	2.83	Moderately Stressed

Co-curricular activities hone my skills.	.97	2.57	Moderately Stressed
I build better relations with others due to my involvement in co-curricular activities.	1.01	2.45	Slightly Stressed
Overall Mean		**2.50**	**Moderately Stressed**

Table 8 shows the summary of the overall level of stress experienced by the participants. Nature of work ranked highest with a mean score of 2.78 interpreted as *moderately stressed*; relationship with supervisors ranked second with the mean score of 2.56 interpreted as *moderately stressed*; co-curricular activities had a mean score of 2.50 interpreted as *moderately stressed*. Furthermore, time spent in school obtained a mean score of 2.28 interpreted as slightly stressed; relationship with the students got a mean score of 2.26 interpreted as *slightly stressed* and relationship with peers, ranked lowest with a mean score of 1.80 interpreted as *slightly stressed.* Taken all together, the survey obtained a mean of 2.36, which is interpreted as *slightly stress.*

This implies that faculty members are slightly stressed when dealing with different stressors such as, nature of work, relationship with peers, relationship with superiors, relationship with students, time spent in school and co-curricular activities. The above finding is similar to the study conducted by Tan (2017) in that faculty members normally experience slight to moderate pressure when facing with diverse stressors like time limitations, professional identity, and students' relation.

When taken separately, some stressors are moderate in level. Aside from teaching, they have several responsibilities to attend to that may be physically and mentally draining which might affect their focus on their primary function. Furthermore, the role of faculty members is fundamental and critical not just in the institution they belong to, but they also have a responsibility of imparting and applying their knowledge of societal issues. To top it all, they are also engaged in community work and in research.

This finding is inconsistent with the study conducted by Colacion-Quiros and Gemora (2016). The researchers pointed out that there is a lesser level of stress encountered by the faculty when taken as a whole in accord to various factors. They also mentioned that the age level is moderately affected by stress in ages 58 and above. This may possibly due to the shift given by the aging process that affects several aspects of human life such as physical, emotional, mental, social, and spiritual. The researchers also found that the major basis of the high level of stress among faculty members was paperwork, comprising functions like research work and attending meetings and conferences. Every faculty member has experienced such undertakings as part of the nature of one's work.

The teaching profession is considered to be a highly stressful profession (Johnson et al., 2005; Newberry & Allsop, 2017, as cited by Harmsen et al., 2018). In the Netherlands specifically, a figure from 2014 showed that one out of five teachers experienced burnout symptoms. Teachers also reported higher levels of workload compared to other professionals (Hooftman, Mars, Janssen, de Vroome, & Van den Bossche, 2015, as cited by Harmsen et al., 2018).

In a study conducted among academic women in Vietnam, relationships at work between superiors and subordinates are affected by power distance and hierarchy. They are identified as a salient and pervasive source of occupational stress by the majority of interviewees. The effort involved in maintaining relationships with superiors is an associated source of stress for Vietnamese academic women (Thanh, 2016).

In addition, perceived student misbehavior and poor relationship with students were found to be positively related to experienced tension, discontent, and negative emotions (Harmsen et al., 2016). Students misbehaving can also refer to students not paying attention or not doing their homework or classwork. Bad behavior always impacts more than the student involved. When a student misbehaves or makes the atmosphere unconducive to study, it disrupts the entire class, then the teacher becomes stressed.

It can be surmised that the related literature states that high levels of prolonged stress can be related to poor working conditions, inordinate time demand, inadequate collegial relationships, large class sizes, time pressures, lack of resources, isolation, role ambiguity, lack of support and involvement in decision making, and student behavioral problems (Abel & Sewell, 2001; Eslinger, 2014; Prilleltensky, Neff, & Bessell, 2016, as cited by Schmidt & Fuso, 2019) and negative school climate (Ryan et al., 2017).

Table 8: Grand Mean Level of Stress

	Mean	***Interpretation***
Nature of work	2.78	Moderately stress
Relationship with peers	1.80	Slightly Stress
Relationship with superiors	2.56	Moderately Stress
Relationship with students	2.26	Slightly Stress
Time Spent in school	2.28	Slightly Stress
Co-curricular activities	2.50	Moderately Stress
Overall Mean	**2.36**	**Slightly Stress**

Conclusions

Faculty members play an important part to the quality education of higher education institutions. They are considered as the frontrunners in deepening the future of young individuals and the nation. Apart from teaching, they are facing different roles and responsibilities that lead to everyday challenges in their daily work. The result revealed that faculty members suffer from stress because of the nature of their work. Most of them have experienced stress because of excess workload, stringent deadlines, and confusion over priorities, unclear procedures, and too many other responsibilities assigned to them. Faculty members experienced the highest level of stress in their nature of work, while, they experienced the lowest level of stress in relationship with peers since they had been in the institution for a long time. Based on the results of the study, it is critical to understand that faculty members are experiencing stress because of excess work load that led them to work beyond standard time. An appropriate delegation of work assignments is also encouraged to reduce work load and minimize stress, so that faculty members could focus on their work suited them. This could give faculty member an autonomy to perform the work that lessens stress. An effective stress management programs should be offered by the institution to faculty members as a crucial step to reduce work stress. The initiative and involvement of school administration in supporting stress management programs could help faculty members increase long term engagement in their nature of work, boost their morale, and achieve more in their vocation.

References

1. Colacion-Quiros, H., & Gemora, R. B. (2016). Causes and effects of stress among faculty members in a state university. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *4*(1), 18-27.
2. Delello, J. A., McWhorter, R. R., Marmion, S. L., Camp, K. M., Neel, J., Everling, K. M., & Marzilli, C. (2015). The life of a professor: Stress and coping.
3. El Shikieri, A. B., & Musa, H. A. (2012). Factors associated with occupational stress and their effects on organizational performance in a Sudanese University. Creative Education, 3(01), 134.
4. Galeon G.A. (2015). Correlates of the teaching performance of the college faculty members. International Journal of Applied Psychology 5(3), 64-72DOI: 10.5923/j.ijap.20150503.02
5. Gramas, M. (2013). Faculty perceptions of student-faculty relationships in associate degree programs of nursing (Order No. 3567754). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1420355997). Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/faculty-perceptions-student-relationships/docview/1420355997/se-2?accountid=28547
6. Harmsen, R., Helms-Lorenz, M., Maulana, R., & Van Veen, K. (2018). The relationship between beginning teachers' stress causes, stress responses, teaching behaviour and attrition. *Teachers and Teaching*, *24*(6), 626-643.
7. Johnston, D., Bell, C., Jones, M., Farquharson, B., Allan, J., Schofield, P., & Johnston, M. (2015). Stressors, appraisal of stressors, experienced stress and cardiac response: a real-time, real-life investigation of work stress in nurses. *Annals of Behavioral* Medicine, 50(2), 187-197.
8. Kumari, B. (2019). A study of occupational stress among faculty members in higher educational

institutions in Pusa (Bihar). BULMIM Journal ofManagement and Research, 4(1), 36-42.
9. Johnston, D., Bell, C., Jones, M., Farquharson, B., Allan, J., Schofield, P., & Johnston, M. (2015). Stressors, appraisal of stressors, experienced stress and cardiac response: a real-time, real-life investigation of work stress in nurses. *Annals of Behavioral* Medicine, 50(2), 187-197.
10. Meng, Q., & Wang, G. (2018). A research on sources of university faculty occupational stress: a Chinese case study. Psychology Research and Behavior Management, 597-605.
11. Ryan, S.., von der Embse, N.P., Pendergast, L.L., Saeki, E., Segool, N., & Scwing, S. (2017. Leaving the teaching profession: The role of teacher stress and educational accountability policies on turnover intent. *Teaching and Teacher Education.* Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.03.016
12. Smith, K. L. (2012). *Coping mechanisms and level of occupational stress among agriculture teachers and other teaching populations* (Order No. 1531364). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1269794536). Retrieved frm https://search.proquest.com/docview/1269794536?accountid=173015
13. Srivastava, A., & Shukla, N. (2017). Occupational stress factors and their coping strategies among female faculty members of a women college. International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences, 6(2), 102-114.
14. Tan, J. S. T. (2017). Factors affecting stress among faculty members of public universities in the Philippines: A multiple regression analysis. International journal of psychological studies, 9(3), 56-69.
15. Teles, R., Valle, A., Rodríguez, S., Piñeiro, I., & Regueiro, B. (2020). Perceived stress and indicators of burnout in teachers at Portuguese higher education institutions (HEI). International journal of environmental research and public health, 17(9), 3248.
16. Thomas, K. R. (2016). A cross-case analysis of faculty and administrator stress in higher education: Do I stay, or do I go? (Order No. 10104364). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1789608609). Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/cross-case-analysis-faculty-administrator-stress/docview/1789608609/se-2?accountid=28547
17. Van Thanh, L. Relationship at work as a cause of occupational stress: the case of academic women in Vietnam. Int J Ment Health Syst 10, 42 (2016). Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1186/s13033-016-0078-2