CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Education is a process of human enlightenment and empowerment for the achievement of a better and higher quality of life. Recognizing such an enormous potential of education, all progressive societies have committed themselves to the universalisation of elementary education with an explicit aim of providing ‘Quality Education for all’. They have also recognized the significance of expansion of secondary education, gradually reaching to a near universalization level and simultaneously improving its quality for effective empowerment of as many more learners as possible in order to achieve advancements in socio-economic and other domains of life. While higher education has also great potential in this respect, it can generally be made accessible to only a small section of the society. However, school education, in the present times can be provided practically to all the members of the society and, therefore, its quality and efficiency assume special significance within the larger framework of personal, social and national development.

Since the effective school education anticipates effective teacher education, the teacher education has to remain effective and functional. Thus, it is the commitment on the part of teachers and teacher educators, which alone is capable of transforming the educational scenario in the country. The teacher educators, in addition to the requisite competencies shall also ensure nurturing of certain qualities amongst the trainees at both the stages. Needless to say, that they too, shall have to have these competencies and qualities in a much greater measure of proficiency and tangibility.

Nevertheless, today’s technically super advanced life with lots of stress and strain hardly provides any congenial atmosphere for any thinker to think, any policy maker to do constructive framing of the policy and above all any teacher to teach with sincerity and dedication. The daily interaction with pupils, co-workers and the incessant and fragmented demands of the teaching in general, often lead to overwhelming pressures and challenges, which further lead to stress and strain. Particularly, the teacher educators (who are preparing teachers for the schools) come across many pressures from different directions vis-à-vis:
• Frequently changing norms and standards set by NCTE.
• Specified rules and regulations set by the University.
• Various conditions set and time to time relaxed by DPI/State Level Agency.
• Expectations of NCERT from the institutions to go hand in hand with the changing times.
• Competitive attitude of the institutions for the attainment of higher grade from NAAC.
• Management’s expectations for optimum utilization of minimum resources.
• One’s own pressure to develop professionally.
• Voluntary organizations like CTE, AIAER and others who seek voluntary membership from teacher educators as also their active participation in their programs.
• Frequent changes in the timetable across the academic session to meet the needs of the curriculum detailed in the calendar of activities suggested by NCTE.
• Unending co-curricular activities to meet the needs of the quality school functioning required in future.
• Lesser span as also lesser number of full-time faculties available for the pupil teachers to be educated for tomorrow
• Wide range of expectations of the special investors in the form of fees i.e., either pupil teachers or their parents
• Maintenance of cordial relations with staff and heads of the practicing schools

Thus, society entrusts responsibility of producing quality teachers on teacher educators. Nevertheless, in adverse circumstances of unlimited circumference as discussed, it is hard task for a teacher educator to accomplish all the specified task objectives with a required level of commitment and competence. All the time, teacher educator is on the toes, which unconsciously take him/her to stress and then to distress.

5.1.1 THE STRESS

In common parlance, the term, ‘Stress’ and ‘Strain’ are used synonymously in a non-scientific manner. Stress is one of those peculiar terms, which is understood by everyone when used in a very general context but understood by few when an operational definition is desired. The ambiguity of the term is in part a function of the fact that it is applied by some to situations, conditions, or stimuli evoking the responses of subjects, and by others to the response dimensions, whether subjective, psychological, endocrine, or central nervous system.
Mason (1975) reviewed literature on stress and concluded that there was confusion and a lack of consensus regarding its definition. The term stress has been approached in at least four different ways. First, as the stimulus or external force acting on the organism; second, as the response or changes in the physiological functions; third, as the interaction between an external force and the resistance opposed to it, as in biology; and finally, as a comprehensive phenomenon encompassing all the three.

A frequently cited definition of stress has been provided by Hans Selye (1956) “the non-specific response of the body to any demand made upon it.”

Agarwala et al. (1979) believed that the confusion in definition is primarily because scholars of different disciplines are using the same term variously. Thus, in physics, stress is a force, which acts on a body to produce strain. In physiology, the various changes in the physiological functions in response to evocative agents denote stress (rather than strain). In psychology, stress refers to a particular kind of state of the organism resulting from some interaction between him/her and the environment. One way of unraveling this confusion is to identify the following parameters of stress:

- The context in which the term is used
- The discipline of the researcher and the nature of the stimuli considered as stressors
- The response relevant to the scientist

Agrawal (2001) laid emphasis on the individual’s perceptions of the demands made by the environment and his ability to meet those demands. It is the mismatch between these personal resources and environmental demands that leads to the condition called stress as is found in the person-environment fit theory and Lazarus’ theory of stress. A diagrammatic representation of the term stress is presented in the Figure 1.1 below:
In general, job stress can be defined as a lack of harmony between the individual and the work environment. However, as far as field of education is concerned; teaching is unique in many ways, and is also concerned with stress-related conditions. Teacher stress has come under considerably scrutiny since 1930. “Teacher stress has continued to be studied since 1930’s, when article on the health and happiness of teachers began to appear in various educational journals”(Smith and Milstein, 1984).

Kyriacou (1989) has defined teacher stress as a negative feeling or an unpleasant emotional state, such as tension, frustration, anxiety, anger and depression, resulting from aspects of their work.

Teacher stress is a much talked of phenomenon. The magnitude of teacher stress varies according to the criteria used and from study to study. Some evidence have emerged that teacher stress has been on the increase during the 1990s. Teaching and teacher stress is very individual and dynamic by its nature. Study results concerning teachers’ age, aging, sex, marital status and work experience in relation to stress are partly conflicting. Some studies have shown these negative feelings to be a problem among young teachers while to some others older teachers are more at risk. Some studies claim that females show more symptoms of stress than males (e.g. Okebukola and Jegede, 1989; Shinde, 1997), while the some other findings have also been presented (Paratkar, 1994). Social support and good relations on the work place are commonly seen to promote well-being in work. A short working day and liberal leisure time are commonly mentioned in connection with the better side of teachers’ work.

Teacher stress is found to be associated with both subjective (e.g. interaction with pupils) and objective (e.g. sex, age, school level) factors. The most general stressors are associated with the quality of social interaction at work (with pupils and colleagues), time
demands and the amount of work. Coates and Thorenson (1976) concluded that the classroom and discipline related problems are the primary source of stress. Heibert and Farber (1984) revealed that some sources of stress operate simultaneously and some in a successive manner. Blasé (1986) found lack of discipline, unsatisfactory achievement and absenteeism as the problems underlying stress. Borg, Riding and Falzon (1991) reported that pupil misbehavior, time demands, work conditions, lack of professional recognition and staff relations as major occupational stressors. Indira (1997) observed that all the sub-areas were not uniformly and exactly equal in influencing the stress among lecturers.

Smith and Bourke (1992) from University of Newcastle tested a causal model of relationships among aspects of teaching context, perceived workload and satisfaction with teacher stress and confirmed the existence of four latent teacher stress dimensions described below:
1. Conflict: Stress arising from staff tensions and role conflict.
2. Students and Physical Conditions: Stress arising from interactions with students and from the teaching environment in general.
3. Time Pressure: Stress arising from having to do too much in insufficient time period.
4. Rewards and Recognition: Stress arising from the lack of rewards, in terms of both money and status, and lack of recognition of teachers' professionalism within the education system.

Based on a review of international research, it is concluded that teacher stress is a real phenomenon and that high levels are reliably associated with a range of casual factors, including those intrinsic to teaching, individual vulnerability and systemic influences. Researches in the area of teacher stress seem to be neglected domain of investigation in the right perspective. The amount of research conducted on stress in general, in other areas of employment and in other teaching areas, makes it evident that research related to teacher stress is of great importance and the stress on teacher educators has far-reaching consequences on the entire system of education. It becomes imperative therefore to study the teacher stress among teacher educators. Considering the yet unexplored area of teacher stress in the Indian context, two things seemed quite prominent;

- The effect of individual related personal variables on teacher stress
- The nature of teacher stress

Hence, here our matter of concern was to examine the relationship of teacher stress with some identified teacher’s personal characteristics i.e., locus of control, family environment and emotional Intelligence among teacher educators; as well as the nature of the teacher stress.
5.1.3 LOCUS OF CONTROL

Julian Rotter first developed the concept in 1960. He originally named this concept as Locus of Control of Reinforcement. A Locus of control orientation is a belief about whether the outcomes of our actions are contingent on what we do (internal control orientation) or on events outside our personal control (external control orientation). Locus of control, according to Rotter’s approach, is conceptualized as referring to a one-dimensional continuum, ranging from external to internal:

External Locus of Control: Individual believes that his/her behavior is guided by fate, luck, or other external circumstances.

Internal Locus of Control: Individual believes that his/her behavior is guided by his/her personal decisions and efforts.

Where Rotter’s conceptualization (1966) viewed locus of control as one-dimensional (internal to external), Levenson (1973) offered an alternative model. The model asserts that there are three independent dimensions: Internality, Chance and Powerful others. According to Levenson’s model, one can endorse each of these dimensions of locus of control independently and at the same time. For example, A person might simultaneously believe that both oneself and powerful others’ influence outcomes, but that chance does not.

**Individual Locus of Control:** Belief about individual control. (High scores indicate that one believes that one's outcomes are controlled by him/her. One’s current situations and rewards are direct outcomes of things one control).

**Chance Locus of Control:** Belief about chance control (High scores indicate that unordered, chance or random events control the outcomes).

**Locus of Control by powerful others:** Belief about control by powerful others (High scores indicate that other people control the outcomes).

Generally, the development of locus of control stems from family, culture and past experiences leading to rewards. Most internals have been shown to come from families that focused on effort, education and responsibility. On the other hand, most externals come from families of a low socioeconomic status where there is a lack of life control.

Previous research results concerning teachers’ locus of control in relation to stress are partly conflicting. Rao (1986); Gupta (1989); Mishra (1991); and Joshi and Singhvi (1997) found locus of control to be a characteristic, bearing a strong correlation with stress.
Teachers having an external locus of control have been found to experience greater stress than teachers with an internal locus of control (Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979); and Mishra (1991). Shejwal (1984) conducted a two-fold study to establish (a) the stressfulness of life events, and (b) to test some of its personality correlates. The analysis revealed that the high stress group was found to have internal control whereas the low stress group was found to have external control. However, Paratkar (1994) examined the stress among teachers concluding that locus of control did not have any relationship with the role stress.

Contrasting results from previous studies highlighted the need for further research in this specific area. Locus of control may be important in studies of job strain, implicated as a risk factor. Such work might lead to a better understanding of how the perception of control relates to job stress.

5.1.4 FAMILY ENVIRONMENT

‘This year (i.e., 1997) Asia is widely considered to be a much more stressful place to live in than was the case as recently as in 1996’. Even India is not an exception, ranking only after Vietnam, South Korea, Thailand, Hong Kong, the Philippines, China, Indonesia, Singapore and Japan (in that order), and rating 6.1 on a 10-point rating scale. The report further adds that ‘the single factor most often cited as being the biggest cause of stress was difficulties balancing professional life with social and family life.’ (The Times of India, 1997)

The family is the oldest and the most important of all the institutions that man has devised to regulate and integrate his behavior as he strives to satisfy his basic needs. Family is a biological unit whose members have common dwelling place, and the parents are bound together by institutionalized social relationships. It is the most intimate group, to which man belongs, and most effective agent in the transmission of the social heritage. Its key position rests on its multiple functions in relation to overall development of its members, their protection, and over all well-being. Therefore, it would emerge that not only the social and physical well-being of the individual is taken care of by the family, but the psychological well-being as well. Ideally, the family provides its members with protection, companionship, security, and socialization. The structure of the family and the needs that the family fulfills vary from society to society. The nuclear family—two adults and their children—is the main unit in some societies. In others, the nuclear family is a subordinate part of an extended family, which also consists of grandparents and other relatives. A third family unit is the single-parent family, in which children live with an unmarried, divorced, or widowed mother or father.
The modern family has profoundly modified its functions and has become highly individualistic. The only function of the family that continues to survive all change is the provision of affection and emotional support by and to all its members. The family environment is influenced by a number of factors like the nature of family constellation; number of children in the family; marital relationships between husband and wife; maternal (paternal) employment; and socio-economic status and religious background of the family.

Achieving the right balance between the workplace and the home is crucial for the efficient functioning of any organization. Getting the right balance between work and home life makes people more effective because it enhances their self-confidence. In the modern world, material goods and standards of living determine societal status to a greater extent than family, education, etc. In such a culture, dual carrier couples definitely have an edge over those in whom the male is the only earning member. Higher income means a better quality of physical life and psychological fulfillment of carrier aspirations of both spouses. However, this advantage does not come without any cost. Dual carrier families face considerable stress and strain (Aggarwal, 2001).

Ushasree (1993) found that various sources of stress included career satisfaction, job related stress and family areas. Shinde (1997) attempted to study the demographic and family variables related to perceived stress; and found unsatisfactory relationship with spouse, parents, parents-in-law and children; associated with greater general perceived stress among teachers. However, Surti (1982) studied the psychological correlates of role stress and found that no significant differences were observed in any type of role stress with family-related variables. Thus, the previous studies highlighted the need for further research in this particular area.

5.1.5 EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Emotional Intelligence started its journey to prominence in 1920 when Thorndike (1920) formulated the concept of “social intelligence”. Building on the work of Thorndike, Gardener (1983) developed the theory of ‘multiple intelligences’, wherein he classified intelligence into two categories: interpersonal and intra-personal intelligences. Further, Salovey and Mayer (1990) coined the term emotional intelligence which they conceptualized ‘as the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and others feelings and emotions, discriminate among them and to use information to guide one’s thinking and action’. Mayer and Salovey (1997) described the four branches of emotional intelligence:

- Perception, Appraisal and Expression of Emotion
- Emotional Facilitation of Thinking
- Understanding and Analyzing Emotions; Employing Emotional Knowledge
- Reflective Regulation of Emotions to Promote Emotional and Intellectual Growth

Goleman (1995) formulated the best-known theory of emotional intelligence and identified the following major areas of emotional intelligence:

  a. Knowing one's emotions
  b. Management of emotions
  c. Motivating oneself
  d. Recognizing emotions in others
  e. Handling relationships

Bar-On (2005) proposed a new model of emotional intelligence wherein emotional-social intelligence is a cross section of inter-related emotional and social competencies, skills, and factors that determine how effectively we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate with them and cope with daily demands.

Steve Hein (2005) found the academic definition by Mayer-Salovey too abstract and his adaptation of the term is:

  a. Emotional identification, perception and expression
  b. Emotional facilitation of thought
  c. Emotional Understanding
  d. Emotional Management

Whereas, Cooper and Sawaf (1997) defined emotional intelligence as the ability to sense, understand and effectively apply the power and acumen of emotions as source of human energy, information, connection and influence. Various factors of emotional intelligence being used in this study are self-awareness, empathy, self-motivation, emotional stability, managing relations, integrity, self-development, value orientation, commitment and altruistic behavior.

In the review of literature, it was revealed that various investigators have suggested different techniques to raise emotional intelligence at workplaces with various strata of learners, such as for leaders, employers, organizers and superintendents. However, very few studies have been conducted for analyzing the emotional intelligence among teachers and its impact on teacher stress. Ciarrochi, Chan and Bajgar (2001) supported that emotional intelligence have impact on occupational stress. Hence, an effort was made to seek relationship of emotional Intelligence to teacher stress among teacher educators.
5.2 EMERGENCE OF THE PROBLEM

Teacher’s role in teaching is crucial and teaching job is extremely demanding. Teachers work under different managements, where the working conditions are not alike. Teacher’s personal variables, working conditions and its effect on students’ achievement have been significant areas of investigation so far. Even now researchers are very much concerned about investigating teacher’s personality, job satisfaction, qualification, experience, etc. and their effect on students’ achievement. However, the effects of the existing system on teacher’s psychological state had been a neglected area, where it was accepted that teachers are not working in stable working conditions of social demands and homogeneous classrooms, which are in addition to other extrinsic factors, responsible for teachers’ stress as well students’ academic declivity. These working conditions account for stress and burnout feelings in the life of teachers.

Researches in the area of teacher’s stress in the context of the Indian educational system seemed to be a neglected domain of investigation. The amount of research conducted on stress in general and in other areas of employment makes it evident that research related to stress is of great importance and the stress among teachers and teacher educators has far-reaching consequences on the entire system of education. Most teachers seemed to work under stress. It became imperative therefore to study the teacher stress among teacher educators. There had yet been no study in particular on teacher’s stress, which evaluates the impact of teacher’s personality and personal variables of teacher educators in Indian conditions. Considering the yet unexplored area of teacher’s stress two things seemed quite prominent with regard to perceived stress among teacher educators:

- The pattern of individual related personality variables to teacher stress, and
- The nature of teacher stress.

Researchers have continued to express the importance of analyzing teachers' individual characteristics when evaluating stress. Internal characteristics tend to dictate how individuals will react to stressful events. Hence, the purpose of this study was to examine the component areas of teacher stress in detail as well as its relationship with some identified teacher’s individual characteristics i.e., Locus of control, family environment and emotional Intelligence of teacher educators in relation to their age, gender, teaching experience, educational qualifications and type of their teacher education institution.
5.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The study was stated as follows:

“STUDY OF TEACHER’S STRESS IN RELATION TO LOCUS OF CONTROL, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AMONG TEACHER EDUCATORS”

5.4 OBJECTIVES

The study was designed to achieve the following objectives:

1. To study the teacher stress of teacher educators in relation to their:
   a. Educational qualifications (categorized as C-I, C-II and C-III)
   b. Gender (male and female)
   c. Type of the teacher education institution (Government, government-aided and self-financed teacher education institutions)
   d. Age (up to 30 years, 31-40 years and 41 years and above)
   e. Teaching experience (Below 2.5 years, 2.5-5 years and more than 5 years)

2. To study the effect of each independent variable vis-à-vis Locus of control, family environment and emotional intelligence on teacher stress of the teacher educators in relation to their:
   a. Educational qualifications (categorized as C-I, C-II and C-III)
   b. Gender (Male and Female)
   c. Type of the teacher education institution (Government, government-aided and self-financed teacher education institution)
   d. Age (up to 30 years, 31-40 years and 41 years and above)
   e. Teaching experience (Below 2.5 years, 2.5-5 years and more than 5 years)

2. To study the interaction effect of all the three independent variables vis-à-vis locus of control, family environment and emotional intelligence on teacher stress of the teacher educators.

5.5 HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses were proposed to test the above stated objectives:

1. There exists no difference in the teacher stress scores of teacher educators with individual-locus of control, chance-locus of control and powerful others-locus of control.

2. There exists no difference in the teacher stress scores of teacher educators with different educational qualifications.

3. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators with individual-locus of control, chance-locus of control and powerful others-locus of control belonging to different educational qualifications.
4. There exists no difference in the teacher stress scores of male and female teacher educators.

5. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of male and female teacher educators with individual-locus of control, chance-locus of control and powerful others-locus of control.

6. There exists no difference in the teacher stress scores of teacher educators belonging to government, government-aided and self-financed teacher education institutions.

7. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators with individual-locus of control, chance-locus of control and powerful others-locus of control belonging to different types of teacher education institutions.

8. There exists no difference in the teacher stress scores of teacher educators with different age levels (i.e., teacher educators up to 30 years of age, between 31-40 years and more than 40 years of age).

9. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators with individual-locus of control, chance-locus of control and powerful others-locus of control belonging to different age levels.

10. There exists no difference in the teacher stress scores of teacher educators with different levels of teaching experience (i.e., teacher educators below 2.5 years of teaching experience, teacher educators between 2.5 - 5 years of teaching experience and teacher educators with more than 5 years of teaching experience).

11. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators with individual-locus of control, chance-locus of control and powerful others-locus of control belonging to different levels of teaching experience.

12. There exists no difference in the teacher stress scores of teacher educators with rich and poor family environment.

13. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators of rich and poor family environment belonging to different educational qualifications.

14. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of male and female teacher educators with rich and poor family environment.

15. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators of rich and poor family environment belonging to different types of teacher education institutions.

16. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators of rich and poor family environment belonging to different age levels.
17. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators of rich and poor family environment belonging to different levels of teaching experience.

18. There exists no difference in the teacher stress scores of teacher educators with high, average and low emotional intelligence.

19. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators with high, average and low emotional intelligence belonging to different educational qualifications.

20. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of male and female teacher educators with high, average and low emotional intelligence.

21. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators of high, average and low emotional intelligence belonging to different types of teacher education institutions.

22. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators of high, average and low emotional intelligence belonging to different age levels.

23. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators of high, average and low emotional intelligence belonging to different levels of teaching experience.

24. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators with individual-locus of control, chance-locus of control and powerful others-locus of control belonging to rich and poor family environment.

25. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators of rich and poor family environment with high and low emotional intelligence.

26. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators with individual-locus of control, chance-locus of control and powerful others-locus of control belonging to high and low emotional intelligence.

27. There exists no interaction on the teacher stress scores of teacher educators with individual-locus of control, chance-locus of control and powerful others-locus of control belonging to the two levels each of family environment (rich and poor) and emotional intelligence (high and low).
5.6 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was delimited in respect of sample, length of service, area and nature of service:

- The teacher educators from teacher education institutions affiliated with the three universities of Punjab State i.e., Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar; Panjab University, Chandigarh and Punjabi University, Patiala were included in the sample.
- The teacher educators from teacher education institutions with at least three years of affiliation i.e., their year of establishment is either 2005 or before 2005, were undertaken.

5.7 SAMPLE SELECTION

In order to conduct the study, all government, government aided and self-financed teacher education institutions with at least 3 years of standing affiliated to the three Universities of Punjab State i.e., Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar; Panjab University, Chandigarh and Punjabi University, Patiala; were selected. In total, 23 colleges of Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar; 34 colleges of Panjab University, Chandigarh and 39 colleges of Punjabi University, Patiala; were selected.

5.8 DESIGN OF THE STUDY

To test the proposed hypotheses, the design of the study was as follows:

1. The factorial design $3 \times 3$ was employed on the scores of teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to three levels of educational qualifications in all the selected teacher education institutions at three levels of locus of control (individual locus of control, chance control and control by powerful others).
2. The factorial design $2 \times 3$ was employed on the scores of teacher stress of male and female teacher educators in all the selected teacher education institutions at three levels of locus of control (individual locus of control, chance control and control by powerful others).
3. The factorial design $3 \times 3$ was employed on the scores of teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to government, government-aided and self-financed teacher education institutions at three levels of locus of control (individual locus of control, chance control and control by powerful others).
4. The factorial design $3 \times 3$ was employed on the scores of teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to three different age levels in all the selected teacher education institutions at three levels of locus of control (individual locus of control, chance control and control by powerful others).
5. The factorial design 3×3 was employed on the scores of teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to three levels of teaching experience in all the selected teacher education institutions at three levels of locus of control (individual locus of control, chance control and control by powerful others).

6. The factorial design 3×2 was employed on the scores of teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to three levels of educational qualifications in all the selected teacher education institutions at two levels of family environment (rich and poor).

7. The factorial design 2×2 was employed on the scores of teacher stress of male and female teacher educators in all the selected teacher education institutions at two levels of family environment (rich and poor).

8. The factorial design 3×2 was employed on the scores of teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to government, government-aided and self-financed teacher education institutions at two levels of family environment (rich and poor).

9. The factorial design 3×2 was employed on the scores of teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to three different age level in all the selected teacher education institutions at two levels of family environment (rich and poor).

10. The factorial design 3×2 was employed on the scores of teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to three levels of teaching experience in all the selected teacher education institutions at two levels of family environment (rich and poor).

11. The factorial designs on the scores of teacher stress of teacher educators in relation to educational qualifications, gender, type of teacher education institution, age and teaching experience at three levels of emotional intelligence (high, average and low) were replicated in the same manner as explained above in this section (from 1 to 5) with respect to locus of control.

12. The factorial design 3×2×2 was employed on the scores of teacher stress among teacher educators belonging to three levels of locus of control (individual locus of control, chance control and control by powerful others) in all the selected teacher education institutions at two levels of family environment (rich and poor) and further at two levels of emotional intelligence (high and low).
5.9 TOOLS EMPLOYED
The following tools were used in the investigation:

TOOL I PERSONAL DATA BLANK - PREPARED BY THE INVESTIGATOR

TOOL II TEACHER STRESS SCALE DEVELOPED BY MAX SMITH AND SID BOURKE (1992)

TOOL III LOCUS OF CONTROL SCALE PREPARED BY SANJAY VOHRA (1992) BASED ON LEVENSON’S SCALE OF LOCUS OF CONTROL (1973)

TOOL IV FAMILY ENVIRONMENT SCALE BY BHATIA AND CHADHA (1993)

TOOL V EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE SCALE DEVELOPED BY ANUKOOL HYDE, SANJYOT PETHE AND UPINDER DHAR (2002)

5.10 PROCEDURE
In order to conduct the study, personal data blanks of teacher educators were filled and following categorizes were identified:

1. On the basis of educational qualification, the teacher educators were classified into three categorizes:

   C-I Teacher educators with M.A. / M.Sc. / M.Com. ; M.Ed. / B.Ed. as educational qualification.

   C-II Teacher educators with M.A. / M.Sc. / M.Com. ; M.Ed.; NET/ SLET as educational qualification.

   C-III Teacher educators with M.A / M.Sc. / M.Com. ; M.Ed.; M.Phil / Ph.D. / any other higher research qualification with or without NET as educational qualification.

2. On the basis of the gender, teacher educators were classified into two categorizes:

   Male Teacher Educators (M)

   Female Teacher Educators (F)

3. On the basis of the type of the teacher education institution, all the teacher educators were classified into three categorizes:

   Government Teacher Education Institutions (GTEI)

   Government-aided Teacher Education Institutions (GATEI)

   Self-financed Teacher Education Institutions (SFTEI)
4. On the basis of the age, all the teacher educators were classified into three categorizes:

- Teacher Educators up to 30 yrs of age (X)
- Teacher Educators with 31 to 40 yrs of age (Y)
- Teacher Educators with more than 40 yrs of age (Z)

5. On the basis of the teaching experience, all the teacher educators were classified into three groups:

- Teacher Educators with Teaching Experience below 2.5yrs (a)
- Teacher Educators with Teaching Experience of 2.5 to 5yrs (b)
- Teacher Educators with Teaching Experience of more than 5yrs (c)

Further, four tools relating to teacher stress, locus of control, family environment and emotional intelligence were administered among the teacher educators of all the selected teacher education institutions.

5.11 STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES EMPLOYED

The following statistical techniques had been employed to analyze the collected data:

1. Means and standard deviations of various sub-groups were computed to understand the nature of data.

2. Two-way analyses of variance had been employed on the scores of teacher stress of various sub-groups in relation to three dimensions of locus of control, two dimensions of family environment and three dimensions of emotional intelligence independently.

3. Three-way analysis of variance had been employed on the scores of teacher stress of various sub-groups in relation to locus of control, family environment and emotional intelligence.

4. To study the significance of various sub-groups, t-tests were employed.

5. Bar-graph representations were prepared to study the nature of teacher stress among various categories of teacher educators.
5.12 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

PART: I Quantitative Analysis (Pertaining to Teacher Stress In Relation to Locus of Control, Family Environment and Emotional Intelligence)

1. Three groups of teacher educators with different locus of control (vis-à-vis, Individual, by chance and by powerful others) were different on the mean teacher stress scores. Teacher educators with locus of control by powerful others exhibited more stress than teacher educators with internal locus of control. Also, teacher educators with locus of control by powerful others exhibited more stress than teacher educators with locus of control by chance. Thus, teacher educators with locus of control by powerful others exhibited more stress than teacher educators with locus of control by chance and teacher educators with individual locus of control.

   Thus, it was observed that the teacher educators, who believe that their outcomes are controlled by powerful others were found to be more stressed as compared to those who believe that unordered, chance and events control their outcomes as also to those who believe that their current situations and rewards are direct outcomes of things controlled by themselves.

2. Teacher stress was not found to be different among teacher educators with different levels of educational qualifications.

3. The teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to different educational qualifications was not qualified by their respective locus of control.

4. Teacher stress was not found to be different among male and female teacher educators.

5. The teacher stress of male and female teacher educators was not qualified by their respective locus of control.

6. Three groups of teacher educators based on the type of their institution (government, government-aided or self-financed teacher education institution) were different on the mean teacher stress scores. Teacher educators from government teacher education institutions exhibited more stress than teacher educators from government-aided teacher education institutions. Also, teacher educators from government teacher education institutions exhibited more stress than teacher educators from self-financed teacher education institutions. Thus, teacher educators from government teacher education colleges exhibited more stress than teacher educators from both government-aided and self-financed teacher education institutions.
7. The teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to different types of institutions was not qualified by their respective locus of control.

8. Teacher stress was not found to be different among teacher educators of different age levels.

9. The teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to different age levels was not qualified by their respective locus of control.

10. Teacher stress was not found to be different among teacher educators with different teaching experiences.

11. The teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to different levels of teaching experience was qualified by their respective locus of control. Further, the observation of means suggested that:
   - Teacher educators with locus of control by powerful others and teaching experience of 5 years or more exhibited more stress than all other categories of teacher educators.
   - Teacher educators with teaching experience of 5 years or more and internal locus of control exhibited lesser stress than teacher educators with lesser teaching experience and locus of control by chance and by powerful others.
   - Teacher educators with locus of control by powerful others exhibited more stress than teacher educators with locus of control by chance and powerful others with same teaching experience.

12. Teacher educators with rich and poor family environments were found to be different on the mean teacher stress scores. Teacher educators with poor family environment exhibited more stress than teacher educators with rich family environment.

   Thus, it was observed that teacher educators who had better relationship dimensions, personal growth dimensions and system maintenance dimensions as far as their family environments is concerned, were found to be less stressed as compared to those who had poor relationship dimensions, personal growth dimensions and system maintenance dimensions.

13. The teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to different educational qualifications was not qualified by two levels of family environment.

14. The teacher stress of male and female teacher educators was not qualified by the two levels of family environment.

15. The teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to different types of teacher education institutions was not qualified by the two levels of family environment.
16. The teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to different age levels was not qualified by the two levels of family environment.

17. The teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to different levels of teaching experience was not qualified by the two levels of family environment.

18. Teacher educators with high, average and low emotional intelligence were found to be different on the mean teacher stress scores. Further, the observation of means suggested that:

- Teacher educators with average emotional intelligence exhibited more stress than teacher educators with high emotional intelligence.
- Teacher educators with low emotional intelligence exhibited more stress than teacher educators with average and high emotional intelligence.

Thus, it was observed that teacher educators, who have higher abilities to sense, understand and effectively apply the power and acumen of emotions, were found to be less stressed as compared to those who have lesser abilities to sense, understand and effectively apply the power and acumen of emotions.

19. The teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to different educational qualifications was found to be qualified by the three different levels of emotional intelligence. Further, the observation of means suggested that:

- Teacher educators with M.A / M.Sc. / M.Com; M.Ed. / B.Ed as educational qualifications and low emotional intelligence yielded higher stress than all other categories of teacher educators.
- Teacher educators with M.A/M.Sc./ M.Com.; M.Ed.; M.Phil / Ph.D. with or without NET /any other higher research qualification as educational qualifications and low emotional intelligence yielded higher stress than all other categories of teacher educators except teacher educators with M.A / M.Sc. / M.Com; M.Ed. / B.Ed as educational qualifications and same emotional intelligence.
- Teacher educators with M.A / M.Sc./ M.Com.; M.Ed.; NET/ SLET as educational qualifications and high emotional intelligence exhibited lesser stress than teacher educators with average emotional intelligence and same educational qualifications.
- Teacher educators with M.A/M.Sc./ M.Com.; M.Ed.; M.Phil / Ph.D. with or without NET /any other higher research qualification as educational qualifications and average emotional intelligence exhibited higher teacher stress than teacher educators with M.A / M.Sc. / M.Com; M.Ed./ B.Ed as educational qualifications and high emotional intelligence.
Teacher educators with M.A/M.Sc./ M.Com.; M.Ed.; M.Phil / Ph.D. with or without NET /any other higher research qualification as educational qualifications and average emotional intelligence exhibited higher teacher stress than teacher educators with M.A / M.Sc./ M.Com.; M.Ed.; NET/ SLET as educational qualifications and high emotional intelligence.

20. The teacher stress of male and female teacher educators was not qualified by three levels of their emotional intelligence.

21. The teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to different types of teacher education institutions was not qualified by three levels of their emotional intelligence.

22. The teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to different age levels was not qualified by three levels of their emotional intelligence.

23. The teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to different levels of teaching experience was not qualified by three levels of their emotional intelligence.

24. The teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to individual locus of control, locus of control by chance and locus of control by powerful others was not qualified by the different levels of their family environment.

25. There was interaction effect of family environment and emotional intelligence on teacher stress of teacher educators. The observation of means revealed that the teacher educators with poor family environment and low emotional intelligence yielded higher stress than all other categories of teacher educators.

26. The teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to individual locus of control, locus of control by chance and locus of control by powerful others was not qualified by the different levels of emotional intelligence.

27. The teacher stress of teacher educators belonging to individual locus of control, locus of control by chance and locus of control by powerful others was not qualified by the different levels each of family environment and emotional intelligence.
PART: II Qualitative Analysis (Teacher Stress among Teacher Educators)

1. The nature of teacher stress among teacher educators was graphically represented and interpretation was as follows:

- Teacher educators were most stressed with ‘aspects of the current education system’.
- Teacher educators were also found to be more stressed for ‘not being able to do a lot of work in a limited time’.
- ‘Making students interested and involved, who are hard to motivate’, was one of the major causes of teacher stress.
- Teacher educators were least stressed by the ‘classroom control’.

2. The dimension-wise teacher stress vis-à-vis ‘conflict,’ ‘students and physical conditions,’ ‘time pressure’ and ‘lack of rewards and recognition’ of all the teacher educators was represented graphically. The bar graph reflects that:

- With regard to all the dimensions of teacher stress, ‘lack of rewards and recognition’ stressed the teacher educators the most.
- The teacher educators were least stressed by ‘students and physical conditions’.

3. C-II teacher educators were least stressed as compared to C-I and C-III teacher educators with respect to all the dimensions of teacher stress vis-à-vis ‘conflict’ ‘Students and physical conditions’ ‘time pressures’ and lack of ‘rewards and recognition’ whereas, C-III teacher educators were more stressed as compared to C-I and C-II teacher educators with respect to all the dimensions of teacher stress.

4. Male teacher educators were more stressed as compared to female teacher educators with respect to the two dimensions of teacher stress namely; ‘conflict’ and ‘lack of rewards and recognition’, whereas, male teacher educators were less stressed as compared to female teacher educators with the remaining two dimensions of teacher stress namely, ‘students and physical conditions’ and ‘time pressures’.

5. The teacher educators of government teacher education institutions were found to be more stressed when compared to the government-aided and self-financed teacher education institutions, whereas, the teacher educators of government-aided teacher education institutions were found to be least stressed when compared to the government and self-financed teacher education institutions except with regards to the dimension of ‘lack of rewards and recognition’.

6. The teacher educators with more than 41 years of age were found to be less stressed when compared to remaining two categories namely, ‘up to 30 years of age’ and
‘between 31 to 40 years of age’. The teacher educators up to 30 years of age were found to be less stressed when compared to the teacher educators between 31-40 years of age with respect to different dimension of teacher stress.

7. Teacher educators with teaching experience between 2.5 to 5 years were found to be least stressed when compared to teacher educators with teaching experience of less than 2.5 years and teacher educators with teaching experience of more than 5 years except when compared with teacher educators of teaching experience less than 2.5 years with regards to the dimension of ‘time pressure’.

5.13 EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The educational implications of the study are as follows:

1. Results reveal that teacher’s stress is increased as locus of control of teacher educators is moved away from the internal realm. In other words, less the control teachers believe, they have over the events that occur in their lives, the more intense is their stress. Also, teacher’s stress is decreased when the family environment is rich. Further, teacher’s stress is decreased, as teacher’s emotional intelligence is higher. Thus, research have identified locus of control, family environment and emotional intelligence variables important to teacher stress. Now, this is a crucial time to realize that the various levels of teachers’ personality characteristics i.e., locus of control, family environment and emotional intelligence should be taken into consideration for their perceived stress and is recommended that:

   a) Like other specialized professions, there can be a watch over the entrants in this noble profession. Selection tests for would-be teachers and teacher educators i.e., entrance tests for B.Ed. and M.Ed. as well as NET (UGC) may include the questions pertaining to requisite personality characteristics so that individuals with more internal realm, rich family environment and high emotional intelligence be chosen to serve up the upcoming generations. Such individuals will experience lesser stress as is exhibited in current research and some previous researches too.

   b) Curriculum framework for various teacher education programs i.e., B.Ed. and M.Ed. should include contents of desired variables so that would be teachers and teacher educators be able to come across orientation, understanding and enhancement programs of the required personality characteristics.
2. Various dimensions of teacher’s stress namely; ‘conflict’, ‘students and physical conditions’, ‘time pressure’ and ‘lack of rewards and recognition’; should be taken into consideration for the composite teacher stress among different categories of teacher educators.

3. With regard to all the dimensions of teacher stress, ‘lack of rewards and recognition’ stressed teacher educators the most. Thus, the appreciation, respect and consideration shown in terms of both salary and status of teacher educators should be taken care of. Education Department should consider undertaking strategies that can help reduce the extreme levels of stress teacher educators might experience.

4. Since the dimension of teacher stress namely, ‘students and physical conditions’, stressed the teacher educators the least, it implies that student-teacher ratio and the minimum required infrastructural facilities might have made it possible. These measures need to be maintained further through rules regulations set by the concerned authorities.

5. Teacher educators from government teacher education institutions exhibited more stress than teacher educators from government-aided teacher education institutions and self-financed teacher education institutions. Thus reasons for such stress of teacher educators of government teacher educators should be traced.

6. Teacher educators with locus of control by powerful others and teaching experience of more than 5 years exhibited more stress than all other categories of teacher educators. This category of teacher educators should also be monitored.

7. As the teacher educators with less educational qualifications and low emotional intelligence yielded higher stress than all other categories of teacher educators, hence this category should be avoided in the selection process.

5.14 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The present study suggests following areas for further research:

1. The present study was confined to teacher educators only. Similar researches can be conducted on schoolteachers, college teachers of degree colleges, vocational teachers, special teachers, university professors etc.

2. Researchers in the area of teacher stress need to consider the problem from a broad perspective and additional information regarding more variables may uncover findings not established by this particular study.

3. A similar investigation may be conducted on teacher educators of other states. But it is highly desirable that if we want to bring a qualitative change in the teacher education, such studies should be conducted at large scales.
4. In view of the above investigation, we conclude that teacher stress is a result of combined effect of several dimensions, which need further diagnosis to make an effective program towards ultimate fulfillment of realization of aims of education.

5. The need for conceptual clarity, consistency in definitions of the terms, and specific use of terminology are essential in achieving the goals of stress research.