CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION
Universities play a vital role in the economic and social life of a country. They train the nation's teachers, scientists, engineers, lawyers, doctors and other professionals and produce much of its cutting-edge research; but, in order to fulfil this role successfully they need to attract and retain high quality staff and provide a supportive working environment.

University teaching has traditionally been regarded as a low stress occupation (Fisher, 1994). Although not highly paid in comparison to professionals in the commercial sector, academics have been envied for their tenure, light work loads, flexibility, perks such as overseas trips for study or conference purposes, and the freedom to pursue their own research interests. However their ability to do so has been threatened over the past decade by deteriorating working conditions. Increasing numbers of academic positions are now untenured, workloads have increased and academics are under increasing pressure to attract external funds, and publish or perish (Fisher, 1994).

Research on stress among academic and general staff of universities from across the globe indicates that the phenomenon of occupational stress in universities is alarmingly widespread and increasing. There is growing evidence that universities no longer provide the low stress working environment that they once did (Association of University Teachers, 1990; Boyd & Wylie, 1994; Winefield, 2000). The United Kingdom Association of University Teachers study (AUT, 1990) found that 49% of university employees reported that their jobs were stressful and 77% reported an increase in occupational stress over recent years. Similarly, in a study on stress in seven New Zealand universities, Boyd and Wylie (1994) reported that half of the academics often or almost always become more stressful in recent years. In addition, 46% expected further increase in workload in the future.

A major source of stress among university teaching faculty is the dramatic increase in the enrollment of students. Student numbers have dramatically increased over the past few years. For instance between 1979 and 1993, in Britain it was reported that the number of university students nearly doubled (Smith & Webster, 1997).

As pointed out by Awopegba (2001) there has been an astronomical increase in student enrollment without a corresponding increase in teaching personnel. The resultant effect is increase in workload and stressed teachers.
In India also there is linear expansion in the existing system of higher education. The number of universities has increased from 25 in 1950 to 221 in 1999-2000, whereas the colleges have also increased in number from about 700 to more than 11000 during the same period (Ghadohiya, 2000). At present there are a total of 481 universities in India out of which 39 are Central Universities, 254 State Universities, 130 Deemed Universities, 58 Private Universities (Gabs Classes, 2010). According to MHRD (Ministry of Human Resource Development, 2011) at present our country has 16,885 colleges with about 99.54 lakhs students and 4.57 lakhs of teachers.

Indian higher education and research sector is the third largest in the world, in terms of the number of students it caters to. There has been a rapid expansion in higher education, with student enrollment growing at about 5 percent annually over the past two decades. This growth is about two-and-half times the population growth rate, and results from both a population bulge in lower age cohorts as well as increased demand for higher education. However, even today’s gross enrollment ratio of Indians in institutions of higher education is approximately 7 percent of the age cohort, which is considerably higher than developing country averages, but lower than the average for Asia as a whole (11 percent) and much lower than Organizations for Economic Cooperation and Development(OECD) countries.

Although total expenditure on higher education has risen since independence from 483 crores to 2418.3 crores between 1980 and 1995, spending per pupil in real terms declined for nearly two decades (Tilak, 1997), before recovering modestly. Higher education occupies a low priority in public expenditures. Its share of Gross National Product was nearly 1 percent during the 1970s, just 0.35% in the mid-1990s before increasing modestly to 0.60% by the end of the decade.

The teachers are at the receiving end of this ongoing transformation in higher education. They are juggling between many responsibilities such as teaching, research and extension requirements at colleges and universities. Even more demanding than the complexity of teaching is the fact that teaching can also generate a high level of stress and fatigue among teachers. Contributing factors to this stress also includes: unclear expectations, spending many hours in class, classes that take more preparation time or having a high number of course preparations in a given semester, handling classes with large enrollments, planning productive activities, or dealing with difficult
or very needy students, dealing with social and learning issues, such as AIDS, learning disabilities and attention-deficit disorder, newer curricular and teaching approaches, including the use of technology, time involved in student advising and conferences, increasing demands from administrative, clerical and committee duties, increasing diversification of expertise, campus politics and meeting the economic necessities of the institution, changes in administrative demands or administrative leadership, lack of financial and personnel support, time pressures and deadlines, continual overload of work, and dealing with inequities and inequalities.

These factors may be compounded by student attendance, attention, discipline, and lack of motivation. The latter can be especially stressful because uninterested students disrupt a classroom and the work of other students. Moreover, teaching uninterested or unmotivated students can also be exhausting and damaging to a teacher's positive sense of self.

Despite teachers braving through all these odds, the nation today witnesses the declining popularity of teaching as a profession, not only among the students that we produce, but also among parents, scientists, society and the government. The teaching profession today attracts only those who have missed all other better opportunities in life, and is increasingly mired in bureaucratic controls and anti-education concepts such as hours of teaching load, paid-by-the-hour, contractual teachers etc. With privatization reducing education to a commodity, teachers are reduced to tutors and teaching is reduced to coaching.

All this is a cause of concern and in turn gives rise to stress among teachers. Teachers stress can be categorized as a serious working hazard which has a power to bring a crisis on the teacher and teaching as an occupation.

Stress

Stress is a complex multivariate process, resulting from a broad system of variables involving inputs, outputs and the mediating activities of appraisal and coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). According to the transactional approach developed by Lazarus and colleagues, the stress process is dynamic, and is constantly changing as a result of the continual interplay between person and environment (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The multidimensionality of
stress is evidenced by the fact that it takes different forms, results from different factors and occurs in all types of environments.

Despite the positive function of a certain amount of stress on an employee, research has consistently demonstrated that excessive occupational stress has adverse effects for both physiological and psychological well being (Cooper & Cartwright, 1997). As a positive influence, stress can bring a sense of excitement in an individual and compel an individual to take actions that can result in improved performance. As a negative influence, it can result in an array of feelings such as rejection, anger and depression, which can lead to decreases in physical well being including headaches, elevated blood pressure and heart disease (Landsbergis, Schnall, Belkic, Baker, Schwartz, & Pickering, 2001). Equally, research indicates that elevated stress levels in an organization are associated with increased turnover, absenteeism, and low morale (Jackson, 1983). These phenomena have been reported among numerous occupational groups including academicians, who are the focus of the present investigation.

**Occupational Stress**

Most of the employed persons experience stress as a normal part of their jobs. However, some employees seem to experience stress more severely than others, to a point where they may need time of work. All employment generates stress and strain to some degree (Koeske, Kirk & Koeske, 1993) and it is generally assumed that stress has negative implications (Dubey & Kumar, 1986) stress is, however, neither inherently bad nor descriptive. It can increase one’s performance. However it does have the potential for turning into distress, due to varied reasons. It is this latter manifestation of stress that is individually and organizationally destructive (Ouick, Murphy & Hurrell, 1993).

Stress can be defined as an imbalance between individual’s perceived environmental demands and their perceived environmental demands and their perceived ability to cope with these demands.

Newman and Beehr (1979) noted that occupational stress first appeared as a keyword in *Psychological Abstracts* in 1973. Within the last two decades, a broad interest in occupational stress by academician has emerged Ivancevich and Matteson, (1980); Cooper (1983); Rao (1983); Quick and Quick (1984); Beehr and Bhagat,
Occupational stress researchers have typically defined stress in one of the three ways: as a stimulus variable, a response, or stimulus-response relationship.

A stimulus definition of stress refers to a job stressor which is any environmental event in the workplace requiring some type of adaptive response.

Caplan (1974) defined stress as any characteristics of the job environment which poses a threat to the individual.

Margolis, Kores and Quinn (1974) defined occupational stress as a condition interacting with worker characteristics to disrupt psychological and physiological homeostasis. The casual situation or conditions are job stress.

Cooper and Marshall (1976) stated that occupational stress includes the environmental factors or stressors such as work overload, role ambiguity, role conflict and poor working conditions associated with a particular job.

In contrast, a response definition of stress is associated with what was referred to as a strain. Stress is an individual’s response to work related environmental stressors. Selye (1976) refers to stress as the reaction of the organism, which can be psychological, physiological, or behavioural.

McGrath and Beehr (1990) have used the term stress as stress-producing events and conditions that are social and psychological rather than physical in nature and also as a strain variable.

Occupational stress is a mental and physical condition which affects an individual’s productivity, effectiveness, personal health and quality of work (Comish & Swindle, 1994).

Myers (1999) reported that stress is the body’s physical, mental and chemical reaction to stressors or circumstances that frighten excite, endanger. Stressors from these sources can work independently or collectively.

Finally, stress may be defined within a stimulus response approach. Researchers who refer to stress in this way refer to the interaction between
environmental stimuli (job stressors) and individual response (strains) (Beehr & Franz, 1987).

Beehr and Newman (1978) defined occupational stress as a condition arising from the interaction of people and their jobs characterized by changes within the people that force them to deviate from their normal functioning.

Parasuraman and Alluto (1981) also reported that job demands, constraints and job related events or situations were not in themselves stressful but that they may be capable of producing psychological stress and strain, depending upon personal attributes and other factors.

Allen, Hitt and Green (1982) have defined occupational stress as disruption in individual’s psychological and physiological homeostasis that forces them to deviate from normal functioning in interaction with their jobs and work environment.

Luthans (1995) defined stress in a simplified manner as an adaptive response to an external situation that results in physical, psychological, and/or behavioral deviations for organizational participants.

Occupational Health and Safety Service’s Guidelines, New Zealand, (1998) defined work stress as the awareness of not being able to cope with the demands of one’s environment, when this realisation is of concern to the person, in that both are associated with a negative emotional response.

Occupational stress can be defined as the harmful physical and emotional response that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker (Sauter & Steven, 1999).

Occupational stress can be defined as the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker. It can lead to poor health and even injury (National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health of United States, 1999).

Occupational stress is the emotional, cognitive, behavioral and physiological reaction to aversive and noxious aspects of work, work environments and work organizations. It is a state characterized by high levels of arousal and distress and often by feelings of not coping (European Commission, Directorate-General for Employment and Social Affairs, 2002).
Occupational stress describes physical, mental and emotional wear and tear brought about by incongruence between the requirement of the job and the capabilities, resources and needs of the employee to cope with job demands (Akinboye, Akinboye & Adeyemo, 2002).

Occupational stress is a term used to define ongoing stress that is related to the workplace. The stress may have to do with the responsibilities associated with the work itself, or be caused by conditions that are based in the corporate culture or personality conflicts (Tatum, 2003).

Occupational stress, in particular, is the inability to cope with the pressures in a job because of a poor fit between someone's abilities and his/her work requirements and conditions (Holmlund-Rytkönen & Strandvik, 2005).

In the present study the term occupational stress refers to stress arising due to role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibility and physical environment.

Role attributes have various effects on different individuals. People are willing to accept roles because they provide important psychological benefits such as status, ego gratification, and increased self-esteem (Williams & Alliger, 1994). However, there are also potential costs associated with the roles when individuals are not able to perform those roles as expected.

Role overload exists when role expectations are greater than the individual's abilities and motivation to perform a task (Conley & Woosley, 2000; Schaubroeck, Cotton & Jennings, 1989; Spector & Jex, 1998).

Role overload creates strain because of the pressure to do more work, having a heavy workload that interferes with work quality, and the feeling of not being able to finish a given task within a specified period of time (Conley & Woosley, 2000). The workload by itself is not harmful but rather the perception of threats related to the workload causes strain (Smith & Lazarus, 1990). In other words, perceptual process plays important role to determine the levels of strain among individuals. The organization may unintentionally put a heavy workload on its employees to increase productivity. However, in the long run, the perceived unbearable load causes the feeling of strain among those employees.
With regard to the experience of role stressors in academics, the literature provides clear evidence that academics are experiencing role overload (Dua, 1994; Gillespie, Walsh, Winefield, Dua & Stough, 2001; Taris, Peeters, Le Blanc, Schreurs & Schaufeli, 2001). For example, academics have been described as having difficulty in completing their assigned jobs properly due to task overload (Dua, 1994; Gillespie et al., 2001; Gmelch, Lovrich & Wilke, 1984; Sharpley, Reynolds, Acosta & Dua, 1996). New academic members felt the pressure of role overload especially strongly and Lease (1999) found that role overload significantly related to strain. Being new in the job, they tend to have a low level of perceived ability to handle teaching and research. In his meta-analysis, Winefield (2000) concluded that increased stress levels in academics were associated with increased workloads and reduced rewards.

Role ambiguity arises when individuals do not have clear authority or knowledge about how to perform the assigned jobs (Ashforth & Lee, 1990; Ivancevich & Matteson, 1980; Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970).

In the case of role ambiguity, individuals experience strain when they consistently do not have a clear picture about their work objectives, their coworkers’ and supervisor’s expectations of them, and the scope and responsibilities of their jobs (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1980). Role ambiguity may also be due to the complexity of the job, that is, the job contains many tasks. An individual has to acquire multiple skills to perform all related tasks. Failure to acquire the required skills may increase role ambiguity. For example, Ph.D. training can be considered necessary for an academic to become a supervisor to a Ph.D. student, and failure to get this training may reduce his or her ability to face the complexity of teaching and research. Lee and Schular (1980) argued that leader behaviour that provides adequate communication mechanisms and knowledge of goal specificity allows subordinates to obtain information that will reduce the perception of role ambiguity and subsequently reduce strain. Whenever individuals do not have clear guidelines regarding their role’s authority and responsibility, they will experience strain, become dissatisfied, and perform less effectively (Lee & Schular, 1980). Employees are concerned about their work roles and goals because their rewards are based on the accomplishment of the work goals and fulfillment of role expectations (Ashforth & Lee, 1990). When goals, roles and performance criteria are ambiguous, employees may perceive these ambiguities as threatening their interests. Subsequently, this will lead to the feeling of strain.
Prior research has identified role ambiguity as a significant problem among academics (Dua, 1994; Sharpley et al., 1996). Sharpley et al. (1996) reported that lack of regular feedback about how well academics were doing was the highest source of strain. Prior research has found that academics reporting receiving less regular feedback about their performance at work (Dua, 1994).

Feedback is important to enable the academics to evaluate their performance on the job and how they are progressing in their effort toward task accomplishment. Since positive feedback may serve as reinforcement to the self-efficacy belief that leads to higher performance and less strain, academics who do not receive regular feedback may experience considerable uncertainty about their role performance (Bandura & Locke, 2003). Higher ambiguity may also arise due to lack of clarity regarding how to juggle different academic activities of teaching, research and professional services that are necessary for the successful accomplishment of the academic role. Regular, formal, direct, verbal and written feedback from a supervisor and informal feedback throughout the year may reduce role ambiguity, which in turn reduces strain.

Models of Occupational Stress

Several models of stress relating specifically to occupational stress (also termed as job stress or work stress) have been developed in an attempt to better understand the relationship between work characteristics and employee well-being. The following section is a review of various models related to occupational stress:

Role episode model

Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek & Roenthal (1964) incorporated two kinds of role stress a) role conflict b) role ambiguity. Role stress for Kahn et al. implies consequences for variables like job related tension, emotional reactions etc. Role conflict is defined as two or more sets of pressures resulting in a situation where compliance with one would make it difficult to comply with another.

Role ambiguity refers to inadequate role sending (role demand) or lack of required information to carry out the particular assignment. Role overload is taken as a special case of role conflict in which all the role demands cannot be met in the
available span of time. Briefly, any aspect of role expectation which exceeds the incumbent’s resources may be termed as role stress.

Essentially this model depicts the interaction between a role sender (who sends the role expectation messages) and the focal person (who receives the role expectation of the role sender). The model also incorporates organizational, personal and interpersonal factors which are supposed to affect role episodes.

**Role theory model**

One of the basic premises the role theory is that various occupational roles that individuals engage in may be stressful regardless of their actual occupation, suggesting that stress found in various work roles that they felt were stressful regardless of an individual’s actual vocational choice. Osipow and Spokane (1987) described six work roles that they felt were stressful regardless of an individual’s actual vocational choice. These six roles were also utilized in the revised version of Occupational Stress Inventory and include: role ambiguity, role insufficiency, role overload, role boundary responsibility and physical environment (Osipow & Spokane, 1987; Osipow, 1998).

**Person and environment fit model**

The P-E fit model (Rogers, French & Cobb, 1974) can be discussed as a subjective model, referring to the fit between the subjective person and the subjective environment (i.e. the individual’s perceptions of the P-E fit). This subjective model is particularly useful in the occupational stress process where it is the employee’s perception of the work environment and their ability to manage that environment which may lead to the experience of occupational stress. The subjective P-E fit model is consistent with other theories of stress which have suggested that stress is subjective in nature, rather than objective (Cox, 1978; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; McGrath, 1970). From this perspective a model of occupational stress can be proposed to include perceived job demands (the subjective environment) and the individual’s perceived abilities to manage those demands (the subjective person), producing strains which are psychological, physical and or behavioral in nature (Harrison, 1978).
**Stress chain model**

Mcgrath (1976) define stress in terms of a set of conditions as having stress in it. He proposed that behavior in organization is a product of interaction of three conceptually independent system i.e. a) physical and technological environment in which behavior takes place b) the social medium or nature of interpersonal relationships within which the behavior occurs and c) the person or the self system of the focal person whose behavior is under consideration. The extent to which the situation is stressful depends upon several things. First it must be perceived by the person. Second it must be interpreted by him in relation to his ability a) to meet the demand b) circumvent c) remove d) live with the constraint, or e) put such opportunity to an effective use. Third, he must perceive the potential consequences of successfully coping with the demand as more desirable than the expected consequences of leaving the situation unaltered.

Mcgrath further suggests situations have potential for stress when they have demands which are perceived to threaten to exceed person’s capabilities to meet them and where there are substantial differences in rewards and costs from meeting versus not meeting the demands.

**General model of occupational stress**

Beehr and Newman (1978) developed a model to identify and organize all relevant facets or components of stress. The personal facets include personality and physical fitness of the individual. The environmental facet refers to the role overload, external demands etc. Human consequences include effects on psychological functioning; such as anxiety, effects on physical health, and effects on overt behavior such as drug abuse. Organizational consequences of stress include such effects as absenteeism, turnover and productivity losses. Adaptive responses, proposed to follow these consequences, represent various attempts to handle stress. First the person makes initial adaptive responses to alleviate stress. If these fail, then he makes secondary adaptive responses. Further if these fail again, then organizational adaptive responses are initiated. Again, if time does not show these adaptive responses to be successful, then long -term human and organizational consequences may occur. These can affect the health of both the person and organization.
Transactional model

Cox (1978) regarded stress as an individual phenomenon conceived as the result of a transaction between the person and his or her situation. The term transaction is used to emphasize the active and adaptive nature of process. The model is based on relationship between four components of the individual and the environment i.e. personal resources, inner needs and values, environmental supplies and support and external demands and constraints.

The job demands-control model

This model of occupational stress by Karasek, 1979; Karasek and Thorell, 1990, is based upon the proposition that the interaction between job demand and job control will explain strain outcomes. Karasek defined job demand as the independent variable that measures stressors, such as workload demands. He originally conceptualized job control under the phrase job decision latitude and defined this as the control that the working individual has over tasks and their conduct during their working day. Karasek suggested that when job demands are high and job control is low, strain will occur, leading to both mental and physical health problems. The concept of job control has long been acknowledged as an important factor in the occupational stress process (Cooper, Dewe & O’Driscoll, 2001), however, questions over how to operationally this construct and how the interaction between demands and control should be measured have led to inconsistent findings and difficulty in replicating Karasek’s proposed model (Fox, Dwyer & Ganster, 1993; Jones & Fletcher, 1996; Schaubroeck & Merritt, 1997).

Integrative transaction process model

Schuler (1984) described that an individual feels stress from his or her perception of the environment with his or her own set of unique abilities, skills, needs and values. So what is a stressor for one person may not be a stressor for the other. An individual’s specific response to stress may either reduce stress or increase it. Thus, multi directional causation among the components of the model may lead to the visualization of each of the components as either cause or effect.

Based on a number of different occupational stress theories and practices Beehr and Franz (1986) identified four approaches to studying occupational stress:
medical, clinical/counseling psychology, engineering psychology, and organizational psychology. For each of these approaches Beehr and Franz indicated what a typical stressor and a typical outcome (or strain) would be. Their medical approach identified the typical stressor as physical and the typical outcome as physical strain (physiological or biochemical). The clinical/counseling psychology approach identified the typical stressor as being psychological and the outcome being psychological strain (for example, anxiety). Thirdly, the engineering psychology approach suggested that the typical stressor was physical (the physical work environment) and the outcome is related to job performance. Finally, the organizational psychology approach suggests that the stressor would be psychological and the outcome would be psychological strain. Beehr and Franz advocate that each of these approaches has been developed largely independently of the others and that their focus is not on the same problems.

**Effort-rewards imbalance model**

This model of occupational stress places emphasis on both the effort and the reward structure of work (Marmot, Siegrist, Theorell & Feeney, 1999) and hypothesis that work-related benefits depend on a reciprocal relationship between the efforts and the rewards obtained from work. Effort has been defined as the job demands or the obligations that are placed upon the employee, and rewards are considered to be distributed by the employing organization and include variables such as salary, job security, and career growth opportunities (Siegrist, 1996). This model of occupational stress hypothesis that an employee’s costs and gains. It is this deficit, or imbalance, that is the cause of stress in the employee which leads to disease and ill-health (for example, cardiovascular disease). Unlike the job Demands - Control model of occupational stress, the Effort-Rewards Imbalance model examines both situational and personal characteristics of the work environment, however, the Effort-Rewards Imbalance model is limited in that it includes a narrow approach to health outcomes (originally used to predict the onset of cardiovascular problems) in comparison to the Job Demands-Control model health outcomes (which was developed to predict both individual strain and learning).
Job-demands-resources model

This model is by Bakker, Demerouti, Taris, Schaufeli & Schreurs 2003; Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner and Schaufeli, 2001, is related to the Burnout Model (Malasch & Jackson, 1981; Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001). According to Malasch and Jackson (1981) chronic stress is emotionally draining and ultimately leads to a state of burnout. Burnout has been conceptualized as a psychological syndrome developed in response to chronic interpersonal stressors on the job and is characterized by three key dimensions (Maslach et al., 2001). Firstly, burnout is characterized by overwhelming exhaustion, secondly by feelings of cynicism and detachment from the job, and finally by sense of ineffectiveness and lack of accomplishment components represent the self-evaluation dimension of burnout.

Linked to the model of burnout is the Job-Demands-Resources Model of occupational stress. This model proposes that the development of burnout follows two processes (Demerouti et al., 2001). Firstly, extreme job demands lead to constant overtaxing of the individual and, in the end, to emotional exhaustion. Secondly, a lack of resources available to the employee complicates the meeting of job demands which then leads to withdrawal behaviors and ultimately to disengagement from work. The Job-Demands-Resources model assumes that although employees in different organizations may be confronted with different working environments can always be classified into two categories-jobs demands and job resources (Bakker et al., 2003). According to this model, job demands are defined as physical, psychological, social or organizational aspects of one’s job that require sustained effort (cognitive and emotional) and are associated with psychological and physical costs to the individual. Job resources are defined as the same aspects of one’s job (physical, psychological, social or organizational) but those aspects are functional in achieving work goals, reducing job demands, and/ or stimulating personal development and growth. Similar to the models of occupational stress presented above, the Job-Demands-Resources model works on the assumption that stress in the workplace is a result of the interaction between the person and their environment.

In the present investigation role theory model has been adopted.

Occupational Stress: A Research Overview

Klenke-Hamel and Mathieu (1990) in a study that included university faculty, revealed the relationship between role strains, tension, job satisfaction, and the
propensity to leave the job. Faculty who were experiencing more stress than they could cope with were more likely to withdraw from student-professor interactions, be less accessible to students, and be less involved in the departmental decision making and committee work.

A survey conducted by the Trade Union Congress (1996) concluded that people working in the voluntary sector and in education constituted the occupational groups most affected by occupational stress.

A study of organizational role stress in relation to job burnout among university teachers has been conducted in (Pestonjee & Azeem, 2001) in India. The results of the study indicated that organizational role stress was highly correlated with job burnout among all ranks of faculty members, and sources of stress included excessively high self-expectations, the pressure to secure financial support for research, insufficient time to keep up with developments in the field, inadequate salary, manuscript preparation, role overload, conflicting job demands, slow progress on career advancement, frequent interruptions, and long meetings.

Winefield and Jarrett (2001) conducted a survey of all staff members of Australian University. The overall response rate for non casual staff was 72% (77% for general staff and 65% for academic staff) resulting in a sample of N = 2,040. High levels of psychological stress were observed, despite the fact that trait anxiety and job satisfaction were normal. Psychological distress was highest and job satisfaction lowest among academic staff engaged in both teaching and research. In general, university staff reported high levels of autonomy and social support from colleagues. However those engaged in both teaching and research reported increased pressure arising from funding cuts by universities, resulting in heavier teaching loads and greater difficulty in securing research funds, as well as a decline in facilities and support for both teaching and research.

Gillespie et al. (2001) in a study on general and academic staff reported a dramatic increase in occupational stress during the past five years. As a group, academic staff reported higher levels of stress than general staff. Five major determinants of stress were identified including: insufficient funding and resources, work overload, poor management practice, insufficient recognition and reward, and job insecurity.
Many faculties reported keeping up with technology as stressful (67 percent), almost equally for men and women teachers (Higher Education Research Institute, 2000). Nonetheless, all faculties believed that technology was educationally beneficial. We are all familiar with the challenges of having to learn new technology in addition to planning our teaching, not to mention the time involved both in mastering it and learning how to incorporate it into our instructional programs in the classroom.

The important recurring themes in analyses of occupational stress characteristics such as work overload, time pressures, conflicting demands due to role ambiguity, poor environmental conditions and poor communication with superiors are all potential problems for educational administrators due to the nature of the high demands of their occupation (Dollard, 2001; Cox, Griffiths & Gonzalez, 2000).

Upadhayay and Singh (2001) in a study on college and school teachers observed that they also experience stress and need to learn coping strategies to overcome the negative effects of job stressors.

Burke (2002) investigated the relationship between occupational stress and health in a sample of over 2,500 women. He also included measures of job satisfaction, psychosomatic symptoms, days of illness and a measure of work-family conflict. Burke reported that women with more work stressors had higher levels of psychosomatic symptoms (stomachaches, back problems, headaches) and more days of illness during the past year, and that woman reporting greater work-family conflict (whether family interfered with work and vice versa) also indicated higher levels of psychosomatic symptoms. In addition he reported that women who recorded more work stressors indicated that they were less satisfied with their job than women who recorded less work stressors.

Yagil (2004) in his study examined the sources of stress encountered by inexperienced compared to experienced teachers. Sixty-nine female teachers in elementary schools and kindergartens in Israel participated in the study. A questionnaire was administered measuring job-related stress factors, emotional involvement in the job and active coping with stress factors. The results show that inexperienced compared to experienced teachers stated that they experience an overall higher level of stress. The major sources of stress for inexperienced teachers were interaction with pupils' parents and workload. Inexperienced teachers are less
involved emotionally in their work, especially in regard to incidents of unsatisfactory performance. However, they are similar to experienced teachers in both their emotional reactions to successful performance and in their actions in stressful situations. Since the research design was quasi-experimental, the differences between experienced and inexperienced teachers might be due to other confounded factors such as general life experience.

In a recent study Johnson, Cooper, Cartwright, Donald, Taylor and Millet (2005) examined occupational stress across a number of different occupations and the relationship between job satisfaction and health. These authors identified six occupations (out of 26 included in the study) as being the most stressful regarding poor health and lowered job satisfaction. These occupations were: ambulance, teachers, social services, customer service call centre, prison officers and police. These findings are important as they highlight specific occupations which are at risk of experiencing stress and suffering the negative consequences of stress, and therefore identify appropriate target populations for research on stress.

Tytherleigh et al. (2005) in a recent study examined occupational stress in United Kingdom higher education institutions among all categories of employees. The results showed that the most significant source of stress for all higher education staff (irrespective of category of employee) was job insecurity. In comparison to the normative data, staff also reported significantly higher levels of stress relating to work relationships, control, and resources and communication, and significantly lower levels of commitment both from and to their organization. However, they also reported significantly lower levels of stress relating to work-life balance, overload and job overall, and lower levels of physical ill-health. Significant differences were identified between staff working at old versus new universities and by category of employee. These results support the growing evidence that universities no longer provide the low stress working environments they once did.

Lease (2007) examined differences in levels of occupational stress and personal strain experienced by new and experienced female and male faculty. Factors affecting the stress-strain relationship were also examined. There were no significant differences on measures of stress or strain between male and female faculty or between new and more experienced faculty members. Role overload and avoidant coping were significant predictors of strain measures with hardiness and responsibility
for home-centered tasks accounting for variance in some, but not all, of the strain measures. Results on the negative impact of role overload and avoidant coping on measures of personal strain are consistent with the literature and suggest the need for promoting different coping strategies in the academic workplace as well as working with faculty to help them prioritize and balance their daily work loads.

A study by Devonport, Biscomb and Lane (2008) explored the sources of stress and use of coping strategies amongst Higher Education lecturers. They found that main source of stress in case of Higher Education lecturers resulted from an unbalanced workload, often exacerbated by insufficient time allowance for task completion.

Antoniou, Polychroni and Kotroni (2009) investigated the specific work-related stressors affecting special educational needs teachers in Greece and the coping strategies used by them. They identified five key stressors, loading mainly onto the domains of working conditions, workload, and organisational problems, which appear to have an impact on teachers of special educational needs students in Greece.

Antecedents of Occupational Stress

A perusal of research studies reveals various antecedents of occupational stress.

McGrath (in Tung & Koch, 1980) revealed that there are six possible classes of stressors in an organisational setting, i.e. Task-based stress; role based stress, stress intrinsic to behaviour, stress arising from the physical environment, stress arising from the social environment, and stress within the person system.

Drawing primarily from the work of Cooper and Marshall (1978) identification of major causes of stress in the workplace can be highlighted. In a study of the current literature, Cooper and Marshall identified over forty interacting factors which could be identified as sources of work stress. They grouped these into categories and proposed six major causes of stress at work, with this classification system also used in Glowinkowski and Cooper (1986), Cooper and Cartwright (1997) and Cooper et al. (2001). These six major categories also depicted vide Fig 1.1 are as under:
According to Gupta (1981) stress generates from four sources: 

*Extra-organizational stressors* - like political factors, economic factors and technological factors also causes stress; *Organizational stressors*- it includes job related factors, role related factors like role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload. It also includes inter personal and group related factors. Group related stressors include factors like conflicts, poor communication, unpleasant relationship and fear of being ostracized from the group as a valued member. Working with superior, peers or subordinates with whom one does not get along can be a constant source of stress. Lack of social support from colleagues and poor interpersonal relationships can cause considerable stress, especially among employees with a high social need; *Individual stressors* like job concerns, career progress, career changes, economic problems, changes in life structure, the pace of life and life change and life traumas cause stress to individuals; *Group stressors*- include group cohesiveness, lack of social support, conflicts, organizational climate can cause stress among people.

Dollard (2001) presented a categorical matrix adapted from Cox et al. (2000) to define the stressful characteristics of work, which included these job characteristics such as work overload, excessive job demands and career stagnation. The social and individual components include factors such as coping style, personality traits, conflicting demand of work and home.
A sense of inequity or lack of reciprocity in one’s interpersonal and organizational work relationships, (Van Horn, Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1999; Taris, Peeters, Le Blanc, Schreurs & Schaufeli, 2001; Van Horn, Schaufeli and Taris, 2001); classroom discipline (Lewis, 1999) and classroom management (Morton, Vesco, Williams & Awender, 1997); self-defeating beliefs (Chorney, 1998) and internal attributions (Bibou-Nakou, Stogiannidou & Kiosseoglou, 1999); lack of government support, lack of information about changes, constant change and the demands of the National Curriculum as among their greatest sources of stress (Travers & Cooper, 1997); gangsterism (Govender, 2005) and factors such as leadership style (Harris, 1999) have found to be important in affecting levels of stress.

Other sources of stress, such as high self-expectations (Gmelch, Wilke & Lovrich, 1986; Hind & Doyle, 1996; Seldin, 1987), job insecurity (Dua, 1994; Melendez & De Guzman, 1983), lack of communication and poor interactions with colleagues (Brown, Bond, Gerndt & Krager 1986; Melendez, & De Guzman, 1983; Seldin, 1987), inequality in the system (Boyd & Wylie, 1994), worries over amalgamations (Dua, 1994; Sharpley, Reynolds, Acosta & Dua, 1996), and lack of regular performance feedback (Boyd & Wiley, 1994; Dua, 1994; Sharpley et al., 1996) have been highlighted in only a few studies.

A brief overview of research related to occupational stress suggests that some sources of stress may be unique to a university or region. These previous studies have typically sampled only a single university, sometimes a single department only. A comprehensive understanding of the sources of stress requires research on academic staff sampled across different universities.

Consequences of Occupational Stress

According to Kyriacou (2001) symptoms of stress in teachers are manifested in anxiety and frustration, impaired performance, and ruptured interpersonal relationships at work and at home. Statistics reveal that teachers hand in more medical insurance claims than persons in other professions, have a four year shorter life expectancy than the national average and often blame stress as a reason for sick leave from school (Van Wyk, 1998).

From an organisational point of view, the consequence of stress results in a significant loss of skilled and experienced teachers through resignation and/or
premature retirement from all levels of the teaching workforce. The stressed teachers who remain within the profession, on the other hand, are likely to be less effective in key areas such as lesson organisation, student behaviour management, responsiveness to students and self-confidence relationships with parents. In individual human terms, the cost of teacher stress can be huge and include impaired health, reduced self-confidence and self-esteem and damaged personal relationships. If early retirement or resignation is taken, often the consequence is dramatically reduced economic status (Warren & Toll, 1993).

Researchers generally agree that a certain degree of stress is a normal part of life, but prolonged stressors could lead to symptoms that are physical, psychological or behavioural (O'Driscoll & Beehr, 2002).

Most researchers agree that strains can be classified into three major types: psychological, physical, and behavioral. A brief explanation of each of these classifications is provided here.

The first major type of strain resulting from stressors is that of psychological strain (also referred to as psychological health). Harrison (1978) posed that strain referred to the deviation from normal responses and that psychological strain included responses such as job dissatisfaction, depression, lowered self-esteem and unsolved problems. Similarly, in their review of occupational stress, Downs, Driskill and Wuthnow (1990) note that the experience of stress has been related to the psychological areas of depression, fatigue, low self-esteem, anger, apathy, irritability, guilt, moodiness, boredom, accidents, withdrawal and burnout. Harrison (1998) also suggested that psychological strain included dissatisfaction, anxiety, dysphoria, complaints of insomnia and restlessness. Each of these resulting psychological strains is further supported in the literature (Beehr, 1998).

The second major strain resulting from exposure to stressors is that of physical strain (also referred to as physical health). Physical or physiological strain is hypothesized to manifest in symptoms such as high blood pressure, changes in blood eosinophils, and elevated serum cholesterol (Harrison, 1978). Downs et al. (1990) outlined in their review that stress has been physically related to cardiovascular disease, hypertension, ulcers, asthma, and migraine headaches. Edwards et al. (1998) noted that physiological strains also included elevated blood pressure and compromised immune system functioning. In general, researchers tend to agree what the major physical strains caused by stress are (Quick, Horn & Quick, 1987).
Finally, the third classification of strain is that of **behavioural strain**. Quick et al. (1987) suggest that behavioural changes are among the earliest and most easily recognised signs of increases in stress. Research has associated increased cigarette smoking, increased alcohol and recreational drug abuse, violence, stuttering, overeating, and frequent utilisation of health care services as symptoms of behavioural strain (Edwards et al., 1998). An important point in this domain is emphasized by Beehr (1998). He notes that not all behavioural responses to stressors should be categorised as strain responses, and that only those responses that are directly harmful to the individual are strain responses. For instance, changes in job performance may be directly helpful (or harmful) to the organization, but by themselves, may not necessarily be harmful to the individual.

On the organizational level, consequences of occupational stress can be grouped into two major subgroups:

1) **Organizational symptoms** – such as discontent and poor morale among the workforce, performance/productivity losses, low quality products and services, poorer relationships with clients, suppliers, partners and regulatory authorities, losing customers, bad publicity, damage to the corporate image and reputation, missed opportunities, disruption to production, high accident and mistakes rates, high labor turnover, loss of valuable staff, increased sick-leave, permanent vacancies, premature retirement, diminished cooperation, poor internal communications, more internal conflicts, and dysfunctional workplace climate.

2) **Organizational costs** – such as costs of reduced performance/productivity (lack of added value to product and/or service), high replacement costs in connection with labor turnover (increase in recruitment, training and retraining costs), increased sick pay, increased health-care costs and disability payments, higher grievance and litigation/compensation costs, and costs of equipment damage.

**Moderators of occupational stress**

Stress researchers have identified a number of moderating factors that can reduce or eliminate the negative effects of occupational stress. The most consistently identified moderators of occupational stress include: an individual’s coping style.
Factors Influencing Occupational Stress

Occupational stress is influenced by various job related factors such as job contents/demands, work overload (Travers & Cooper, 1997; Male & May 1998), pressured deadlines, work schedule, low participation in decision making, lack of
control over workloads, physical environment, organizational culture, interpersonal relationships at work, social or physical isolation, poor relationships with superiors, interpersonal conflict, lack of social support (Dussault, Deaudelin, Royer & Loiselle, 1999; Van Dick, Wagner, Petzel, Lenke & Sommer, 1999), role in organization, career development.

Gender is one of the individual characteristic which influences occupational stress (Dua, 1994; Sharpley et al., 1996; Kirkcaldy & Furnham, 1999; Antoniou et al., 2006; Fotinatos-Ventouratos & Cooper, 2005; Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005).

The effects of gender on work-related stress have also been investigated in studies of Jick and Payne, 1980; Quick and Quick, 1984; Quick, Quick, Nelson and Hurrell, 1997 and findings on gender differences have been mixed. Jick and Mitz (1985) reviewed 19 studies of gender differences in occupational stress and found that women more frequently experienced psychological distress in the workplace, while men experienced more severe physical distress. Gender differences in occupational stress were also reported by Narayanan, Menon, and Spector (1999), who found that interpersonal conflict played a greater role in causing job stress for women than for men whereas others reported that men experienced greater stress (Greenglass, Burke & Ondrack, 1990; Niles & Anderson, 1993; Ogus, Greenglass & Burke, 1990; Swanson, Power & Simpson, 1996).

In contrast, in a meta-analytic review of 15 studies, Martocchio and O’Leary (1989) concluded that there were no important gender differences in either perceived or experienced stress in the workplace. In a more recent study, similar findings were reported by Guppy and Rick (1996).

The other individual characteristics /circumstances which influences occupational stress, are age (Sager, 1990; Dua, 1994; Ben-Bakr, Al-Shanmari & Jefri, 1995; Sharpley et al., 1996; Kirkcaldy & Furnham, 1999; Antoniou, Polyehroni & Valchakis, 2006; Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005), educational level (Dua, 1994; Ben-Bakr et al., 1995; Kirkcaldy & Furnham, 1999; Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005), nationality/ethnic background (Dua, 1994; Ben-Bakr et al., 1995; Lu et al., 2003), marital status (Kirkcaldy & Furnham, 1999), social class (Fotinatos-Ventouratos & Cooper, 2005), hierarchical level (Dua, 1994; Kirkcaldy & Furnham, 1999), tenure and experience (Ben-Bakr et al., 1995; Kirkcaldy & Furnham, 1999), performance (Varca, 1999), management style of superiors (Lind & Otte, 1994), organization size and type of
organization (Ben-Bakr et al., 1995), supervisor’s power (Erkutlu & Chafia, 2006), and personality traits (Lind & Otte, 1994; Montgomery et al., 1996; Freid & Ferris, 1999).

Some of the individual factors influencing occupational stress are coping styles (Griffith, Steptoe & Cropley, 1999; Admiral, Korthagen & Wubbels, 2000), personality, hardiness. One of the most important factor influencing occupational stress is emotional intelligence, which is one the predictor of occupational stress (Nikolaou, 2002) and have been found positively related to occupational stress by Ciarrochi, Deane and Anderson, (2002); Cockerton (2007) and Extremera and Berrocal (2007) and has been negatively associated to occupational stress by Gardner (2005).

Self efficacy is another significant variable of occupational stress and significant negative correlation between occupational stress and self efficacy has been reported by Omolara, 2008; Jespon and Forest, 2006 and Hogan, Lambert, Jenkins and Wambold, 2006.

Personality characteristics, such as sense of control and hardiness also influence occupational stress. Westman and colleagues found that sense of control moderated the stress–burnout relationship, and that hardiness buffered the effects of job stress (Westman, 1990; Etzion & Westman, 1994).

Locus of control is another variable which effects occupational stress. It refers to the extent to which individuals believe they can exert control over a specific aspect of their job, such as the pace of work or the procedures for task completion, scheduling of tasks and decision latitude (O’Driscoll & Cooper, 2002).

Locus of control and self-esteem has been linked to teacher stress (Byrne, 1992; Fielding & Gall, 1982). For example, Byrne (1992) found those teachers who have low self-esteem tend to be more susceptible to stress and that teachers with high self-esteem tends to handle stressors in a more productive manner. Similarly, teachers who have an external locus of control have been found to experience greater stress than teachers with an internal locus of control (Byrne, 1992; Kyriacou & Sutcliff, 1979).

Social Support also effects occupational stress. There is consistent evidence that employees with more support from others experience lower strain and burnout.
(Lee & Ashforth, 1996), and where an employee is faced with potentially stressful demands, conflicts and problems in the workplace, having support from others may reduce the impact of the pressures on the individual’s well-being (O’Driscoll & Cooper, 2002).

Although research (Ganster, Fusilier & Mayes, 1986) found no evidence of buffering or found reverse buffering effect of social support; where the presence of social support exacerbated the amount of stress experienced, Greenglass, Fiksenbaum & Burke (1996) indicated that support from colleagues and supervisors had a significant buffering influence on teacher burnout, and feelings of isolation exacerbated the stress experienced.

Isolation and stress were assessed in 1110 Canadian teachers, and it was found that a strong positive correlation exists (Dussault, Deaudelin, Royer & Loiselle, 1999). Van Dick et al. (1999) highlighted in the assessment of 424 teachers in Germany, that social support had both a positive effect on health and also a buffering effect in respect of work stress.

Differences in how people cope with occupational stress affect the outcomes of that stress. Coping represents the ways that individuals cognitively and behaviorally manage environmental demands in their lives (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Pithers (1995) states that the extent and strength of an individual’s coping resources can mitigate the strain produced by occupational stress.

Chan (1998) examined stress and coping among teachers in Hong Kong. He found that the type of coping strategies teachers used mediated the effects of stress on their emotional well-being. Similar results were obtained in Sweden, where using active coping strategies buffered the effects of teachers’ job stress (Brenner, Sorbom & Wallius, 1985), and making positive appraisals of one’s work, such as comparing one’s own job favorably to that of others, lessened distress (Needle, Griffen & Svendsen, 1981). Seeking out social and emotional support by turning to others has also been shown to benefit teachers under stress (Greenglass, Fiksenbaum & Burke 1995; Burke, Greenglass & Schwazer, 1996). In contrast, avoiding one’s problems may exacerbate distress (Chan, 1998).

Teaching experience also affects stress. Inexperienced teachers have to cope with a high level of stress that derives from the ambiguity and uncertainty involved in
entering a new job. Their ability to perform the job is put to the test and they are joining a new group of more experienced colleagues. Although this is true for anyone taking a job for the first time, teachers do not enjoy the moratorium that is usually allowed at this phase. In order to gain the esteem of pupils and their parents, teachers must demonstrate high levels of ability and skillfulness regardless of their teaching experience. Thus, while in many professions the stress involved in entering a new job is counteracted by an initially low level of demands and by environmental support, inexperienced teachers often face demands which are similar to those encountered by experienced teachers. As a result, inexperienced teachers have to cope with high levels of stress and anxiety, and with feelings of loneliness. Indeed, Nias (1985) found that the first years of teaching are described as extremely stressful by teachers. The difficulties of inexperienced teachers might account for the fact that the highest level of turnover in the teaching profession occurs during the first 5 years of teaching.

Studying the influence of organizational level on occupational stress, Kasl (1978) in a study of blue collar employees found that low status workers who routinely performed work requiring minimal skills experienced greater alienation and were absent from work more often than workers in less routine jobs. Workers at lower organizational levels also report experiencing less job satisfaction and more occupational stress (Guppy & Rick, 1996; Karasek, 1979; Long, 1998; Marmot, 1994; Pretty, McCarthy & Catano, 1992; Seegers & Van Elderen, 1996; Theorell & Karasek, 1996).

A brief overview of related research shows that a large number of factors are responsible for influencing occupational stress among academic faculty members. But it was not possible to study all in the current study. Hence, out of all these variables the investigator planned to investigate that in what ways emotional intelligence, self efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies influence the occupational stress of academic faculty members. A brief perusal of all these selected variables is being presented herewith:

**Emotional Intelligence**

One of the rapidly growing areas of interest with regard to emotional intelligence is its role in the workplace. Traditionally the workplace has been considered to be a cold and rational environment, a place where there is no room for
the experience or expression of emotions and in fact researchers fostered the belief that emotion is the antithesis of rationality (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Ashkanasy, Zerbe & Hartel, 2002). However, this view has begun to be challenged, with the recognition that individuals bring their affective states, traits and emotions to the workplace.

Emotions are an integral and inseparable part of everyday organizational life. The experience of work is saturated with emotions, from moments of fear, joy, frustration or grief to an enduring sense of commitment or dissatisfaction (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995).

Numerous studies have identified emotional intelligence as critical psychological factor in the behavior of individual workers in organizations. Although the construct of emotional intelligence is relatively new, it has enjoyed unprecedented attention from scholars and corporate gurus. Emotional intelligence started its journey to prominence in 1920 when Thorndike formulated the concept of social intelligence. Since then other forms of intelligence have been identified by scholars in the field of psychology. Three clusters of intelligences have been identified. These are: abstract intelligence which pertains to the ability to understand and manipulate verbal and mathematical symbols; concrete intelligence, which describes the ability to understand and manipulate objects; and social intelligence, which describes the ability to understand and relate with people.

Thorndike (1920) conceptualized social intelligence as the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls to act wisely in human relations.

Thorndike and Stein (1937) reviewed the attempts to measure the social intelligence. Thorndike has discussed, identifying three different areas. The first area encompassed primarily an individual’s attitude toward society and its various components: politics, economics, and values such as honesty. The second involved social knowledge: being well versed in sports, contemporary issues, and general information about society. This area seemed often conflated with the first. The third form of social intelligence was an individual’s degree of social adjustment.

But Thorndike and Stein concluded that attempts to measure the ability to deal with people had more or less failed. It may be that social intelligence is a complex of
several different abilities, or a complex of an enormous number of specific social
habits and attitudes.

Building on the work of Thorndike, Gardener (1983) developed the theory of
Multiple intelligence, wherein he classified intelligence into two categories viz.
interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence. He described interpersonal intelligence as
the ability to understand other people, what motivates them, how they work, and how
to work cooperatively with them. He identified teachers, politicians, salespersons, clinician
and religious leaders as individuals who are likely to have a high degree of
interpersonal intelligence. Intrapersonal intelligence is a correlative ability turned
inward. It is a capacity to form a veridical model of oneself and to be able to use that
model to operate effectively in life.

Baron (1988) attempted to assess Emotional Intelligence in terms of measure
of well-being. In his doctoral dissertation, he used the term Emotional Quotient which
gained widespread popularity as a name of Emotional Intelligence before Salovey and
Mayer had published their first model of Emotional Intelligence.

In what looks like a synchronization of Thorndike’s and Gardner’s model,
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, to discriminate among them and to use
information to guide one’s thinking and action. Emotionally intelligent individuals
are often described as well-adjusted, warm, genuine, persistent, and optimistic
(Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

To clarify the construct further, Mayer and Salovey (1997) postulated that
emotional intelligence involves the ability to perceive emotions accurately, appraise
and express emotion, the ability to access and/or generate emotional knowledge, and
the ability to regulate emotion to promote emotional and intellectual growth. This
definition succeeds not only in clearing the ambiguity inherent in the previous
definition; it also is able to carve a distinct image for the construct of emotional
intelligence.

Goleman’s explanation of the construct was based on Salovey and Mayer’s (1990)
original theory. Among other claims, Goleman theorized that emotional intelligence is
equal to, if not more important than, Intelligence Quotient as an important indicator of
success in one's professional and personal life. Elaborating further on the construct, Goleman (1998) explained that an individual's emotional intelligence can affect one's work situation. He also applied his conceptual understanding to organization as a whole.

Bar-On (2000) defines emotional intelligence as terms of an array of emotional and social knowledge and abilities that influence overall ability to effectively cope with environmental demands. This include (1) the ability to be aware of, to understand, and to express oneself; (2) the ability to be aware of, to understand, and to relate to others; (3) the ability to deal with strong emotions and control one's impulses; and (4) the ability to adapt to change and to solve problems of a personal or social nature.

Emotional intelligence refers to the ability to process emotional information as it pertains to the perception, assimilation, expression, regulation, and management of emotion (Mayer & Cobb, 2000; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000).

Domains of emotional intelligence

According to Salovey and Mayer (1990) emotional intelligence subsumes Gardener interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences, and involves abilities that may be categorized into five domains:

**Self awareness**- observing oneself and recognizing a feeling as it happens.

**Managing emotions**- handling feelings so that they are appropriate, realizing what is behind a feeling, finding ways to handle fears and anxieties, anger and sadness.

**Motivating oneself**- channeling emotions in the service of a goal; emotional self control; delaying gratification and stifling impulses.

**Empathy**- sensitivity to other's feelings and concerns and taking their perspective into account; appreciating the differences in how people feel about things.

**Handling relationship**- managing emotions in other's, social competence and social skills.

Bar-On (1997) identifies five domains of functioning relevant to success in his model of emotional intelligence. These include:
Intrapersonal skills- It consists of five related abilities: (a) Emotional self awareness, the ability to recognize and understand one’s feelings; (b) assertiveness, the ability to express feelings, beliefs and thoughts; (c) self regard, the ability to accurately appraise oneself; (d) self-actualization, the ability to realize one’s potential capacities; and (e) Independence, the ability to be self directed and self controlled and in one’s thinking and actions to be free of emotional dependence.

Interpersonal skills- It consists of three related abilities: (a) Empathy, the ability to be aware of, to understand, and to appreciate the feelings of other’s; (b) Social responsibility, the ability to demonstrate oneself as a cooperative, contributing and constructive member of ones social group; and (c) interpersonal relationship, the ability to establish and maintain satisfying relationship that are characterized by emotional closeness.

Adaptability- this dimension consists of three related abilities(a) reality testing- the ability to validate one’s emotions; (b) flexibility- the ability to adjust one’s emotions, thoughts, and behavior to changing situations and conditions; and (c) problem solving, the ability to identify and define problems as well as to generate and implement potentially effective solutions.

Stress management- It consists of two related abilities: (a) stress tolerance- the ability to withstand adverse events and stressful situations without falling apart by activity and positively coping with stress and (b) impulse control- the ability to resist or delay an impulse and to control one’s emotions.

General mood- It is an important motivational variable that facilitates the various other factorial components of emotional intelligence. It consist of two related constructs: (a) optimism- the ability to look on the brighter side of life and to maintain a positive attitude even in the face of adversity; and (b) happiness- the ability, to feel satisfied with one’s life, to enjoy oneself and others and to have fun.

Goleman (1998) suggested that emotional intelligence consists of five major parts:

Knowing our own emotions - It means ability to recognize our own feelings, emotions and thoughts. Some persons are highly aware of their emotions and their thoughts about them, but others seem to be almost totally oblivious to these. The individuals who are not aware of their own feelings, they cannot make intelligent
choices. These people are also low in expressiveness—as they don’t show their feelings clearly through facial expressions, body language, or other cues most of us use to recognize others’ feelings (Malandro, Barker & Barker, 1994). This can have an adverse effect on their interpersonal relationships, because other people find it hard to know how they are feeling or reacting.

**Managing our own emotions** - It means to regulate the nature, intensity, and expressions of emotions (Zillmann, 1996). This is very important both for one’s own mental health and to interact effectively with others.

**Motivating ourselves** - It means being able to motivate oneself to work long and hard on a task, remaining enthusiastic and optimistic about the final outcome, and being able to delay gratification— to put off receiving small rewards now in order to get larger ones later on (Shoda, Mischel & Peake, 1990). Being high in such skills can contribute to success in many different contexts.

**Recognizing and influencing others emotions** - sensing what people are feeling, being able to take their perspective, and cultivating rapport and attunement with a broad diversity of people.

**Handling relationships** - It means handling emotions in relationship well and accurately reading social situations and networks; interacting smoothly; using these skills to persuade and lead, negotiate and settle disputes, for cooperation and teamwork.

Recent studies have identified four factors within the Emotional Intelligence scale developed by Schutte, Malouff and Cooper, (1998) these factors have been named optimism/mood regulation, utilization of emotions, appraisal of emotions, and social skills. **Optimism/mood regulation** refers to the ability to maintain positive emotional outlook or to control emotions when under pressure; for example, *I use good moods to keep myself trying in the face of obstacles.* **Utilization of emotions** measures the ability to use the emotional impact of major events to guide personal development; for example, *some of the major events of my life have led me to re-evaluate what is important and not important.* **Appraisal of emotions** is a scale for gauging the ability to recognize and perceive emotions in self and others; for example, *By looking at their facial expressions, I recognize the emotions people are experiencing.* **Social skills** is a measure of the ability to empathize and relate with
other people; for example, *When another person tells me about an important event in his or her life, I almost feel as if I have experienced this event myself.*

Bar-On (2005) proposed a new model of emotional intelligence which provides a theoretical basis for the EQ-I. In this model 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. According to Bar-On (2005) this model of emotional and social intelligence has very much in common with the earlier models that have one or more of the following components: (a) the ability to recognize, understand, and express emotions and feelings; (b) the ability to understand how others feel and relate with them; (c) the ability to manage and control emotions; (d) the ability to manage change, adapt, and solve problems of a personal and interpersonal nature and the ability to generate positive effects and be self-motivated. Based on Baron’s model, to be emotionally and socially intelligent is to effectively understand and express oneself, to understand and relate well with others, and to successfully cope with daily demands, challenges and pressures.

Emotional intelligence in this study was conceptualized in terms of perception, appraisal and expression of emotions, emotional facilitation of thinking, understanding, analyzing and employing emotional knowledge and reflective regulation of emotions.

**Occupational Stress and Emotional Intelligence**

Despite the theoretical advances in understanding emotion in the workplace, empirical literature has yet to catch up. The emergence of emotional intelligence has provided researchers with a means to measure *effective* utilization of emotion in the workplace and to relate this to a number of workplace variables. One area that has remained under investigated is the role of emotional intelligence in the occupational stress process. Occupational stress is defined as an imbalance between an individuals perceived demands and their perceived ability to deal with these demands (Cox, 1978; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The role of emotion in the stress process is important and, as noted by Lazarus (1999), emotions and stress are interdependent – where there is stress there is also emotion. The construct of emotional intelligence provides an opportunity for researchers to investigate the relationship between occupational stress and the effective utilization of emotion in the workplace.
In a study investigating the role of emotions specific to the occupational stress process, Spector and Goh (2001) outlined their emotion-centered occupational stress model and suggested how a focus on emotions can enhance employee well-being. Organizational culture has been suggested to play a role in the experience and expression of emotions at work (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Zapf, Seifert, Schmutte, Mertini & Holz, 2001) and, with regards to occupational stress, the display and feeling rules of an organization may impact on the psychological and physical health of its employees (Spector & Goh). Spector and Goh’s emotion-centered model of occupational stress is consistent with Lazarus (1966) transactional model of stress. Their model proposes that first an employee is exposed to an event in their environment which they may or may not perceive as stressful. If the event is perceived as stressful then negative emotions will arise, leading to one or more of the three forms of strain (psychological, physical and behavioral).

Emotional intelligence has been found to impact on psychological health—particularly occupational stress (Ciarrochi, Chan & Bajgar, 2001). Ciarrochi, Chan and Caputi (2000) for example, posit that emotional intelligence may protect people from stress and lead to better adaptation. They opine that an objective measure of emotion management skill is associated with a tendency to maintain an experimentally induced positive mood which has obvious implication for preventing stress. Again, Bar-On (2003) found that there was a moderate yet significant relationship between emotional and social intelligence and psychological health. The aspects of emotional and social intelligent competencies that were found to impact on psychological health are: (a) the ability to manage emotion and cope with stress, (b) the drive to accomplish personal goals in order to actualize one’s inner potential and lead a more meaningful life and (c) the ability to verify feelings and thinking.

Nilcolaou and Tsaousis (2002) in a study explored the relationship between emotional intelligence and sources of occupational stress and outcomes in a sample of professionals in mental health institutions. The results showed a negative correlation between emotional intelligence and stress at work, indicating that high scorers in overall emotional intelligence suffered less stress related to occupational environment.

Ciarrochi et al. (2002) examined the role of emotional intelligence in understanding the relationship between stress and mental health (measured by prevalence of depression, hopelessness and suicide ideation). In a sample of
university students these authors examined objective (meaning there are right and wrong answers determined by consensus) emotional perception measured by the stories test, subjective (based upon individual beliefs and to which there are no right or wrong answers) emotional perception (measured using the Schutte et al., emotional intelligence measure; 1998), life stress, daily hassles, suicide ideation, depression and hopelessness. The results indicate that university students who report being able to manage their own emotions, also reported fewer daily hassles, less suicide ideation, depression and hopelessness compared with those students reporting lower levels of managing emotions. The students high in managing others emotions respond less to stress with feelings of suicide ideation than other individuals who are low in managing emotions of others.

It appears that these authors suggest that being lower on particular aspects of emotional intelligence results in ignorance and confusion in recognizing stress and its consequences, and that being high on a different aspect of emotional intelligence fosters strong bonds between people giving them the social support they need to deal with stress.

Pau and Croucher (2003) investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence and perceived stress in dental undergraduates. Factor analysis confirmed four factors previously identified in the literature as comprising emotional intelligence: optimism/ mood regulation, utilization of emotions, appraisal of emotions, and social skills. Results indicated that females had significantly higher emotional intelligence scores than males. Correlation analysis showed an inverse relationship between emotional intelligence and perceived stress. In conclusion, low emotional intelligence scorers report more perceived stress.

Slaski and Cartwright (2003) investigated emotional intelligence, stress and health in a group of managers. They reported that there was significant relationship between emotional intelligence, stress and health and that emotional intelligence may play a role in moderating the stress process and increasing an individual’s resilience to stress.

Pau, Croucher, Sohanpal, Muirhead and Seymour (2004) explored how dental undergraduates with different levels of emotional intelligence cope with stress. The qualitative unstructured depth interviews were carried in teaching hospital in UK. The subjects selected from the undergraduate population of a 5-year dental degree course.
A questionnaire survey was carried out to determine the emotional intelligence scores of the subjects. In each year of study, subjects were divided into low and high emotional intelligence groups at the median score. From each emotional intelligence group in each year, one male and one female subject were recruited. The data was collected by unstructured face-to-face interviews. 10 males and 10 females with low and high emotional intelligence, representing all 5 years of study were interviewed. The experience of stress was expressed in emotional terms, ranged from anger and frustration to hatred. Four sets of coping strategies, adopted at varying degrees according to emotional intelligence, were identified. High emotional intelligence students were more likely to adopt reflection and appraisal, social and interpersonal, and organization and time-management skills. Low emotional intelligence students were more likely to engage in health damaging behaviors.

A study by Ogniska, 2005 on emotional intelligence in the workplace to explore its effects on occupational stress and health outcomes in human service workers was done on 330 participants (42.4% of men and 57.6% of women), representing various human service professions (physicians, nurses, teachers, probation officers and managers) were taken for the study. The results confirmed an essential, but not very strong, role of emotional intelligence in perceiving occupational stress and preventing employees of human services from negative health outcomes. Also, Gardner (2005) performed a research on 79 teachers to study the relation of emotional intelligence. The study reported that employees who reported using emotional intelligence were less likely to report feelings of stress, ill-health and lowered satisfaction and commitment.

Gerits, Derksen, Verbruggen and Katzko (2005) did a two-year longitudinal study on the emotional intelligence profiles of nurses caring for clients with highly frequent and extremely severe behaviour problems. The results showed that fewest symptoms of burnout were reported by female nurses with relatively high EI profiles and relatively low social skills. Males with higher problem-solving and stress-tolerance skills also showed less burnout.

The authors also suggested the need of coaching for professionals and certainly nurses working under stressful conditions may be different for males versus females. For purposes of burnout prevention, female nurses may need more extensive
training on how to become not too involved while male nurses may need more extensive training on problem solving and stress tolerance.

Gohm and Croser (2005) examined the association between emotional intelligence (emotion-relevant abilities) and stress (feelings of inability to control life events), considering personality (self perception of the meta-emotion traits of clarity, intensity, and attention) as a moderating variable among 158 freshmen. Results suggest that emotional intelligence is potentially helpful in reducing stress for some individuals, but unnecessary or irrelevant for others. It was found that the highly stressed intense but confused participants in particular because they have average emotional intelligence, but do not appear to use it, presumably because they lack confidence in their emotional ability.

Ginzberg (2006) conducted a study with the objective to find the effect of stress on emotional intelligence of students. Results show negative effect of stress on emotional intelligence of students.

King (2006) conducted a study to test the relationship of emotional intelligence and occupational stress among professional staff in New Zealand. An online survey done on 157 professional staff including salaried staff, line managers, senior managers, managing directors and chief executive officers. The results reveal that an individual’s ability to manage emotional reactions to stressful situations reduces the stress at workplace.

Cockerton (2007) conducted a study on emotional intelligence and its relationship with stress, coping and psychological well-being in the workplace centered on police-work and performance. Results show positive correlation between emotional intelligence and perceived stress.

Pau (2008) conducted a cross sectional survey on 98 first-year students to study the role that emotional intelligence plays in the experience of stress. Results indicated low emotional intelligence is associated with high stress. The t-test indicated that emotional intelligence is the most important predictor of perceived stress.

Rani (2008) studied emotional intelligence of teacher trainees in relation to perceived stress, personality and life satisfaction and found significant relation between emotional intelligence and perceived stress for graduate and postgraduate
Singh and Singh (2008) designed a study to investigate the relationship as well as the impact of emotional intelligence on to the perception of stress on a sample size of 312 (174 males and 138 females). The findings of the study indicate no significant difference in the level of emotional intelligence and perceived stress between genders, but significantly negative relationships of emotional intelligence with stress for both the genders. Developing emotional intelligence helps in reducing stress in an individual.

Birks, Mc Kendree and Watt (2009) studied emotional intelligence and perceived stress in healthcare students and found that emotional intelligence appeared to be a moderator of stress at some level. However its effect seems to be slightly less pronounced at time where generally higher levels of stress were reported.

Thus to recapitulate, the studies conducted on occupational stress and emotional intelligence bring to light that individuals exhibiting high scores of emotional intelligence are likely to have less occupational stress. These studies indicate that ability to deal effectively with the emotions assist in coping with stress at workplace.

Lack of sufficient studies in academic context and the mixed results in literature, prompted the investigator to study and understand the influence of emotional intelligence on the occupational stress of university academic faculty.

**Self -Efficacy**

One’s beliefs about oneself can act as moderating variables in the stress-strain relationship. These beliefs have been considered in other areas within organizational psychology, showing for example the moderating effects of self-esteem on the results of teamwork (Brief & Aldag, 1998). Other results have supported the idea that stressors have a less negative effect when individuals have more positive self-perceptions (Mossholder, Bedein & Armenakis, 1982).

Bandura (1997); Jex and Bliese (1999); Schwarzer, Schmitz and Daytner (1999) consider, moreover, that self-efficacy is relevant in the study of stress and work, fulfilling a moderating role. The basis for this is found on considering control
as a key factor in the stress process, so that the mere exposure to stressors, with control by the subject has no adverse effects. On the other hand, exposure to stressors occurs without control on the part of the subject may lead to undesired or harmful effects. In this way, Bandura’s Cognitive Social Theory considers the experience of stress in terms of low efficacy for exercising control over stressful situations or conditions.

A key element in Bandura’s (1977) social learning theory, self-efficacy refers to an individual’s belief in his or her capability to organize and execute a course of action needed to meet the demands of a situation.

Self-efficacy refers to ones level of confidence in mobilizing the energy and choosing the appropriate response strategy in a given task situation (Wood & Bandura, 1989).

In the work context, self-efficacy refers to judgments employees make concerning their ability to do what is required to successfully perform their jobs (Riggs & Knight, 1994). Unlike dispositional characteristics, self-efficacy beliefs are situationally specific (Wang & Richarde, 1988) and should, therefore, respond to organizational initiatives designed to enhance employees’ perceptions of self-efficacy. In this respect, Bandura (1977) identified several sources of information that may engender high levels of self-efficacy. These include internal cues drawn from an individual’s own state of physiological arousal, verbal persuasion aimed at convincing an individual of his or her capabilities, vicarious experience by way of behavior modeling, and, also, enactive mastery through repeated performance. There is considerable research evidence documenting the direct relationship between high levels of job-related self-efficacy and increased levels of learning, persistence and subsequent performance in complex task environments (Gist & Mitchell, 1992).

Bandura (1994) defined perceived self-efficacy as people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives. Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves and behave. Such beliefs produce these diverse effects through four major processes. They include cognitive, motivational, affective and selection processes.
A strong sense of efficacy enhances human accomplishment and personal well-being in many ways. People with high assurance in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided. Such an efficacious outlook fosters intrinsic interest and deep engrossment in activities. They set themselves challenging goals and maintain strong commitment to them. They heighten and sustain their efforts in the face of failure. They quickly recover their sense of efficacy after failures or setbacks. They attribute failure to insufficient effort or deficient knowledge and skills which are acquirable. They approach threatening situations with assurance that they can exercise control over them. Such an efficacious outlook produces personal accomplishments, reduces stress and lowers vulnerability to depression.

In contrast, people who doubt their capabilities shy away from difficult tasks which they view as personal threats, have low aspirations and weak commitment to the goals they choose to pursue. When faced with difficult tasks, they dwell on their personal deficiencies, on the obstacles they will encounter, and all kinds of adverse outcomes rather than concentrate on how to perform successfully. They slacken their efforts and give up quickly in the face of difficulties. They are slow to recover their sense of efficacy following failure or setbacks. Because they view insufficient performance as deficient aptitude it does not require much failure for them to lose faith in their capabilities. They fall easy victim to stress and depression.

According to Schwarzer et al. (1999) self-efficacy can make a difference to people’s ways of thinking feeling and acting. With respect to feelings, a low sense of self-efficacy is associated with depression, anxiety and helplessness. People with low self-efficacy also harbour pessimistic thoughts about their performance and personal development. In contrast, a strong sense of belief in oneself facilitates cognitive and executive processes in multiple contexts, influencing, for example, decision making and academic achievement. (Bandura, 1995; Schwarzer et al. 1999).

Self-efficacious people, however, perform well on specific tasks, cope better with anxiety, depression and helplessness, set higher goals, and follow through with them, recover more quickly from failure, and think more strategically than those who are not self-efficacious (Bandura, 1995, 1997). In other words, self-efficacy affects the choices people make, the amount of effort they expend on an activity, how long they persevere at doing a task, and their emotional reactions. Nonetheless, self-
efficacy is concerned not with the number of skills that you have, but with what you believe you can do with what you have under a variety of circumstances (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy beliefs, which, according to Bandura (1997) are context-specific judgments that are derived from master experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and psychological states, are specific to tasks, and they are made and used relative to one's goals.

Individuals form their self-efficacy beliefs by interpreting information primarily from four sources. The most influential source is the interpreted result of one's previous performance, or mastery experience. The perception that performance has been successful raises efficacy beliefs while the perception that performance has not been successful, lowers efficacy beliefs, contributing to the expectation that future performances will also be inept.

Vicarious experiences are those in which the skill in question is modeled by someone else. When a model with whom the observer identifies performs well, the efficacy of the observer is enhanced and when the model performs poorly, the efficacy expectations of the observer also decreases.

Individuals also create and develop self-efficacy beliefs as a result of the social persuasions they receive from others. These persuasions can involve exposure to the verbal judgments that others provide. Persuaders play an important part in the development of an individual's self-beliefs. But social persuasions should not be confused with knee-jerk praise or empty inspirational homilies. Effective persuaders must cultivate people's beliefs in their capabilities while at the same time ensuring that the envisioned success is attainable. And, just as positive persuasions may work to encourage and empower, negative persuasions can work to defeat and weaken self-efficacy beliefs. In fact, it is usually easier to weaken self-efficacy beliefs through negative appraisals than to strengthen such beliefs through positive encouragement. For teachers, forms of social persuasion can include the response of their students (Mullholand & Wallace, 2001) and the sense of collective efficacy within the entire faculty (Goddard & Goddard, 2001).

Somatic and emotional states such as anxiety, stress, arousal, and mood states also provide information about efficacy beliefs. People can gauge their degree of confidence by the emotional state they experience as they contemplate an action. Strong emotional reactions to a task provide cues about the anticipated success or
failure of the outcome. When they experience negative thoughts and fears about their capabilities, those affective reactions can themselves lower self-efficacy perceptions and trigger additional stress and agitation that help ensure the inadequate performance they fear. Of course, judgments of self-efficacy from somatic and emotional states are not necessarily linked to task cues. Individuals in a depressed mood lower their efficacy independent of task cues. One way to raise self-efficacy beliefs is to improve physical and emotional well-being and reduce negative emotional states. Because individuals have the capability to alter their own thinking and feeling, enhanced self-efficacy beliefs can, in turn, powerfully influence the physiological states themselves. As Bandura (1997) has observed, people live in psychic environments that are primarily of their own making.

The sources of self-efficacy information are not directly translated into judgments of competence. Individuals interpret the results of events, and these interpretations provide the information on which judgments are based. The types of information people attend to and use to make efficacy judgments, and the rules they employ for weighting and integrating them, form the basis for such interpretations. Thus, the selection, integration, interpretation, and recollection of information influence judgments of self-efficacy.

**Levels of generality in self-efficacy**

Researchers have conceptualized generalized self-efficacy as the confidence in one’s own coping skills that is manifested in a wide range of challenging situations, and which has a broad and stable nature (Schwarzer et al. 1999). Nevertheless, the degree of generality may vary depending on the different results it is intended to predict or moderate, such as the degree of similarity of the activities, the modalities or forms in which the skills manifest themselves (behavioural, cognitive and affective), and qualitative aspects of the situation. According to some authors, self-efficacy as general capacity seems to be a better predictor of performance than specific self-efficacy. Other studies show that the two types of self-efficacy (generalised and specific) are positively related, and may act in a complementary way (Jex & Bliese, 1999; Watt & Martin, 1995). Nevertheless, other authors point out the need to develop measures of specific skills in specific populations (Maibach & Murphy, 1995; Bandura, 1997).
Self-efficacy as a specific construct has been understood as the belief about level of competence in particular situations. For example, in the field of work, Chemiss (1993) introduced the concept of professional self-efficacy, understood as belief in the ability to correctly fulfill one’s professional role, and operationalised it using the *Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey* (Schaufeli, Leiter, Maslach and Jackson, 1996). The results are borne out in the meta-analysis carried out by Lee and Ashforth (1996). Furthermore, the professional self-efficacy dimension reflects a personality characteristic closer to the concept of self-efficacy than to a genuine component of the burnout reaction (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; De Rijk, Blanc & Schaufeli 1998).

In the present study the self efficacy has been measured using the construct of teacher efficacy as it deals with academic faculty of universities.

**Teacher Self Efficacy**

Teacher efficacy may be defined as self-efficacy applied to teaching since the present study is on academic faculty. Over the last 20 years, the construct of teacher efficacy has evolved from Rotter’s (1996) Locus of Control Theory and Bandura’s Social Cognition theory (1977, 1986 & 1997).

McLauhlin and Marsh (1978) defined teacher efficacy as *the extent to which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to affect student performance*. Ashton (1985) defined it as *teacher’s belief in their ability to have positive effect on student learning*.

Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) noted that the earliest reference to *teacher efficacy* in the Educational Resources Information Center system is a study by Barfield and Burlingame (1974), in which efficacy was defined as *a personality trait that enables one to deal effectively with the world*.

Teaching efficacy is the teacher’s belief in his or her ability to affect student performance (Greenwood, Olejick & Parkey, 1990).

Teachers with teaching efficacy find teaching meaningful and rewarding, expect students to be successful, assess themselves when students fail, set goals and establish strategies for achieving those goals, have positive attitudes about themselves and students, have a feeling of being in control, and share their goals with students (Ashton, 1984).
Teachers do not feel equally efficacious for all teaching situations. Teacher efficacy is context specific. Teachers feel efficacious for teaching particular subjects to certain students in specific settings, and they can be expected to feel more or less efficacious under different circumstances. Even from one class period to another, teacher’s level of efficacy may change (Ross, Cousins & Gadalla, 1996). Therefore, in making an efficacy judgment, consideration of the teaching task and its context is required. In addition, it is necessary to assess one’s strengths and weaknesses in relation to the requirements of task at hand.

Self-efficacy affects the efforts teachers invest in teaching, the goals they set, and their level of aspiration. Teacher’s with strong sense of efficacy are open to new ideas and are more willing to experiment with new methods to meet the needs of their students in a better way (Berman, Mc Laughlin, Bass, Pauly & Zellman, 1977), and tend to exhibit greater levels of planning and organization (Milner, 2001). Efficacy beliefs influence teacher’s persistence when things do not go smoothly and their resilience in the face of setbacks.

Greater self-efficacy enables teachers to be less critical of students when they make errors (Ashton & Webb, 1986) and work longer with a student who is struggling (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) and be less inclined to refer a difficult student to special education (Soodak & Podell, 1993).

Ashton, Webb and Dada (1983) completed a study and supported Armor, Oseguera, Cox, King, McDonell, Pascal… Zellman (1976) conclusions regarding the relationship of teacher efficacy to student achievement. In addition, from intensive interviews with the teachers, it was learnt that current conditions in the schools, the isolation, the difficulty in assessing one’s effectiveness as a teacher, the lack of collegial and administrative support, and the sense of powerlessness that comes from limited collegial decision-making make it difficult for teachers to maintain a strong sense of efficacy. The importance of teacher efficacy to the survival of the teaching profession has been suggested by Glickman and Tamashiro (1982). They reported that teachers who left the profession were significantly lower in sense of efficacy than first or fifth year teachers.

Teachers with higher sense of efficacy exhibit greater enthusiasm for teaching, have greater commitment to teaching (Trentham, Silvern & Brogdon, 1985) and are more likely to stay in teaching (Milner, 2002).
Self-efficacy has also been researched as a cognitive vulnerability factor. Friedman (2000) examined the self-report of the newly qualified teachers and described his findings as the *shattered dreams of idealistic performance*. Respondents revealed sharp declines in self-efficacy as they found that they could not live up to their ideal performances.

**Occupational Stress and Self-efficacy**

One’s beliefs about oneself can act as moderating variables in the stress-strain relationship. Jimmieson (2000) studied employee reactions to behavioral control under conditions of stress: the moderating role of self-efficacy. In a sample of 100 customer service representatives, a significant three-way interaction among role conflict, work control and self-efficacy (measured at Time 1) was observed on (low) depersonalization (measured at Time 2). The work control reduced the negative effects of work stress on this outcome measure only for employees who perceived high levels of self-efficacy at work. In addition, there was evidence to suggest that self-efficacy moderated the main effects of work control on job satisfaction and somatic health.

Schaubroeck, Lam and Xie (2000) found three-way interactions involving self-efficacy. In their cross-cultural study of Chinese and American bank tellers they found that job demands, job control, and self-efficacy interacted in the prediction of several strain measures. They concluded that increasing job control for low efficacy individuals could be harmful. Furthermore, they suggest that organizations should focus on increasing self-efficacy. One method to do this is supportive supervisory practices (Gist & Mitchell, 1992; Wood & Bandura, 1989).

In another study, Brouwers and Tomic (2000) used structural equation modeling to analyze the relationships between self-efficacy and burnout in 243 secondary school teachers. Self-efficacy emerged to have a synchronous effect on personal accomplishment and a longitudinal effect on depersonalization. However, low self-efficacy had a synchronous effect on emotional exhaustion. The direction of the causal relationship between self-efficacy and stress symptomatology is particularly significant as it suggests that cognitive interventions designed to improve self-efficacy may mediate the effects of stress.
Grau, Salanova and Peiro (2001) analyzed two self-efficacy measures: generalized and professional, as a moderator in the occupational stress process. Based on data collected from 140 workers that use new technologies in their jobs, it was found that self-efficacy moderates the stress-strain relationship in general, in the sense that low levels of self-efficacy are related to high levels of occupational stress. The results of hierarchical multiple regression analyses showed that general and professional self-efficacy is complementary as moderators in stress processes, depending on the specific strain studied. However, it was found that professional self-efficacy has more interaction effects. Specifically, they found that individuals with low levels of generalized self-efficacy show more emotional exhaustion when their job autonomy is higher, while those with low levels of professional self-efficacy show greater cynicism when routine and role conflict are high, and have low levels of organizational commitment when the level of role conflict is high. The increase in stressors is not associated with strain for workers with high levels of self-efficacy.

Jex, Bliese and Buzzell (2001) conducted a study to examine whether coping style influenced the impact of self-efficacy on stressor-strain relations. It was hypothesized that high self-efficacy would weaken stressor-strain relations when accompanied by frequent use of active coping and infrequent use of avoidance coping. Data collected from 2,293 members of the U.S. army revealed 3-way interactions among self-efficacy, role clarity, and active coping and among self-efficacy, work overload, and avoidance coping. As predicted, self-efficacy mitigated the effects of low role clarity on strain only when active coping was high. Also as expected, strain levels were lower for participants with high self-efficacy than for participants with lower self-efficacy when work overload was low but avoidance coping was high.

A non-recursive model with relationships between perceived lack of social support, perceived self-efficacy in eliciting support at the workplace, and the three successive burnout dimensions—emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment—was tested in a sample of 277 secondary-school teachers in the Netherlands. Results showed that teachers' who perceived lack of support from colleagues and principals had a significant effect on their self-efficacy beliefs in eliciting support from them, while these self-efficacy beliefs were shown to predict their level of burnout. The hypothesized feedback loop was also confirmed: Teachers'
level of burnout predicted the extent to which they feel lack of support. An additional effect of the personal-accomplishment dimension of burnout on perceived self-efficacy was suggested. It was concluded that perceived self-efficacy in eliciting support at the workplace is a usable construct in the prediction of teacher burnout (Brouwers, Evers & Tomic, 2001).

Teacher stress, self-efficacy, social support, and psychological distress were assessed by Chan (2002) in a sample of 83 Chinese prospective teachers in Hong Kong. These teachers reported significantly higher levels of symptoms in somatic problems, followed by anxiety and dysphoria. In exploring the role of personal and social resources in the stress-symptom process, neither self-efficacy nor social support mediated the impact of teacher stress on psychological distress. In contrast, social support moderated the influence of stress on distress in addition to the main effects of stress. While there were subtle differences when specific symptoms were considered, the high-stress/low-support group was most vulnerable. Self-efficacy and social support as protective factors for teacher stress management were also discussed.

Adeyemo and Ogunyemi (2005) studied the interactive effects of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy on occupational stress among academic staff of Nigerian University. The results indicated that the two independent variables, when taken together, were effective in predicting occupational stress. Each of the variables contributed significantly to the prediction of occupational stress with self-efficacy making higher contribution to the prediction of occupational stress. On the basis of this finding, it is suggested that emotional intelligence programming and self-efficacy intervention techniques will benefit teachers immensely in coping with stress.

Stetz, Stetz and Bliese (2006) studied the importance of self-efficacy in the moderating effects of social support on stressor and strain relationship on 96 US military police soldiers. The results showed that organizational constraints, supervisor support and self-efficacy had statistically significant interactions in the prediction of job satisfaction and psychological well-being. Organizational constraints, co-worker support and self-efficacy had a significant interaction in the prediction of psychological well-being. Social support buffered the stressor and strain relationship when self-efficacy was high and reverse buffered the relationship when self-efficacy was low. These results indicate that interventions aimed at reducing strains by increasing social support should consider an individual's self-efficacy.
Betroret and Domenech (2006) studied the relationships among teacher occupational stressors, self-efficacy, coping resources, and burnout in a sample of 247 Spanish secondary school teachers. Concretely, two specific aims were formulated in order to examine the effect of teaching stressors on teacher burnout and the role of self-efficacy and school coping resources as mediator or moderator variables in the stressor-burnout relationship. Teachers reported that when their pedagogical practice in the school setting was being interfered with or hindered by a set of factors from the multiple contexts involved in students' learning, problems of burnout occurred. In addition, results revealed that teachers with a high level of self-efficacy and more coping resources reported suffering less stress and burnout than teachers with a low level of self-efficacy and fewer coping resources, and vice versa.

Ling, Qin and Paul (2007) in a study investigated the direct and moderating effect of general self-efficacy on the relationship between stressors and well-being in Chinese societies. Survey data were collected from 386 and 306 employees in Hong Kong and Beijing, respectively. The results consistently showed that general self-efficacy was positively related to mental well-being and physical well-being. A series of hierarchical regressions revealed that general self-efficacy moderated the relationship between stressors and mental well-being, yet did not moderate the relationship between stressors and physical well-being. Results verified that general self-efficacy plays an important role in employees' well-being in the collectivist society of China.

These studies suggest that self-efficacy acts as a moderator of occupational stress. The relationship between occupational stress and self-efficacy has been studied at school level. Very few studies on occupational stress and self-efficacy have been studied on university faculty. Hence this study was undertaken as an attempt to study the influence of self-efficacy on occupational stress among academic faculty.

**Organizational Commitment**

Fostering organizational commitment among the academic staff is important because, employees that are highly committed stay longer, perform better, miss less work, and engage in organizational citizenship behaviors. These findings can be generalized to the teachers as well. Teachers who are not committed to their work place are likely to put less effort in the classroom as compared to teachers with high...
levels of commitment. This would adversely affect student learning and achievement in particular and standard of education in the country in general. Moreover, high turnover among teachers, especially when good teachers quit, can have high costs and implications for the education system. This is because good quality teachers take with them their research, teaching skills, and experience. Other costs include the time involved in recruitment, selection, and training of new faculty; advertising expenses; and increased workloads for existing faculty. It is not necessary to be a management expert or an economist to understand that if the education managers are spending thousand of dollars and hours of their time to replace teachers, preventing brain drain in the first place might have saved some of the resources.

Organizational commitment of worker is not a new concept, this topic was examined as early as 1938 by Barnard. Kanter (1968) viewed organizational commitment as the willingness of workers to devote energy and loyalty to an organization.

Sheldon (1971) defined organizational commitment as an attitude or an orientation toward the organization which links or attaches the identity of the person to the organization.

According to Porter, Steers, Mowday and Paul (1974) organizational commitment relates to the strength of one’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization. It manifests in (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; (2) a willingness to exert a considerable amount of effort on behalf of the organization; and (3) a desire to remain within the organization.

Kanter (1974) views commitment as a high level of attachment to someone or something in a social endeavor. It is simultaneously psychological and social and describes an intrinsic attachment to that endeavor. Thus, it goes beyond mere calculation of expected benefits from participation in a venture. Rather, commitment takes on a moral character, investment with devotion and dedication (Etzioni, 1975). Commitment can manifest itself in extra investment of personal resources such as time, money, or effort (Becker, 1969). Also, commitment entails a referent, that is, commitment to something outside the individual.

Kanter (1974) and Etzioni (1975), summarizes the dimensions of commitment strong identification with the goals of the organization (i.e., a strong intrinsic
attachment), extra involvement in the organization (i.e., expenditure of non required resources); and strong loyalty to the organization (i.e., willingness to forego other opportunities and remain).

According to Weiner and Gechman (1977) commitment behaviors are socially acceptable behaviors that exceed formal and or normative expectations relevant to the object of commitment; whereas, Marsh and Mannari (1977) stated that committed employee considers it morally right to stay in the company, regardless of how much status enhancement or satisfaction the firm gives him or her over the years.

Organizational commitment is the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982).

Commitment in the organization can take various forms (affective, normative and continuance) and have the potential to influence the organizational effectiveness and well-being of the employee (Meyer, 1991). Work experience develops from a synthesis of employee’s perceptions about the work they do the organization they belong to and the interpersonal relations that bring these entities together. Perceptions held by employees play an important role in their decisions to enter, stay with or leave the organization (Meyer, 1991; Varca, 1999). Therefore, an increase in job strain may lead to increase occupational stress, decreased organizational commitment (manifestation of the individuals ones own self and reflects values standards that are basic to human existence) and eventually result in poor service delivery (Elizur, 2001).

Components of Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment has been defined and measured in several different ways (Mathie & Zajac, 1990). The various definition and measures share a common theme that organizational commitment is considered to be bond or linking of the individual to the organization. The definition differs in terms of how this bond is considered to have developed. The most commonly studied, type of organizational commitment has been attitudinal, most often measured with scale developed by Porter and his colleagues (Porter et al., 1974).
Attitudinal organizational commitment is defined as the relative strength of an individual identification with and involvement in a particular organization. Conceptually, it can be characterized by at least 3 factors: (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of organization’s goals and values (b) a willingness to exert a considerable effort on behalf of the organization and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Mowday et al., 1982).

The second most popular form of organizational commitment studied has been calculative commitment. Built upon the work of Becker (1960), calculative organizational commitment is defined as structural phenomena, which occurs as a result of individual’s organizational transactions and alterations in side-bets or investments over time (Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972). In this sense, individual become bound to an organization because they have side bets or sunk costs (e.g. a pension plan) invested in the organization and cannot afford to separate themselves from it. McGhee and Ford (1987) also endorsed this view of organizational commitment.

Meyer and Allen (1984) and Allen and Meyer (1987) used the term affective commitment and continuance commitment respectively to characterize Porter et al. (1974) and Becker (1960) discrepant view of the construct. It was noted that both affective commitment and continuance commitment effects links between the employees and organization and decreases the likelihood of turnover; the nature of links are quite different. Employees with a strong affective commitment remain with the organization because they want to whereas those with strong continuance commitment remain because they need to. Consequently, one might expect on the job behavior of those who are affectively committed to differ from that of an employee whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance commitment. Those who value and want to maintain membership should be willing to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization (Modway et al., 1982). In contrast, those who feel compelled to remain to avoid financial and other costs may do little more than the minimum required to retain employment.

Allen (1985) stated that organizational commitment has a third component also besides affective and continuance and that is normative component. The normative component refers to the employees feeling of moral obligation to the organization.
In the present study, organizational commitment refers to three forms of commitment: affective, normative and continuance as measured by Organizational Commitment scale developed by Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993) which was used as a theoretical base.

**Occupational Stress and Organizational Commitment**

Identity theory suggests that we experience distress when our role-relevant goals are blocked and that this distress is stronger when we are highly committed to the role. Past research, however, clearly demonstrates that commitment is inversely related to the experience of stress. Reilly (1994) in their study examined whether commitment also moderates the relationship between work stressors and burnout. Over 500 hospital nurses provided information about the frequency of nursing stressors, their career commitment, and burnout. Although nurses who reported greater commitment tended to experience less burnout overall, moderated regression analyses showed that the link between work stressors and burnout was significantly stronger for the more committed nurses.

Leong, Furnham and Cooper (1996) in their study attempted to examine the effect of organizational commitment as a moderator of the stress-outcome relationship among professional and administrative officers from various departments of a public sector organization in England. Results showed that commitment was significant only in the relationship between stress due to factors intrinsic to job, and mental ill-health. Therefore, there was little evidence for the moderating effect of commitment in any of the outcome variables. Commitment was found to affect the outcome variables directly while occupational stress was only found to predict mental and physical health.

Lee and Henderson (1996) explored levels of occupational stress (burnout) and organizational commitment (intent to stay), their inter-relationships, and their relationships to personal and organizational factors in nurse administrators. The result indicates that half the respondents experience low levels of burnout whereas a third has high levels of burnout. Commitment scores were high for most nurse executives and were correlated inversely with burnout scale scores (depersonalization, personal accomplishment, emotional exhaustion), with the amount or phase of burnout, and with non-nursing management experience.
Siu and Cooper (1998) investigated the direct and moderating effects of locus of control and organizational commitment on the relationship of sources of stress with psychological distress, job satisfaction and quitting intention of 122 employees working in Hong Kong firms. The results of the study suggested that locus of control and organizational commitment had strong direct effects (externals were dissatisfied with the job itself and thought of quitting the job quite often; employees who had a high commitment had higher job satisfaction) and moderating effects (the stressor-strain relationships were significant in externals, and commitment buffered most of the stressor-strain relationships).

Mishra and Srivastava (2001) did a study on the moderating effect of the job stress on the organizational commitment and job-satisfaction relationship. The moderated multiple regression analysis and sub-group analysis show that job stress has moderating effect on organizational commitment and job-satisfaction relationship.

Taris, Schreurs and Ingrid (2001) examined the antecedents of job strain (emotional exhaustion, health complaints) and withdrawal behaviour (e.g. lowered organizational commitment) among a cross-sectional sample of 131 academic staff members of the law department of a large Dutch university. Conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1986) provided the theoretical background for this study. Strains and withdrawal behaviours were expected to be most prominent among those who reported having few resources and/or who reported high job demands. Structural equation modelling revealed that this was indeed the case. As predicted, differential patterns of effects emerged for job demands and job resources. Analysis of the effects of four job-specific stressors revealed that especially the structural aspects of a staff member’s teaching task (e.g. the number of students in their classes) contributed strongly to perceived job demands.

Nikolaou and Tsaousis (2002) studied the relationship between emotional intelligence, as measured and sources of occupational stress and outcomes in a sample of professionals in mental health institutions. The results showed a negative correlation between emotional intelligence and stress at work, indicating that high scorers in overall emotional intelligence suffered less stress related to occupational environment. A positive correlation was found between emotional intelligence and organizational commitment, suggesting a new role for emotional intelligence as a determinant of employee loyalty to organizations. The authors propose that emotional
intelligence and organizational commitment may work together to reduce occupational stress.

Lambert (2004) found that job stress had a negative effect on organizational commitment for both correctional officers and non-correctional officers, suggesting that job stress has a negative effect on commitment regardless of the position of a correctional employee.

Ashari (2005) investigated the relationship between organizational commitment and occupational stress among the academic staff of University Teknologi Malaysia, Skudai, Johor. The results show that majority of the academic staff experience low level of stress and are moderately committed to the organization. Furthermore, this study also confirms that there exist negative significant relationship between stress and commitment. The results also show that the stress factors which influence commitment most are role ambiguity and role conflict. However, the influence of these stress factors on the academic staff’s commitment was only 27.7%.

Vakola and Nikolaou (2005) explored the linkage between employees’ attitudes towards organizational change and occupational stress and organizational commitment. The results were in the expected direction showing negative correlations between occupational stressors and attitudes to change indicating that highly stressed individuals demonstrate decreased commitment and increased reluctance to accept organizational change interventions. The results did not support the role of organizational commitment as a moderator in the relationship between occupational stress and attitudes to change.

Hogan et al. (2006) examined the effect of occupational stressors of role ambiguity, role conflict, perceived dangerousness of the job, and two forms of work-family conflict (i.e. work on family conflict and family on work conflict) on organizational commitment. Based on ordinary least squares regression results, role ambiguity, role conflict, and work on family conflict had statistically significant effects. Perceptions held by employees play an important role in their decisions to enter, or to stay with or leave the organization. Therefore an increase in job strain may lead to increase in occupational stress, decreased organizational commitment, and eventually result in poor services. It becomes important to investigate the effect of organizational commitment on occupational stress of academic faculty of universities.
Jepson and Forrest (2006) in their study on individual contributory factors in teacher stress: the role of achievement striving and occupational commitment on teachers (N=95), found negative relationship between perceived stress and occupational commitment.

Omolaro (2008) investigated the influence of work related stress on organizational commitment. The finding of the study revealed that employees with low stress were more committed to organizational commitment than those with high stress. Also, work-related stress was found to have significantly influenced organizational commitment it was recommended that organizational support system strategies be design and utilized work process in order to reduce the effect of work related stress on psychological and physiological well being of the employees.

Sharon and Bradford (2008) examined affective organizational commitment and continuance organizational commitment as moderators of the relationship between job-related anxiety and intention to leave among 506 Israeli nurses who completed self-administered surveys. Both affective organizational commitment and continuance organizational commitment buffered the relationship between job-related anxiety and intention to leave the hospital (i.e., the positive relationship was not as strong with high levels of commitment). Further, the relationship between job-related anxiety and intention to leave increased more strongly for low levels (vs. high levels) of continuance organizational commitment.

Tiwari and Mishra (2008) investigated the role of work stress and health in the prediction of organizational commitment in railway employees (N=300) and found out that work stress was inversely related with affective, normative and overall commitment.

Idris (2009) studied occupational stress among the academics of Malaysia and found out that academics that experienced increased levels of role stressors were more likely to have increased levels of strain. Subsequently, the strained academics were more likely to show higher levels of cynicism and lower levels of professional efficacy and organizational commitment. The predicted moderators (i.e organizational support, peer support, and self-efficacy) had no significant influence on the relationships between role stressors and strain. Mediation analyses also showed that strain strongly mediated the relationship between role ambiguity and outcomes of strain (i.e. cynicism, professional efficacy, and organizational commitment).
Villanueva and Djurkovic (2009) studied the relationship between the occupational stress of employees in small and medium enterprises and their intentions to leave the organization. The results of the regression analyses indicate that perceived organizational support fully mediates the relationship between stress and intention to leave, while job satisfaction and affective commitment are partial mediators of the aforementioned relationship.

Viljoen and Rothmann (2009) studied the relationship between occupational stress, ill health and organisational commitment. A survey design was used. The results showed that different organisational stressors contributed significantly to ill health and low organisational commitment. Stress about job security contributed to both physical and psychological ill health, whereas overload and job aspects contributed to psychological ill health. Stress about control and resources contributed to low organisational commitment. Low individual commitment to the organisation was predicted by five stressors, namely work-life balance, overload, control, job aspects and pay.

The research reviews exploring the relationship between occupational stress and organizational commitment bring to light that occupational stress and organizational commitment are negatively related to each other but due to limited research studies are done on academic faculty of Universities, this study has been undertaken to find the effect of organizational commitment and its components on occupational stress.

**Coping Strategies**

Coping refers to cognitive behavioural responses to disruptive and otherwise stressful life events that tax the person’s capacity to adjust (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978; Folkman & Lazarus, 1980). Historically psychoanalysts tried to conceptualize the concept of coping process (Freud, 1946; Haan, 1977). They have analyzed coping as largely unconscious responses to internal conflicts with the interest in life events as a major causes of stress, the interest of the researchers is being diverted towards the process of coping with external stressors.

The word coping has two connotations in literature. The term has been use to provide the way of dealing with stress, or the effort to Master condition of harm, threat, or challenge when a routine or automatic response is not readily available (Lazarus, 1974).
Coping consists of efforts, both action oriented and intra psychic, to manage (i.e. master, tolerate, reduce, minimize) environmental and internal demands and conflicts (Lazarus & Launier, 1978).

According to Lazarus (1991), coping refers to the cognitive and behavioural efforts to manage specific external or internal demands (and conflicts between them) that are appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of a person.

Coping can have an effect on three kinds of outcomes – psychological, social, and physiological. In case of psychological outcomes coping can have an effect on the person’s morale (the way one feels about oneself and one’s life), emotional reaction e.g. level of depression and anxiety, or the balance between positive trend and negative feelings (Bradburn, 1969), the incidence of psychiatric disorders and even performance.

From a social perspective, one can measure its impact on functional effectiveness, such as employability, community involvement, and sociability (Renne, 1974), the effectiveness of interpersonal relationship or the degree to which useful social roles is filled (and acting out anti-social behaviour, etc. is avoided).

From a psychological perspective, outcome includes short-term consequences, such as the development and progression of a particular disease.

Coping strategies refer to the specific efforts, both behavioral and psychological, that people employ to master, tolerate, reduce, or minimize stressful events. Two generals coping strategies have been distinguished.

Problem focused – it deals with efforts to do something active to alleviate stressful circumstances.

Emotion focused - involve efforts to regulate the emotional consequences of stressful or potentially stressful events.

Research indicates that people use both types of strategies to combat most stressful events (Folkman & Lazarus, 1980). The predominance of one type of strategy over another is determined, in part, by personal style (e.g. some people cope more actively than others) and also by the type of stressful event; for example, people typically employ problem-focused coping to deal with potential controllable problems such as work-related problems and family-related problems, whereas stressors
perceived as less controllable, such as certain kinds of physical health problems, prompt more emotion-focused coping.

An additional distinction that is often made in the coping literature is between active and avoidant coping strategies. Active coping strategies are either behavioral or psychological responses designed to change the nature of the stressor lead people into activities (such as alcohol use) or mental states (such as withdrawal) that keep them from directly addressing stressful events. Generally speaking, active coping strategies, whether behavioral or emotional, are thought to be better ways to deal with stressful events, and avoidant coping strategies appear to be a psychological risk factor or marker for adverse responses to stressful life events (Holahan & Moos, 1987).

Coping strategies are methods of coping that characterized individual's reactions to stress in different situations or overtime within a given situation.

It can be said that the individual characteristics, situational factors and the relationship between person and environment determine how an individual responds and copes (Compas, 1987).

Classification of coping strategies

The psychoanalysts hold different views regarding classification of coping responses. Moos and Billings (1982) suggested three primary spheres of activity in coping responses are:

- **Appraisal-focused coping**- Coping attempts to define the meaning of a situation.
- **Problem-focused coping**- Tries to modify or eliminate the source of the stress.
- **Emotion-focused coping**- Governs the emotions aroused by stressors and maintains affective equilibrium.

Further, a distinction between problem-focused and emotion-focused coping has also been suggested (Lazarus & Launier, 1978; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Coping responses have been classified as avoidant and non-avoidant type (Suls & Fletcher, 1985).

According to Pareek (1977) usually people exercise only two types of strategies of cope with stress. One is the passive or avoidance strategy in which a person may accept, deny or put the blame on somebody or something. This style is also known as dysfunctional style of coping with stress situations. The other is the
active or approach strategy in which a person faces the reality and tries to solve the problem himself or with the help of others. These strategies are termed as functional style of dealing.

Antonovsky (1979) described three components of coping strategies viz. rationality which means the accurate objective assessment of the stressful situation, flexibility which means considering a number of different possible ways of dealing with a stressful situation, and farsightedness which means thinking through the consequences and discussing the problems with someone else.

Newton and Keenan (1985) describe five strategies in coping with work-related stress: (1) talking with others (superiors, colleagues); (2) direct action (a problem-solving orientation); (3) preparatory actions (problem appraisal, getting information, seeking a solution); (4) withdrawal and avoidance; and (5) expressing helplessness and resentment.

Eight coping strategies identified by Folkman and Lazarus (1988) are listed as follows: (1) Confrontive coping; (2) Seeking social support; (3) Planful problem solving; (4) Self-control; (5) Distancing; (6) Positive reappraisal; (7) Accepting responsibility and (8) Escape avoidance.

Levels of coping strategies

Coping can be accomplished at four levels:

Changing the environment- In some cases at least, it would easier to alter social conditions to humans need than to force people to waste their energy trying to adapt to changes in the environment that are of their making and that they could easily modify.

Handling the potential stressors- Modifying one's perspective of things is an effective way of coping with stress. Very often, severe depression is induced unnecessarily when there is little or no correspondence between the objective and subjective stressors.

Finding adequate specific responses- In all cases in which an event has become a stressor, and adequate specific response elicited as rapidly as possible will relieve stress. Barring quantitative overload, stress level will decrease, as one becomes as expert, develops the tools of the trade, and learns how to use them.
Seeking relaxation or diversion from the demand- If one relaxes out muscles, the psychological cause of tension will disappear. Number of people claiming that such exercises are beneficial and do help them to get away from the demands. Numerous techniques are now being proposed from Transcendental Mediation (Bloom, 1976), the Relaxation Response (Benson, Beary & Carol, 1974) and autogenic training to transactional analysis and yoga. Regular hours, good eating habits, physical exercise, and physical withdrawal from stressful situations are reported to be associated with less stress symptoms than other more result-oriented to be associated with less stress symptoms than other more result oriented techniques such as a change to a different work activity, a new strategy of attack on work, etc.

**Occupational Stress and Coping Strategies**

Individuals and organizations cannot remain in a continuous state of tension. Some strategies can be adopted deliberately or undeliberately to deal with stress.

Srivastava (1991) investigated the moderating effect of approach and avoidance modes of coping on the relationship of occupational stress and job performance found that approach mode of coping attenuates whereas avoidance mode of coping intensifies the inverse relationship between occupational stress and job performance.

Barnsley (1992) defined the effectiveness of community college teachers in coping with stress through a chronological review of the literature written about the American community colleges from 1920 to 1989. The main outcome of the study was a decade-by-decade description of how authors of each decade portrayed the effectiveness of community college teachers in coping with job stress. Several characteristics were identified as predictors in the ability of teachers to cope with job stress: the teacher is student-oriented, has a thorough knowledge of subject matter, uses a variety of teaching methods, possesses good communication skills, motivates students, is well organized, has an inborn capacity for teaching, is dedicated, enjoys teaching, is enthusiastic, has broad scholarship, keeps up to date in the field, and has a positive mental attitude. One of the key conclusions of the study was an appalling lack of research-based literature about effective coping strategies and methods used by teachers in community colleges. If the primary focus of community colleges is to provide high quality education, it is imperative that we train educators to become effective in stress management.
Chan (1998) examined stress and coping among teachers in Hong Kong. He found that the type of coping strategies teachers used mediated the effects of stress on their emotional well-being. Similar results were obtained in Sweden, where using active coping strategies buffered the effects of teachers' job stress (Brenner, Sorbom & Wallius 1985) and making positive appraisals of one's work, such as comparing one's own job favorably to that of others, lessened distress (Needle, Griffen & Svendsen, 1981). Seeking out social and emotional support by turning to others has also been shown to benefit teachers under stress (Greenglass, Fiksenbaum & Burke, 1995; Burke, Greenglass & Schwarzer, 1996; Greenglass et al., 1996). In contrast, avoiding one's problems may exacerbate distress (Chan, 1998).

Multiple coping strategies have been reported useful for reducing occupational stress. Some of these are cognitive refraining, humor, planning, optimism, exercise, time management, self-care, and leisure activities (Arenano, 2000; Gomez, 1996).

The greatest volume of contemporary research concerning cognitive vulnerability to teacher stress relates specifically to individual differences in coping style. In one recent study Griffith, Steptoe and Cropley (1999) questioned 780 primary and secondary school teachers, aiming to assess the associations between stress, coping responses and social support. High levels of stress were associated with low social support and the use of disengagement and suppression of competing activities as coping strategies. Interestingly, stepwise multiple regressions revealed that coping style not only mediated the effects of environmental stressors, but also influenced teachers' perceptions of their environment as stressful. This is significant as it suggests that some of the stressors associated with teaching may not be inherently stressful but act as stressors only in transaction with coping style.

A different approach to assessing the relationship between coping strategies and teacher stress was employed by Admiraal, Korthagen and Wubbels (2000). Concerned with active vs. passive responses to disruptive behaviour in the classroom, 27 student teachers gave a total of 300 responses to indicate their coping responses to everyday stressful classroom situations. A strong relationship emerged between a coping style involving active behavioural intervention and teacher satisfaction, and a weaker relationship with pupil time on task was also evident.

Parikh, Taikari and Bhattacharya (2004) in a study on nurses, occupational stressors and coping mechanism, found that their common coping mechanism include
problem solving, social support and avoidance. Perceived control appears to be an important mediator of occupational stress.

Torkelson and Muhonen (2004) in their study investigated the relationship between coping and health problems in the context of gender and level in the organization in relation to occupational stress. The data was collected through questionnaire from 279 women and men (100 managers and 179 non-managers) at a sales department in a Swedish telecom company in which men and women worked at similar tasks. It was hypothesized that, if gender and level in the organization were controlled for, the use of problem-focused strategies would be associated with fewer health problems and the use of emotion-focused strategies with greater health problems. It was also predicted that men and women at a similar organizational level would not differ in their use of problem-focused coping strategies. The results showed, contrary to the hypothesis, that when level and gender were controlled for, no relation between problem-focused strategies and health was obtained. Instead the emotion-focused strategy of seeking emotional support was associated with fewer health problems, whereas focus on emotions and alcohol/drug disengagement were associated with more symptoms. Coping was at least partly related to level. At managerial level the men and the women used basically the same strategies whereas at a non-managerial level traditionally-conceived coping patterns were evident.

Shejwal and Shahnaz (2006) examined the relationship between job burnout variables and coping mechanism among high school male and female teachers teaching in Pune. The results showed that male teachers, compared to female teachers, used more of problem focused and emotion-focused coping mechanisms. The male teachers, compared to female teachers, had higher job burnout in the areas of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization but not in the area of loss of personal accomplishment. Among the male teachers, there were no significant correlations between coping mechanism variables and any of the job burnout variables. Among female teachers, there were no significant correlations between the coping mechanisms and the job burnout variables except for depersonalization, which showed a significant positive correlation with both the coping mechanisms.

The research studies indicate that people use both types of strategies (active and passive) to combat most stressful events. The predominance of one type of strategy over another is determined, in part, by personal style (e.g. some people cope more actively than others) and by the type of stressful situation.
Justification of the Problem

Teachers constitute the core of the faculty in a university. The development of teaching faculty requires an academic environment free from any stress that is conducive and congenial for research, training and development of teachers, which ensures commitment towards institution.

The study of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy is of considerable importance for predicting effectiveness of teaching. Emotional intelligence is what gives a person a competitive edge and self-efficacy of teachers enhances human accomplishment and personal well-being in many ways. The teachers having emotional intelligence and efficacious outlook can do better in their professional life. The teachers if they are emotionally competent and have a strong sense of efficacy, will manage their feelings well, recognize and respond effectively and tolerate frustrations better. In turn they will have well adjusted personality and cope up with stress in a better way.

The studies of Ciarrochi et al. (2002), Crockerton (2007) and Extremera and Berrocal (2008) found significant positive relationship between stress and emotional intelligence, whereas a study conducted by Ginzberg (2006) showed a negative effect of stress on emotional intelligence. Another study conducted by Nikolaou (2002) indicated negative correlation between emotional intelligence and stress at work indicating that high scores in emotional intelligence suffered less stress related to occupational environment.

According to Venkatiash and Naidu (1984) the quality of a nation directly or indirectly, depends on the quality of the teachers. It is said elsewhere, that good teachers costs more but poor teachers costs most. The aim of the educational administrators is to develop and groom effective teachers who can deliver the goals of education.

In a study on university faculty members by Klenke-Hamel and Mathieu (1990) it was found that faculty who are experiencing more stress than they can cope with are likely to withdraw from student-professor interactions, be less accessible to students, and be less involved in the departmental decision making and committee work.
Faculty member's commitment may be directed toward a number of entities: for example, to the occupation of teaching, to student success, to specific programs, or the departments as an organization. Researches show that occupational stress results in psychological strain and is associated with coping. Limited studies have been conducted on occupational stress and factors associated with it viz. emotional intelligence, self efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies, in higher education in various universities, though to a large extent all research in this domain of occupational stress has concentrated on primary and or secondary school teachers (Lindquist, 2001; Ryan, 2001; Sharma, Sharma & Yadav, 2002; Javed & Pandey, 2003). This group is obviously very different from university staff. For example, in comparison to primary and secondary school teachers, university staff, often enjoys some freedom in deciding what, when, and how they want to teach, which may affect their well-being positively (Karasek, 1985; Schreurs & Taris, 1998). Further, university students are older than the pupils of the average primary or secondary school teacher, and presumably they are relatively better interested in the topics being taught; for example, psychology majors may be expected to be genuinely interested in at least some of the classes they attend; if not, they would have chosen a different topic of study. Thus, it is questionable whether the evidence gained from studies among primary and secondary school teachers generalizes to the university setting; teaching may not be so important a stressor among academics as among primary and secondary school teachers. Consistent with this reasoning, Abouserie (1996) found that the participants in her study (university academic staff) considered conducting research and not teaching as the main cause of stress at work. Finally, in contrast to the tasks of primary and secondary school teachers, teaching makes up only part of the tasks of university staff; they are usually involved in research to a substantial degree and have management tasks as well. On the one hand, such supplementary tasks may be considered a healthy diversification of one's job. On the other hand, however, combining such diverse tasks may well be an important cause of job stress and strain. It is probable that many academics see themselves foremost as researchers and as lecturers second. If this is correct, one possibly important stressor might be that academic staff has to reconcile the very different (and often time-consuming) tasks of teaching and conducting state-of-the-art research. Teaching usually comes first, simply because classes have to be scheduled well in advance. Therefore, any flexibility that may be needed often occurs at the expense of the time available for research. In short, it is argued that evidence on the sources of stress among primary
and secondary school teachers cannot be generalized immediately to academic university staff. In particular, the combination of research-related and teaching tasks will be an important source of occupational stress.

The research review exploring the relationship between occupational stress and emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies reveals that studies are mostly from the west only. Studies conducted in Indian context and too in the higher education set up of northern part of India are but very few.

Hence, this study will, contribute to the research literature by throwing light on the relationship between occupational stress of academic faculty in relation to their emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies in the higher education setting particularly in the Universities of Punjab.

Statement of the Problem

The present study therefore, is an endeavor to find aforementioned relationships. The title of this study reads as under:

A STUDY OF OCCUPATIONAL STRESS OF ACADEMIC FACULTY IN RELATION TO THEIR EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY, ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AND COPING STRATEGIES

Objectives

The main objectives of this study are:

1. To find out whether occupational stress, emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies will differ in case of male and female academic faculty members.

2. To find out whether occupational stress, emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies will differ in case of different designations.

3. To find out whether occupational stress, emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies will differ in case of different faculties.
4. To find out the relationship of occupational stress with emotional intelligence, self efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies in case of total sample.

5. To find out the relationship of occupational stress with emotional intelligence, self efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies in case of male academic faculty members.

6. To find out the relationship of occupational stress with emotional intelligence, self efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies in case of female academic faculty members.

7. To find out the predictors of occupational stress from among the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies in case of total sample.

8. To find out the predictors of occupational stress from among the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies in case of male academic faculty members.

9. To find out the predictors of occupational stress from among the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies in case of female academic faculty members.

**Hypotheses**

On the basis of above mentioned objectives, following null hypotheses were proposed to be tested:

**H°1** There exists no significant difference in faculty members’ occupational stress, emotional intelligence, self efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies in case of total sample with regard to gender.

This overall hypothesis covers the following domains:

**H°1-1** There exists no significant gender differences in occupational stress experienced by faculty members

**H°1-2** There exists no significant gender differences in emotional intelligence of faculty members

**H°1-3** There exists no significant gender differences in self-efficacy of faculty members.
H-1-4 There exists no significant gender differences in organizational commitment and its components in case of faculty members

H-1-5 There exists no significant gender differences in coping strategies adopted by faculty members

H-2 There exists no significant difference in faculty members' occupational stress, emotional intelligence, self efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies in case of total sample with regard to designation.

This overall hypothesis covers the following domains:

H-2-1 There exists no significant difference in occupational stress with regard to designation of faculty members

H-2-2 There exists no significant difference in emotional intelligence with regard to designation of faculty members

H-2-3 There exists no significant difference in self-efficacy with regard to designation of faculty members

H-2-4 There exists no significant difference in organizational commitment and its components with regard to designation of faculty members

H-2-5 There exists no significant difference in coping strategies with regard to designation of faculty members

H-3 There exists no significant difference in faculty members' occupational stress, emotional intelligence, self efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies with regard to different faculties in case of total sample.

This overall hypothesis covers the following domains:

H-3-1 There exists no significant difference in faculty members' occupational stress with regard to different faculties

H-3-2 There exists no significant difference in faculty members' emotional intelligence with regard to different faculties

H-3-3 There exists no significant difference in faculty members' self-efficacy with regard to different faculties

H-3-4 There exists no significant difference in faculty members' organizational commitment and its components with regard to different faculties
H°3-5 There exists no significant difference in faculty members' coping strategies i.e. confrontive coping, distancing, self control, seeking social support, accepting responsibility, escape avoidance, planful problem solving and positive reappraisal of academic faculty members' with regard to different faculties.

H°4 No relationship exists between occupational stress (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibilities and physical environment) and emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies of academic faculty members in case of total sample.

H°4-1 No relationship exists between occupational stress (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibilities and physical environment) and emotional intelligence of academic faculty members in case of total sample.

H°4-2 No relationship exists between occupational stress (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibilities and physical environment) and self-efficacy of academic faculty members' in case of total sample.

H°4-3 No relationship exists between occupational stress (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibilities and physical environment) and organizational commitment of academic faculty members' in case of total sample.

H°4-4 No relationship exists between occupational stress (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibilities and physical environment) and coping strategies of academic faculty members' in case of total sample.

H°5 No relationship exists between occupational stress (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibilities and physical environment) and emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies of academic faculty members in case of male academic faculty members.
H°5-1 No relationship exists between occupational stress (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibilities and physical environment) and emotional intelligence incase of male academic faculty members.

H°5-2 No relationship exists between occupational stress (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibilities and physical environment) and self-efficacy incase of male academic faculty members.

H°5-3 No relationship exists between occupational stress (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibilities and physical environment) and organizational commitment and its components incase of male academic faculty members.

H°5-4 No relationship exists between occupational stress (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibilities and physical environment) and coping strategies incase of male academic faculty members.

H°6 No relationship exists between occupational stress (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibilities and physical environment) and emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies of academic faculty members incase of female academic faculty members.

H°6-1 No relationship exists between occupational stress (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibilities and physical environment) and emotional intelligence incase of female academic faculty members.

H°6-2 No relationship exists between occupational stress (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibilities and physical environment) and self-efficacy incase of female academic faculty members.

H°6-3 No relationship exists between occupational stress (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibilities and physical environment) and organizational commitment and its components incase of female academic faculty members.
H°6-4 No relationship exists between occupational stress (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibilities and physical environment) and coping strategies in case of female academic faculty members.

H°7 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the occupational stress of academic faculty members independently or conjointly in case of total sample.

H°7-1 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the role overload of academic faculty members independently or conjointly in case of total sample.

H°7-2 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the role insufficiency of academic faculty members independently or conjointly in case of total sample.

H°7-3 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the role ambiguity of academic faculty members independently or conjointly in case of total sample.

H°7-4 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the role boundary of academic faculty members independently or conjointly in case of total sample.

H°7-5 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the responsibility of academic faculty members independently or conjointly in case of total sample.

H°7-6 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the physical environment of academic faculty members independently or conjointly in case of total sample.
H-8 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the occupational stress of male academic faculty members independently or conjointly.

H-8-1 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the role overload of male academic faculty members independently or conjointly.

H-8-2 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the role insufficiency of male academic faculty members independently or conjointly.

H-8-3 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the role ambiguity of male academic faculty members independently or conjointly.

H-8-4 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the role boundary of male academic faculty members independently or conjointly.

H-8-5 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would not contribute significantly in predicting the responsibility of male academic faculty members independently or conjointly.

H-8-6 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the physical environment of male academic faculty members independently or conjointly in case of total sample

H-9 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the occupational stress of female academic faculty members independently or conjointly.
H°9-1 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the role overload of female academic faculty members independently or conjointly.

H°9-2 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the role insufficiency of female academic faculty members independently or conjointly.

H°9-3 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the role ambiguity of female academic faculty members independently or conjointly.

H°9-4 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the role boundary of female academic faculty members independently or conjointly.

H°9-5 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the responsibility of female academic faculty members independently or conjointly.

H°9-6 None of the independent variables of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, organizational commitment and coping strategies would contribute significantly in predicting the physical environment of female academic faculty members independently or conjointly.