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#### Abstract

The aim of the study was to find out the factors which create stress among public sector secondary school teachers to determine the stressors being faced by the secondary school teachers. The study was related to the secondary schools of public sector in Punjab. Punjab province is comprised of 9 divisions. Due to limited time and resources, the study was delimited to public sector secondary schools of Lahore division. The study adopted descriptive survey design using a sample of 1000 teachers drawn from 100 secondary schools from public sector in Lahore division. From each school 10 teachers were randomly selected. One rating scale was developed to collect data for the study. The percentage, mean, standard deviation and t-test were applied as descriptive and inferential statistics to analyze the collected data. In the light of the results and conclusions of the study, it may be recommended that unwanted sounds and noise may be minimized in the school environment, trainings be imparted to the staff, workload should be equally distributed and necessary facilities should be provided at schools.
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## Introduction

Stress is a feeling of emotional or physical tension. Stress is often described as a feeling of being overloaded, wound-up tight, tense and worried. In our daily life, everybody faces stress. Stress is basic to life, no matter how prosperous, powerful, good looking happy employed or unemployed is someone. Stress is experienced by all in their everyday lives in a wide variety of situations and settings in the family, in school and on the job. Specifically, it is the pressure and strain that result from demand in change that require some kind re-adjustment in individual. Conflict, deprivation and anxiety could also produce stress. In an age of rapid escalation in the rates of general occupational stress teaching is one of the most stressful occupations (Kyriacou, 2001). In another study, it was proposed that teacher stress is associated with student misbehavior (Hastings and Bham, 2003).

Teacher stress can be brought about from different circumstances. Stress regularly occurs when teachers have trouble discussing different parts of connections with students (Hepburn, 2001) reason of teacher's stress can be separated into organizational and individual stressors. Many stressors can be found in the workplace and incorporate unfavorable working situations, extreme workloads, authoritative issues, and scarcity of assets, absence of support as well as self-sufficiency, and basic leadership. The workplace can include physical stressors, for example, noise at workplace, swarming, large size of class, youth brutality, and additionally managerial pressures (Hastings and Bham, 2003). Personal stress can be linked with the compatibility among individual and instructive values, aspiration to succeed, affectability edge, intensity, various parts for female teachers, (for example, parent, overseer, homemaker, and instructor), and flawlessness (Bachkirova, 2005).). A ma-
jor factor of teacher stress can be specifically ascribed to the pupils. Through the response of the survey and interview most of the teachers refer to student's behavior as being responsible for their stress. (Bham, 2003).

The major purpose of this study is to obtain from teachers their perception about major factors of organizational stress being faced by them. Another purpose of this study is to identify the stressors which create stress among public sector secondary school teachers. This is achieved by controlling for the selected background variables of gender, age, level of education, grade level taught, years of teaching experience, size of the school, and perceived personal-life stress. The four factors which made the most substantial contribution to overall job-related stress of teachers were Role Overload, Relationships with Students, Work Load, and Relationships with Colleagues. Kyriacou (2001) who summarizes many of the studies on stress in the field of education, defines stress as "The experience of teachers of unpleasant, negative emotions such as irritation, nervousness, pressure, disturbance, depression resulting from aspect of their work as a teacher".

Stress has been seen from psychology, medical and environmental perspective (Thurn, \& Ey, 2003; McNamara, 2000). According to medical perspective, stress can be seen as a psychological or physical stimulus that may lead to many deceases (Ludvigsson, 2008; MacGeorge, 2005). According to the psychological perspective, stress can be seen as a relationship between individual and environment. Stress may also refer to an external pressure exerted on a human's ability to cope. According to the penguin dictionary of psychology stress is a state of mental disturbance brought on by organizational and environmental forces and pressures (Reber, Allen, \& Reber, 2009). According to the environmental perspective, stress can be seen as an independent element which comes from characteristics of distressing or harmful environments and extra demand of work which is placed upon an individual (McNamara, 2000).

Stress, as indicated by Slyers (2011), implies a general reaction which the human body makes to any interest on it. It is a stress which is physical, mental, physiological and sociological which may come about because of not taking care of with certain requests at the work place. Oboegbulem (2007) characterized stress as a procedure in which natural occasions or powers, called stressors, debilitate living beings' presence and prosperity and how the individual reacts to such risk. It could likewise be seen as an inclination which happens when an individual's working or living conditions or circumstances make demands away from the individual's ability to handle such circumstance physically or mentally. Contributing, Willis (2005), Melgosa (2004) and Ugoji and Isele (2009) expressed that stress is likewise a state of being liable to outside powers or weights which can either be great (eustress) or terrible (pain). Distress represents to high and low stress levels and trouble is regularly characterized as high stretch level. Principals who experience eustress will have the capacity to meet occupation requests and this may induce constructive work life (e.g., fulfillment and constructive good values) while principals who experience trouble won't have the capacity to satisfy work requests prompting disappointment which influences an individual's profitability, adequacy, individual wellbeing and nature of work (Fevre, 2003; Leka 2004).

A further concept often used interchangeably with stress is burnout. Although there is no one single definition for the phenomenon of burnout, it is usually defined as a syndrome of mental, physical and emotional exhaustion resulting in cynicism and reduced professional efficacy (Goddard, O'Brien, \& Goddard, 2006). The sources of stress, As per Adebola and Mukhtari (2008), could be organizational, local and monetary. Organizational stress is a term used to characterize stress that is identified with working environment. It happens when there is an error between the requests of the work and individual's capacity to do and finish these requests (Mahmood, Nudrat and Zahoor 2013). Organizational stress is likewise the experience of negative passionate stress, for example, disappointment, uneasy tension, nervousness and depressed credited to job related stressor (Kyria-
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cou, 2001). Such issues like extra workload, interference of stake holders and issues in educational planning and policies, absence of self-rule in execution of obligations, conflicts amongst work and family obligations, poor academic achievements of the students, misbehavior of the students and poor workplace constitute organizational stressors.

Oboegbulem (2011) recognized those stressors which are characteristic for the employment and which verge on upsetting working conditions as: aggregate school working hours, physical or ecological elements like overpopulation of students; issues with the school plant; inadequate and incompetent teachers with lazy work attitude; negative attitude of the students towards learning; parental uncertainty towards the instructive well-being of their children's; low inspiration; deficient assets to run Journal of Education and Practice the school, low prospects of headway, absence of employer stability and poor staff advancement programs. Others are close to home issues including part struggle; societal issues and weights; money related issues and local stresses (Adebola and Mukhtari, 2008). Occupational stress can in the end influence both physical and mentally prosperity if not control effectively. Lack of monetary and budgetary assets to run the school constitutes financial stressors.

There is a lot of research committed to the investigation of the ramifications of stress on happiness and prosperity. In the writing, the impacts of stress are frequently classified into research about identified with physiological signs; identified with mental appearances, and those identified with behavioral indications. The physiological signs caused by stress may incorporate migraines, incessant exhaustion, hypertension, muscle strain, ulcers, gastrointestinal sickness and coronary illness (Black, 2003). The effects related to mental issues caused by stress incorporate uneasiness, dissatisfaction, gloom and steady stress (Black, 2003). Negative anxiety has likewise been for quite some time related with various maladaptive behavioral reactions, for example, caffeine ingestion, cigarette smoking, rest aggravations, and an expanded utilization of different substances (Maslach, 2009). The effect of stress on the physical, mental and social soundness of the teachers, stress is likewise found to affect their conduct identified with their occupations. This is a vital connection amongst stress and work environment results as teachers' conduct and states of mind were found to affect students' results (Glatfelter, 2006).

Notwithstanding the issue of non-appearance, stress among teachers is likewise observed to be related with issues in classroom management the relationship between students and teachers. For instance, an investigation of 1430 teachers in Canada found that teachers who were exhausted or who were stressed because of the misbehavior of the students will probably feel less positive about dealing with their classes in keeping the students busy and in utilizing suitable instructional techniques (Klassen and Chiu, 2010).

A large portion of the consideration in research has been given to physical issues emerging from stress. A delayed introduction to stress can bring about basic hypertension, elevated cholesterol level, ulcer, joint inflammation, coronary illness and significantly disease (Luthans, 2002). Such kind of elements is not the sources just for the individual yet in addition for the organization. Extreme level of stress acting through focal sensory system to change hormonal adjusts) can likewise weaken a person's insusceptible reactions, diminishing I the body's capacity to battle attacking microscopic organisms and infections. In fact, it is assessed that passionate anxiety assumes an essential part in over half of the medical issues. Hypersensitivities, headache, hypertension, coronary illness, ulcers and even skin break out are a few diseases accepted to be identified with high level of stress and fall in the class of psychosomatic sicknesses.

## Methodology

This study was quantitative based on the survey of the opinion of teachers about the organizational stress among public sector secondary school teachers. In this study a rating scale was developed to find out the factors of organizational stress and the job related stressors faced by the public sector secondary school teachers.

## Statement of the problem

The researchers intended to study "Organizational stress among public sector secondary school teachers"

## Objectives of the study

The objectives of this research study were to

1. To find out the factors which create stress among teachers in the school.
2. Explore the job-related stressors being faced by the teachers of secondary school.

## Research Questions

The study aimed to search in to the following questions:

1. What are the factors which create stress among teachers in the school?
2. What are the stressors being faced by the secondary school teachers?
3. 

## Population of the study

The study relates to the public sector secondary school teachers in Punjab. The population of this study was all the teachers currently working in secondary schools in Punjab.

## Sample of the study

There are nine divisions of Punjab. Due to limited time and resources Lahore division was selected as the sample of the study. For the purpose of the study 50 male and 50 female public secondary schools were randomly selected. Stratified sampling was used for the male and female teachers $50 \%$ male and $50 \%$ female teachers were selected. After selected the school 10 teachers were randomly selected from each school. In total 1000 teachers both male and female formed the sample of the study.

## Delimitation

The study was delimited to
All the public sector male and female secondary schools of Lahore division and all the teachers currently teaching to secondary classes of the districts along with Lahore, Kasur and Shekhu pura.

## Instrument of the study

Rating scale was used as an instrument for this research. Validity and reliability of the instrument was got developed through expert opinion and Cronbach Alpha as well. The rating scale consisted of 35 questions devised on; five point Likert scale item. The item scores ranged from a one strongly agree to a five strongly disagree.

## Results and Discussion

The collected data was coded and analyzed using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). The percentage, mean, standard deviation and $t$-test were applied as descriptive and inferential statistics to analyze the collected data. Demographic information like age, experience, qualification and gender were included in quantitative survey. In this study 1000 participants participated out of them 592(59.2\%) were male and 408(40.8\%) female. In regard to age 349(34.9\%) were between 20-30 years, 197(19.7\%) were between 31-40 and 454(45.4\%) were having age 41 or above 41 . Highest qualification of 140 (14.0\%) participants were B.Ed., $810(81.0 \%)$ were having MA or M.Sc. and 50(5.0\%) of the participants were M. Phil \& Ph. D.
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Table 1. t-statistics Comparison of scores according to gender regarding the role of management

| Gender | N | Mean | F | Sig. | T | df |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 592 | 25.57 | 17.141 | .000 | 1.314 | 998 |
| Female | 408 | 24.92 |  |  |  |  |

Table 1 presents that t -value (1.314) which is significance $(\mathrm{p}=.000)$ at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore it inferred there is a significance difference between perception of male and female teachers, the role of male and female management differ significantly.

Table 2. t -statistics Comparison of scores according to gender regarding the work conditions

| Gender | N | Mean | F | Sig. | T | df |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 592 | 25.62 | 35.770 | .000 | 2.198 | 998 |
| Female | 408 | 24.55 |  |  |  |  |

Table 2 presents that t -value (2.198) which is significance ( $\mathrm{p}=.000$ ) at 0.05 level of significant. Therefore it can be decided that there is a significant difference between perception of male and female teachers with respect to work conditions.

Table 3. t-statistics Comparison of scores according to gender regarding work relations with students and staff members

| Gender | $\mathbf{N}$ | Mean | F | Sig. | T | df |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Male | 592 | 19.07 | 22.231 | .000 | 2.650 | 998 |
| Female | 408 | 18.18 |  |  |  |  |

Table 3 presents that $t$-value (2.650) is significance $(p=.000)$ at 0.05 level of significant. Therefore it is decided there is significance difference between perception of male and female teachers respond with respect to work relations.

Table 4. t -statistics Comparison of scores according to gender regarding school policy and ethos

| Gender | N | Mean | F | Sig. | T | Df |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Male | 592 | 22.15 | .494 | .482 | -2.357 | 998 |
| Female | 408 | 22.99 |  |  |  |  |

Table 4 presents that t -value $(-2.357$ ) which is not significance ( $\mathrm{p}=.482$ ) at 0.05 level of significant. Therefore it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between perception of male and female teachers with respect to school policy.

Table 5. $\mathbf{t}$-statistics Comparison of scores according to gender regarding general factors

| Gender | N | Mean | F | Sig. | T | Df |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 592 | 19.83 | 7.600 | .006 | 2.582 | 998 |
| Female | 408 | 19.01 |  |  |  |  |

Table 5 presents that t-value (2.582) which is significance ( $\mathrm{p}=.006$ ) at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, it can be inferred that there is significant difference between perception of male and female teachers with respect to general factors.

Table 6. Comparison of scores according to age regarding the role of management

|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Group | 2187.291 | 2 | 1093.645 | 18.806 | .000 |
| Within Group | 57978.684 | 997 | 58.153 |  |  |
| Total | 60165.975 | 999 |  |  |  |

Table 6 shows that ( $\mathrm{F}=18.806, \mathrm{df}=2$ ) and $\mathrm{p}=.000$ there is a significant difference between role of management in the teachers on the basis of teachers age. In other words age does affect the role of management.

Table 7. Comparison of scores according to age regarding the work conditions

|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Between Group | 1598.958 | 2 | 799.479 | 14.391 | .000 |
| Within Group | 55387.817 | 997 | 55.554 |  |  |
| Total | 56986.775 | 999 |  |  |  |

Table 7 shows that ( $\mathrm{F}=14.391, \mathrm{df}=2$ ) and $\mathrm{p}=.000$ there is a significant difference between work conditions in the teachers on the basis of their age. In other words age does affect the work conditions.

Table 8. Comparison of scores on the Basis of age regarding to work relations

|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Between Group | 544.926 | 2 | 272.463 | 10.113 | .000 |
| Within Group | 26860.638 | 997 | 26.941 |  |  |
| Total | 27405.564 | 999 |  |  |  |

Table 8 shows that $\mathrm{F}=10.113, \mathrm{df}=2$ and $\mathrm{p}=.000$ there is a significant difference between work relations in the teachers on the basis of their age. In other words age does affect the work relations.

Table 9. Comparison of scores on the Basis of age regarding to school policy and ethos

|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Between Group | 97.742 | 2 | 48.871 | 1.613 | .200 |
| Within Group | 30208.194 | 997 | 30.299 |  |  |
| Total | 30305.936 | 999 |  |  |  |

Table 9 shows that ( $\mathrm{F}=1.613$, $\mathrm{df}=2$ ) and $\mathrm{p}=.200$ there is no significant difference between school policy in the teachers on the basis of their age. In other words age does not affect the school policy.

Table 10. Comparison of scores on the Basis of age regarding to general factor

|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Between Groups | 806.994 | 2 | 403.497 | 17.302 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 23250.990 | 997 | 23.321 |  |  |
| Total | 24057.984 | 999 |  |  |  |

Table 10 shows that $(\mathrm{F}=17.302, \mathrm{df}=2)$ and $\mathrm{p}=.000$ there is a significant difference between general factors in the teachers on the basis of their age. In other words age does affect the general factors.

Table 11. Comparison of scores on the Basis of experience regarding the role of management

|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Between Groups | 1993.377 | 2 | 996.688 | 17.082 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 58172.598 | 997 | 58.348 |  |  |
| Total | 60165.975 | 999 |  |  |  |

Table 11 shows that $(\mathrm{F}=17.082, \mathrm{df}=2)$ and $\mathrm{p}=.000$ there is significant difference between role of management in the teachers on the basis of their experience. In other words, experience does affect the role of management.

Table 12. Comparison of scores on the Basis of experience regarding to work relations

|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Between Groups | 371.002 | 2 | 185.501 | 6.841 | .001 |
| Within Groups | 27034.562 | 997 | 27.116 |  |  |
| Total | 27405.564 | 999 |  |  |  |

Table 12 shows that ( $\mathrm{F}=6.841, \mathrm{df}=2$ ) and $\mathrm{p}=.001$ there is a significant difference between work relations in the teachers on the basis of their experience. In other words, experience does affect the work relations.

Table 13. Comparison of scores on the Basis of experience regarding to school policy and ethos

|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Between Groups | 175.258 | 2 | 87.629 | 2.900 | .056 |
| Within Groups | 30130.678 | 997 | 30.221 |  |  |
| Total | 30305.936 | 999 |  |  |  |

Table 13 shows that ( $\mathrm{F}=2.900, \mathrm{df}=2$ ) and $\mathrm{p}=.056$ there is significance difference between school policy in the teachers on the basis of their experience. In other words experience does affect the school policy.

Table 14. Comparison of scores on the Basis of experience regarding to general factor

|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Between Groups | 42.318 | 2 | 21.159 | .878 | .416 |
| Within Groups | 24015.666 | 997 | 24.088 |  |  |
| Total | 24057.984 | 999 |  |  |  |

Table 14 shows that ( $\mathrm{F}=.878, \mathrm{df}=2$ ) and $\mathrm{p}=.416$ there is no significant difference between general factors in the teachers on the basis of their experience. In other words, experience does not affect the general factors.

## Conclusion

The main focus of the study was to identify the factors which create stress among teachers and the job related stressors being faced by the secondary school teachers. For this purpose, a rating scale was designed to recognize and identify the factors which create stress among teachers and job related stressors. The researcher concluded from the findings of the rating scale that extreme work load, large class size and lack of necessary facilities are the major factors which create stress among teachers. It was concluded that unnecessary paper work, misbehavior of the students is also the key determine in causing stress. It was explored through this study that less time is given to accomplish the assignments, asks assigned irrespective of potential, entrust more of extra duties and harsh attitude of the boss were the job related stressors being faced by the public sector secondary school teachers.

## Recommendations

The following recommendations were made as a result of the study.

1. Unwanted sounds and noise may be decreased in the school environment and schools should be the calm areas. Arrangement of light in the classroom and ventilation in the school environment should also be improved.
2. There should be such strategies that may lower the probability of conflicts with other fellow teachers, head of the school and others staff. School management process should be improved and head should involve all teachers in decision making process.
3. Trainings be imparted to the staff enabling them to better cope with the staff rather to burst out.
4. Work load should be equally distributed and possibly decreased and necessary facilities should be provided at the schools
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