Asian Social Studies and
Applied Research (ASSAR)
Published by ASAR Council

Volume 2 Issue 4
November, 2021
ISSN (E): 2709-9229

Impact of Occupational Stress on Self-Efficacy of University Teachers

RASHID MEHMOOD
MPhil. Education Scholar, Department of Education,
University of Haripur, Pakistan.

MUHAMMAD SAEED KHAN
Associate Professor, Department of Education,
University of Haripur, Pakistan.

TEHSEEN TAHIR
(Corresponding Author)
Assistant Professor, Department of Education
University of Haripur, Pakistan.
Email: dr.tehseen78@gmail.com

Abstract

The research investigated the impact of occupational stress on self-efficacy of university teachers. The research questions of the study were: how do university teachers perceive about their occupational stress? what is the impact of university teacher's occupational stress on self-efficacy of the university teachers? The research study was descriptive in nature and survey by method. The population of study comprised of 141 teachers (108 male and 33 female). The sample consisted of 100 teachers (67 male and 33 female) from both faculties of the University of Haripur using random sampling technique. The two questionnaires used for the current research using five-pint Likert scale. The tools made validated and reliable through pilot testing. Afterwards, the data collected from the sample and entered in excel for further process. In addition, the SPSS used for the analysis. The results revealed that teachers experienced the occupational stress in the organization. Moreover, occupational stress has negative significant impact on teachers' self-efficacy.

Key Words: *Occupational Stress, Self- efficacy Regression, University Teachers.*

Introduction

Stress, particularly general and skilled stress, may be a growing reality in today's calling. The duty of a teacher is taken into account to be terribly disagreeable as a result of in Kyriacou (2001) analysis found that twenty fifth of academics area unit stressed which they'll have psychological issues due to teacher stress, together with psychological and depressive symptoms, arising from sure factors and conditions of their work as academics (Kyriacou, 2001; Kyriacou & Pratt, 1985; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1978; İpek, et al., 2018; Schonfeld, 1992). It has been known mutually of the factors influencing the academic performance and self-efficacy (SE) of university academics (Jepson & Forrest, 2006).

Job stresses are often somewhat negative or positive, however once job demands additionally increase the pressure and pressure to perform a good vary of tasks, it will cause negative job effects (Bandura, 1997; Schunk & Pajares, 2009). Physical and positive conditions, like anxiety, stress, or excitement in academics performing arts a specific task, influence teachers' perceptions of SE. However, the affected states have a weaker relationship to SE than alternative states, and these sources could increase or decrease teachers' perceptions of effectively in conjunction with others (Bandura, 1997; Morris & Usher, 2011). For instance, once a lecturer is anxious to try and do a task, awareness of his or her ability decreases.

Stress within the work may be a scenario that folks face within the work during which they face demands to fulfil what they need not old, thus success can't be achieved. As a result, their brains become unbalanced. The faculty members at the university have heaps of responsibilities. Duties of university members embrace teaching and advising students and making ready papers and shows for classroom lectures and analysis conferences. Teachers ought to additionally do educational work with family life, social life and community commitment (Faisal et al., 2019). These responsibilities place a significant burden on teachers.

In the context of academic settings that are absolutely associated with performance, these events were influenced by variety of things (Rasool et al., 2020). In researcher's point of view, teachers stress is the illustration by a teacher of rough and rude emotions as aggression, frustration, depression and confusion caused by some social problems of their workplace. It is an obvious indicator that teachers' low performance, including lack of self-efficacy (SE) has become the most concerned issue especially at university level; a need is felt to find out the impact of occupational stress and SE of teachers in the University of Haripur.

Research Questions

The research questions of the study were:

Q1. How do university teachers perceive about their occupational stress?

Q2. What is the impact of occupational stress on self-efficacy of university teachers?

Research Hypotheses

It was hypothesized that:

H_{01}: There is no impact of occupational stress on self-efficacy of university teachers.

All educators in the universities are the residents of the nation, every one of these instructors experience the issues and have concerns identified with their occupations. These educators are not appropriately encouraged and prepared for instructing, learning and common sense. In a typical view universities education is considered as a low-pressure occupation so for. Although it is anything but a generously compensated activity, yet universities instructors then again appreciate adaptability in day by day plans light remaining task at hand, residency track plans and furthermore different advantages like abroad instructive grants, gatherings and courses and furthermore the chances to upgrade their own training.

Literature Review

Stress is the fundamental issue that impacts not just the educators' own wellbeing and prosperity, climate of instructive foundation, yet additionally the groups of the instructors. There is some mind full factor for it, at instructive organizations just as at their homes. In the working environment there are parts of issues, for example, instability of occupation, long working hours and ridiculous cut off times and so forth. These things are making issues for the educators at their work puts however the family issues are additionally exceptionally inquisitive, for example, lopsided time winning the home condition. This thing impacts the relatives particularly youngsters and older folks. They invest not appropriate energy at home that causes the shortcoming of relationship. There are many factors which may cause stress among university teachers (Mufti, 2012).

The first analysis on teacher SE is often found in management theory (Duffin et al., 2012). Teacher SE and the teacher's confidence within the ability to execute the action needed to complete explicit} learning task in a very particular context (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Another definition given to explain a tutor's SE is that a teacher believes he will teach an awfully difficult and imitative student and has several sides of teacher apply (Aloe et al., 2013). Extremely teacher SE encourages and motivates students to implement new learning strategies and foster a lot of positive relationships with students (Mojavezi & Tamiz, 2012). Teacher SE additionally assesses teacher delusion, and fewer competent academics are a lot of doubtless to remain off from the teaching profession (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). Teacher traits related to high-level teacher SE powerfully influence students apply and learning within the room (Chang, 2015). In distinction, low-level SE teachers might feel that room conditions are on the far side their management to enhance student success (Bruce et al., 2010).

Teacher SE has systematically contended a crucial role in class scientific discipline analysis as a result of the impact of teaching, teaching strategies, and its impact on student education (Klassen et al., 2009). Substantial analysis has shown that teachers with high levels of SE have lower levels of job satisfaction, lower levels of job-related stress, and fewer issue managing student misconduct (Caprara et al., 2003). Therefore, understanding the foremost stakeholders of teacher well-being and SE in operating for college effectiveness and improvement are often considerably rewarding. The thought of SE comes from Bandura's social cognitive theory of activity amendment (Bandura, 2002). It refers to his / her teacher's understanding of the way to with success manage tasks / responsibilities and challenges associated with his / her skilled role (e.g., work-related tasks, handling disciplinary problems within the room, etc.) (Caprara et al., 2003). This belief is set by variety of things, of that temperament traits - temperament traits - have junction rectifier to a growing tutorial interest within the subject as an example, supported a five-factor model of temperament (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Djigic et al., (2014) found that academics with a high degree of exposure to expertise and task rumoured a robust sense of competency.

Sousa et al. (2012), in their study of frontline service workers, found that private values were additionally necessary employees of SE. Especially, each openness (i.e., autonomy, arousal and hedonism) and self-growth values (i.e., power and practice) are tributary to SE to vary values. These values are a part of the noted Schwartz's (1992) model of human values, which has conservation values (i.e. tradition, conformity and security) and self-transportation values (i.e. benevolence and universality). in line with Schwartz, personal values are often outlined as trans-situational goals, that dissent considerably and function guiding principles in people's lives. Schwartz (1992, 2012) known 10 basic worth types: power (social standing, dominance over folks and resources), apply (personal success by social standards), heredity (pleasure or romantic satisfaction), enthusiasm (excitement, challenge) and innovation). , autonomy (freedom of thought and action), financial aid (to increase and enhance the well-being of the folks around

us), catholicity (awareness and tolerance and concern for the well-being of all folks and nature), tradition (respect and commitment to cultural or spiritual practices and concepts, conformity (Restraint on actions and motivations that damage others or violate social expectations), and security (protection of society, relationships and self and stability) .These 10 values are established in a very motivational two - dimensional system. the primary perspective is against amendment, against freedom and protection. Emphasizes that temperateness is that the priority here, maintaining strategies and consistency in conserving stability. Conversely individuals range their personal interests at the expense of others, and other people overcome their stingy issues to push the welfare of others. a lot of recently, Schwartz (2012) has highlighted that self-transportation and care values are often categorised with a social focus, whereas others have issues concerning the results or established organizations, with a private focus.

The link between values and SE is powerful (i.e., low controlled motivation and high involuntary motivation). In fact, studies that deal usually with person-status conflict counsel that the pressure of perceived circumstances to possess a price or to act in a very explicit method ought to powerfully weaken individual values like persistent personal variations (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003; Barni et al., 2016).

Research Methodology

The survey design also permits the researcher to get deeper description of variables of the study such as university teachers' stress that was an independent variable, whereas teachers' self-efficacy SE was dependent variables. The population of study comprised of 141 teachers (108 male and 33 female) working in two faculties Basic and Applied Sciences and Social and Administrative Sciences, the University of Haripur. The sample consisted of 100 teachers (67 male and 33 female) from both faculties of the University of Haripur. This sample was included teachers from the cluster of Professors, Associate professors, Assistant professors and Lecturers working in the University of Haripur.

The following questionnaire were used in the current research:

First, self-administered questionnaire was used to assess the occupational stress of University teachers. The questionnaire contained 37 statements. Moreover the 5-point Likert scale i.e. Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree used to find out the perceptions of teachers regarding their occupational stress in university. Second questionnaire was adopted from (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Second, the self-efficacy questionnaire was available on internet in ready format having contained 24 statements. This questionnaire was divided into three sections i.e. efficacy in students' engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies and efficacy in classroom management. Each section contained eight statements. In addition, the 5-point Likert scale used Never to Always. This tool used to assess the SE of teachers.

The validity of research tools was also obtained from panel of experts from the Department of Education, The University of Haripur. The mistakes and suggestion from experts obtained were incorporated in research tools accordingly.

The tools were piloted among non-sample of research. This process helped the researcher to check the reliability of research tools. The tools distributed among 10 teachers. They responded according to the given data. In addition, the collected data entered in Excel for further process. After wards, the SPSS used in the next step. The Cronbach Alpha reliability used to confirm the reliability of tools. The output of data revealed the reliability of tools that were 0.819 and 0.801 respectively.

The researcher personally visited, distributed questionnaires and collected the desired information from the sampled respondents of the institution. Clear instructions were prepared for the respondents to respond.

Approval was taken from university ethical committee. Apart from this respondent were asked to feel free in their responses as data will be kept confidential and only be used for research purpose. The collected data were analyzed by SPSS. The descriptive statistics was used to find out the perceptions of university faculty about their occupational stress in the organization. The linear regression used to notice the impact of independent variable to the dependent variables of research.

Data Analysis

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of university teachers perceive the occupational stress

	N	Min	Max	Mean	SE Mean	SD
Occupational Stress	100	2.59	4.73	3.8041	0.04977	0.49769
Valid N (listwise)	100					

The table 1 depicts descriptive statistics of university teachers' occupational stress. The OS (N = 100, Min = 2.59, Max = 4.73, Mean = 3.8041, SE Mean = 0.04977 and SD = 0.49769) teachers agreed that they have to do a lot of work under tense circumstances, less rewarded for their performances, face various challenges and unable to carry out other assignments due to heavy work load from superiors. Moreover, they also agreed that apart from organizational workload, they also face problems that include the self-satisfaction.

Table 2: Correlation among occupational stress and self-efficacy of university teachers

N	r	Sig. (2-tailed) p
100	-.737**	0.000

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 2 delineates the Spearman correlation that examined the relationship among two variables of the study. The results indicated that there is a significant positive negative significant relationship (r (100) = -0.737, p = 0.000). Likewise, TP with OS has negative significant relationship (r (100) = -0.738, p = 0.000). The p values are less than significant level (0.05) (p = 0.000 < (0.05).

Table 3: Model Summary of Regression Analysis of strength of relationship between model and dependent variable

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.698[a]	.487	.481	11.94306

a. Predictors: (Constant), OS

In the model summary table, the factors that influenced the dependent variable indicated as predictors, which was occupational stress. The predictors evaluated between model and dependent variable self-efficacy. The multiple R for the equation was 0.698(69.8%) value indicated strong relationship between observed model and predicted values of dependent variable. Therefore, this model summary of regression was successful in explaining approximately 48.7% variance with adjusted R^2 = 48.1% of independent variables.

Table 4: Occupational Stress ANOVA Summary Table (Regression Model)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	13247.705	1	13247.705	92.877	.000[b]
	Residual	13978.405	98	142.637		
	Total	27226.110	99			

a. Dependent Variable: SES

b. Predictors: (Constant), OS

The independent variable of ANOVA table occupational stress was regressed on (13247.705) the dependent variable; self-efficacy using Linear Regression Model for the acceptability of the model from statistical perspective. An F (92.877) test was used to determine the significant of the overall model. The table presented the analysis of variance summary table. The F for this model based on dependent variable self-efficacy was calculated and to be found statistically significant as showed by p value (0.000) which is less than significant level (0.05) (p = 0.000 < (0.05).

Table 5: Coefficient Multiple Regression Results of OS on SE

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	136.747	9.252		14.780	.000
	OS	-.628	.065	-.698	-9.637	.000

a. Dependent Variable: SES

The multiple regressions reported in table 4.41, the predictors occupational stress as independent variables found to be significant. According to standardized estimates (beta weight), one unit increased of OS (β = -0.698) which made negative impact on dependent variable, as indicated by t-value (-9.637) with the p-value (0.000) which less than significant level (0.05) (p = 0.001 < (0.05) and found statistically significant.

Discussion

The current research revealed that teachers have occupational stress working as different roles in the organization. They face multiple challenges in the institution. The results found consistent with Ali et al., (2013) who found occupational stress among private Pakistani teachers. The stress is related to their exposure, tactic and span in the school. In addition, significant negative relationship found between occupational stress and self-efficacy of teachers. The results are in line with Hülya et al., (2018), Aftab and Khatoon (2012), Khan et al., (2012), Morris and Usher (2011) who revealed in their studies that occupational stress is significantly correlated with self-efficacy of teachers. Moreover, demographic variables of participants also experienced stress in the organisation.

The study demonstrated the regression analysis in order to find out the impact of occupational stress on self-efficacy of teachers in the university. The outcomes showed that occupational stress has negative significant impact on self-efficacy of teachers. The researchers like Dijk (2009); Ahmad (2017); Kim et al (2009) and Khalid et al (2019) found that self-efficacy of the employees also affected by the stress.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, following conclusions can be made:

It can be concluded that university teachers experienced occupational stress due to long hours, heavy workload, job insecurity, lack of autonomy and changes of duties. In addition, there can be more reason behind occupational stress of teachers that are related with personal problems or health problems, and it can be related with workplaces.

The occupational stress is directly correlated with self-efficacy because stress and self-efficacy are psychological factors. The regression analysis revealed the negative significant impact of OS on SE. It can be concluded that occupational stress and self-efficacy are psychological factors. The OS includes the heavy workload and insecurity of job negatively affected teachers' self-efficacy.

References

Ahmad, Z. (2017). Effect of Emotional Intelligence, Occupational Stress and Self- Efficacy on Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Research & Innovation in Education (JRIE)*, *3*(1), 63-85.

Ali, K., Ishtiaq, I., & Ahmad, M. (2013). Occupational stress effects and job performance in the teachers of schools of Punjab (Pakistan). *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *3*(11), 665-680.

Aloe, A.M., Amo, L.C., & Shanahan, M.E. (2013). Classroom management self-efficacy and burnout: A multivariate meta-analysis. *Journal of Physical Education 26*(1), 101-126. doi: 10.1007/s10648-013-92440

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. F. Freeman.

Bandura, A. (2002), Social cognitive theory in cultural context. Applied Psychology: *An International Review, 51*(3), 269–290. doi: 10.1111/1464-0597.00092

Bardi, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Values and behavior: strength and structure of relations. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull. 29*, 1207–1220. doi: 10.1177/ 0146167203254602

Barni, D., Vieno, A., Roccato, M., & Russo, S. (2016). Basic personal values, the country's crime rate and the fear of crime. *Social Indicators Research*, *129*(3), 1057-1074.

Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*(2), 239-253.

Bruce, C.D, Esmonde, I., Ross, J., Dookie, L., & Beatty, R., (2010). The effects of sustained classroom-embedded teacher professional learning on teacher efficacy and related student achievement. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(1), 1598-1608, doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.011

Chang, Y. (2015). Examining relationships among elementary mathematics teachers' efficacy and their students' mathematics self-efficacy and achievement. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education, 11*(6), 1307-1320.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) Manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Dijk, M. (2009). *Employee self-efficacy and job stress during organizational change: The mediating effect of risk perception* (Master's thesis, University of Twente).

Djigić, G., Stojiljković, S., & Dosković, M. (2014). Basic personality dimensions and teachers' self-efficacy. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *112*, 593-602.

Duffin, L.C, French, B.F., & Patrick, H. (2012). The teachers' sense of efficacy scale: Confirming the factor structure with beginning pre-service teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*(6), 827–834.

Faisal, F., Noor, N., & Khair, A. (2019). Causes and consequences of workplace stress among Pakistani university teachers. *Bulletin of Education and Research, 41* (3), 45-60

Hülya, İ. P. E. K., Akçay, A., Atay, S. B., Berber, G., Karalik, T., & Yilmaz, T. S. (2018). The relationship between occupational stress and teacher self-efficacy: A study with EFL instructors. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, *8*(1), 126-150.

İpek, H., Akçay, A., Atay, S. B., Berber, G., Karalik, T., & Yilmaz, T. S. (2018). The relationship between occupational stress and teacher self-efficacy: A study with EFL instructors. *AJESI - Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International, 8*(1): 126-150

Jepson, E. & Forrest, S. (2006). Individual contributory factors in teacher stress: The role of achievement striving and occupational commitment. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*, 183-197.

Khalid, A., Ghaffari, A. S., Pan, F., Wei, W., & Amin, A. (2019). The impact of occupational stress on job burnout among bank employees in Pakistan, with psychological capital as a mediator. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *7*, 410-422.

Khan, A., Shah, I., Khan, S., & Gul, S. (2012). Teacher' stress, performance & resources: The moderating effects of resources on stress & performance. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 2*(2), 21-29.

Kim, B. P., Murrmann, S. K., & Lee, G. (2009). Moderating effects of gender and organizational level between role stress and job satisfaction among hotel employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *28*(4), 612-619.

Klassen, R. M., Bong, M., Usher, E. L., Chong, W. H., Huan, V. S., Wong, I. Y., & Georgiou, T. (2009). Exploring the validity of a teachers' self-efficacy scale in five countries. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *34*(1), 67-76.

Kyriacou, C. & Pratt, J. (1985). Teacher stress and psychosomatic symptoms. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 55, 61–64.

Kyriacou, C. & Sutcliffe, J. (1978). Teacher stress: Prevalence, sources, and symptoms. *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 48, 159–167.

Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review, 53*(1), 27-35.

Mojavezi, A., & Tamiz, M. P. (2012). The impact of teacher self-efficacy on the students' motivation and achievement. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2*(3), 483-491.

Morris, D. B. & Usher, E. L. (2011). Developing teaching self-efficacy in research institutions: A study of award-winning professors. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 36*(3), 232-245.

Mufti, O. (2012). *Determinants of stress causing dissatisfaction among university teachers of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Qurtuba University of Science and Information Technology NWFP (Peshawar and DI Khan) Pakistan

Rasool, S. F., Wang, M., Zhang, Y., & Samma, M. (2020). Sustainable work performance: the roles of workplace violence and occupational stress. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *17*(3), 912-924.

Schonfeld, I. S. (1992). Assessing stress in teachers: Depressive symptoms scales and neutral self-reports of the work environment. In J. C. Quick, L. R. Murphy, & J. J. Hurrell, Jr. (Eds.), *Stress and well-being at work: Assessment and interventions for occupational mental health* (pp. 270–285). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association

Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2009). Self-efficacy theory. In K. R. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 35–53). New York, NY: Routledge

Sousa, C. M., Coelho, F., & Guillamon-Saorin, E. (2012). Personal Values, Autonomy, and Self-efficacy: Evidence from frontline service employees. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *20*(2), 159-170.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 202.