EFFECTS OF JOB STRESS ON PERFORMANCE OF ACCADAMICIANS WORKING IN PUBLIC SECTOR UNIVERSITIES OF PUNJAB

Atif Jamal[1], Ayesha Chaudhry[2], Babak Mahmood[3], Saira Siddique[4], Muhammad Furqan Ashraf[5]

[1, 2, 3, 4, 5] Department of Sociology Government College University Faisalabad (GCUF)

Punjab, Pakistan

[1]atijutt@gmail.com, [2]ayeshanoor@hotmail.com, [3]babakmahmood@gcuf.edu.pk,

[4]sairasiddique14@hotmail.com, [5]furqanashrafsoc@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examines the effects of job stress on performance of academician working in public sector universities of Punjab. Through reviewing an extendable literature on different indicators of job stress were accorded. Quantitative descriptive research method was approached and survey method was used to collect data from academic heads, academia and students who were enrolled in different departments. Three different inventories as tool of data collection were prepared on the basis of different indicators of job stress. Uni-variate and multiple regression analysis were used to analyse the data. It was concluded that multiple indicators interlink with each other affect job performance of academia and their heads, students good and bad performance also depends on academia stress. Many of these indicators have diverse effect on job performance but slight variations of stress are prevailed among old, permanent and aged academia as compare to new, non permanent and young academia. It was also suggested that university must assess the level of stress among academia and minimize the frustration and disappointment level among academia to cope prevailing situation of stress.

INTRODUCTION

Stress is the body's response of person that needs a physical, mental and enthusiastic alteration or reaction (Newman, 2012). Stress may emerge out of any circumstance or believed that causes to feel puzzled, irate, apprehensive or irritated. It happens when individual understands the burden on one or

prerequisites of circumstance are more extensive than one may deal with, and if these necessities are massive and proceed for a significant stretch of time with no span, mental, physical or conduct issue can happen" (Travers & McMillan, 2013). It is encountering in various circumstances and its reasons are distinctive as nervousness, despondency and dissatisfaction in the people. The dissatisfaction leads to the constant circumstance and impact on the wellbeing of person. Stress is for all intents and purposes difficult to stay away from. Stress is an extremely common and significant portion of

Job stress

It is reasoned that work worry of employee is a typical occurrence today. Worry in the work environment create irregularity in the sound existence of the employee that impact its wellbeing. It makes them disappointed because of medical problems. Work stress is one of the most significant working environment wellbeing threats for workers in emerged and emerging nations. Stress concerns relations at work, for example, disputes with the superordinate, clashes with colleagues, and with" the board policies. Work stress is progressively turning into an outbreak in the workplace.

University academia should be aware to create quality alumni may more readily play out their job in the event that are presented for improvement activities held for upgrading clinical expertise (Raza & Naqvi, 2011). Although an elevated level of pressure has been seen in instructing in general, the advanced education department is a generally new focal point of concern. There is solid proof to accept its workforce could speak to an especially weak work gathering. There are different reasons for college instructor worry as closed by the numerous specialists. These causes are inside occupation as; remembered moderate advancement for professional success, helpless personnel correspondence and private matters. A significant number of the specialists are recognized that outstanding task at hand, job uncertainty, clashing position requests, continuous interferences and taking a stab at distributions" (Golden burg & Waddell, 2007).

Objectives

1.   To understand the factors liable for work pressure
2.   To examine prevalence of work stress in academia
3.   To investigate a connection between work stress and performance

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

An employee spends one third of his life on work (Goswami, 2015), unfair treatment and biased behaviour increased frustration among employees resulting into low performance (Imran et al., 2015). Another research study indicates that employee performance is a key factor associated with the success of every organization (Mustafa, 2013), success can be prolonged through employees' performance it also can be achieved is by different critical factors of organization success (Thao and Hwang, 2015). Therefore, for seeking more enhancement of employee performance by putting efforts to factors to enhance employees' motivation level that is less stressful environment, empowerment of employees and comfort workplace environment, (Jaffe & Scott, 1995) revealed that prime objective of all

organizations to produce a work place where employees sincerely care of organizational objectives and can feel sense of ownership for results that they frequently try to make them" desirable.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

People with various characters react comparably to physical dangers, however various replies to sense of self dangers are identified with character variances (Eysenck, 1988). Most speculations of work related working concur that character makes critical commitments to performance and prosperity, though recognizing the connection among character and climate" factors.

Nature characteristics might be fixed somewhat, however their place in the framework as forerunners or results will rely upon the idea of the collaboration among people and ecological frameworks, and to any progressions that can happens in that framework. Cooper (2000) sorted six groups of administrative factors that may cause stress in the work" environment. They are as:

❖   Variables natural for the work incorporates, heat, sound, chemical exhaust and shift work.
❖   An association at work incorporates fight with colleagues or managers and absence of social help.
❖   Role in an associations and job imprecision.
❖   Occupation improvement dearth of status, absence of possibilities for raises, absence of profession path and employment instability.
❖   Administrative structure and atmosphere incorporate absence of possibilities for raises, absence of prospects to partake in decision making, absence of authority over the movement of work.
❖   Home and work boundary incorporates strife among home-grown and work jobs, absence of spousal backings for staying in the workforce.

There is an unpredictable connection between work related, authoritative elements and mental attributes" (Appelberg, Romanov and Kosdenvuo, 2001). The components also affect on decision making, research distribution, advancement, treachery, inner clash, absence of strengthening, overload, Reward and acknowledgment, unfit to utilize aptitude, performance assessment, new innovation, teaching of new course, promised arrangement, absence of physical service and unprejudiced though writing performance report of workforce. These people, social and hierarchical elements lead" toward the pressure.

METHODOLOGY

Quantitative research methodology was adopted and survey method was used, which provide studying the sampled population and analyse the results which can be generalize on entire population (Cresswell, 2009). Population of the study were the deans, chairs/hods/incharges, teachers and students of eight Universities of Punjab. Stratified random sampling method was used to select sample from sub population, it refers the process to guarantee desired respondents within population (Fuller, 2009). Structured questionnaire that is exceptionally viable and effective as making data accessible in near fewer time frames (Robson, 2005) was developed on the basis of theoretical framework and reviewed literature, for each sampled class, separate questionnaire was prepared by using likert scale. Initial part of the

questionnaire was consisted of demographic profile, individual data sheet was developed about gender, age, qualification, experience, post, position of head and academia and marital status, afterward first part of the questionnaire was about academia heads (deans, chairs / hod's /incharges), second was for academia(teachers), and third one for students, these three questionnaires were also discussed with relevant experts, on the behalf of their opinion some statements were redesigned and yet finalized it. Data was collected through personal interviews that were conducted by the researcher himself with the help of assistant, who was got briefed about the data collection procedure. Although, all the respondents were belonged to academia, who were fully understand the research procedure, therefore, students were briefed that how to respond against each item statements that were given in the questionnaire. Data collection time period was may, 2020 to September in the same year. Data was analyzed through multiple techniques by putting data into SPSS 2.1.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Univariate Analysis

Table1: Demographic data of academia heads

Items	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	177	73%
Female	65	28%
Post		
Permanent	171	71%
Contractual	41	17%
TTS	32	13%
Post		
Dean	37	15%
Chairman/Chair	182	75%
In charge	24	10%
Qualifications		
Post –Doc	40	17%
PhD	202	83%
Experience		
<10	50	21%
10-20	126	52%
21+	65	27%
Age		
Under 26	0	0%
26-35	0	0%
36-45	32	14%
46-55	144	60%
56+	65	26%
Marital Status		
Married	207	86%
Un-married	36	15%

Above table shows frequency and percentages of the response for each variable as out of 242 respondents, majority are male i.e. 73 % (177) and only 28 % (65) are female that shows male dominancy, second variable about current post of respondents that were divided into three categories i.e. permanent, contractual and tenure track, numerous are permanent academic staff as 71& (171), while 17& (41) are contractual and only fewer 32% (13) are working on TTS.

Academic administration by post is divided into three groups, majority of the respondents 75% (182) were chairperson of various departments lying under their domain, while 15% (37) were deans, and only 24% (10) were In charge of different departments. Education of these posts are considered as most attractive for appointments, therefore, education of majority of academic staff was PhD e.g. 83% (202), and only 17% (40) were holding Post Doctorate, the most advance degree.

Majority of the respondents i.e. 52% (126) of the heads own experience among 10 to 20 years, 27% (65) respondents were more than 21 years experience, whereas only 21% (50) less than ten years working experience. Further, discloses that 60% (144) respondents were among the age bracket of 46 to 56 years, 14% (32) were less than 45 years of age, though 26% (65) were aged more than 56 years of age. The marital status variable shows that 207 (86%) of respondent were married, however 36 (15%) were unmarried.

Table 2: Demographic data of academia

Items	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	259	62%
Female	163	38%
Age		
Under 30	54	13%
30-40	215	51%
41-50	86	20%
51+	72	17%
Post		
Permanent	255	61%
Contractual	129	30%
TTS	42	11%
Position		
Professor	28	8%
Associate Prof	55	13%
Assistant Prof	83	20%
Lecturer	258	60%
Qualifications		
Post –Doc	15	3%
PhD	139	32%
MS/MPhil	229	54%
MA/MSC	28	8%

Experience in years		
<5	139	32%
5-10	119	28%
11-15	89	21%
15+	70	17%

Above table indicates respondents demographic detail, it shows majority of the respondents 62% (259) were male, only 38% (163) were female. While majority relate to the age category of 30-40, as 51% (215), fewer as 13% (54) were aged less than 30 years. The post was divided into three categories, as majority of the respondents were permanent 61% (255), contractual employee 30% (129), TTS/Adhoc only 11% (42).

Academic positions are divided into different categories, numerous were lecturers 60 (258), fewer were professor 8% (28), while associate professor 13% (55), assistant professor 20% (83). Education of majority hold MPhil/MS 54% (229), MA/MSC 8% (28), PhD holder was 32% (139).

Experience of majority of the respondents was about less than five years as 32% 139, five to ten years were 28% (119), while eleven to twelve years were 21% (89) and only 17% (70) had fifteen years plus experience, they are more satisfied as compare those who had less experience.

STUDENT RESPONSE ANALYSIS

Table 3: Response of students about their academia performance

Item	Response				
	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Mean	S.D
Your academia replies positively while students ask questions in class	439	84	127	3.23	0.612
Your academia performance is affected by criticism of the HOD	199	29	412	1.67	0.634
An even distribution of workload helps your academia to perform better	501	32	117	3.51	0.931
Your academia teach the course of their choice	472	35	143	3.41	0.913
Academia performance is constantly valued by their departmental heads	279	25	345	1.13	0.653

Teaching novel course is hectic	429	55	166	3.18	0.656
Your academia assigned work is of attention to them	388	33	129	3.31	0.832
Your academia frequently notices miserable in the university environment	180	15	455	1.71	0.792
Your academia performance is assessed on regular basis	242	11	397	2.93	0.116
Your academia performance looks obscured by the thoughts of the head of department	461	16	173	3.31	0.321
Your academia stay dispassionate although assessing students' performance	490	10	150	3.51	0.821
One of the refreshing factors of your academia is to obtain appreciation and honored from HOD	180	16	454	1.18	0.586
Your academia performance is supplemented with their promotion	240	15	395	1.31	0.493
Your contractual academia has the same benefits as the regular ones	149	65	436	1.72	0.243
Your academia positively views their colleagues while in classroom	137	17	494	1.02	0.686
Your contractual academia enjoys the same amount of respect as that of regular one	458	47	145	3.51	0.783
Your contractual academia has the same performance as that of regular one	519	40	91	3.74	0.657

Your academia has a cordial collaboration among their colleagues	230	15	405	1.21	0.583
Your academia treats you and others with respect	398	18	154	3.52	0.875
Your academia communication with head, colleagues, friends and students seems strained	119	23	508	1.12	0.786
Your academia perceive irritated in the class					
Your academia seems to be annoyed with their academic work	125	73	452	1.52	0.562
Your academia becomes intolerant on small embarrassment	109	66	475	1.75	0.586
Your academia by no means feels isolated in the campus overall	478	69	105	3.73	0.873
Your academia is enough support staff for their assigned work	208	35	407	1.53	0.779
Your academia easily gets resources for using in the classroom	190	16	444	1.87	0.597
Your academia has strong relation at campus	109	25	516	1.31	0.525
The space of classroom is sufficient for all academic activities	448	68	134	3.07	0.603
The university environment is safe for you and your academia	491	53	106	3.55	0.823
Your classroom have proper cooling /heating systems	180	23	455	1.81	0.532
Your academia feels physically, emotionally and spiritually threatened	230	15	405	1.07	0.753

Your classroom is equipped with sufficient audio and visual aid facilities	418	35	197	2.91	0.495
Your classrooms have enough physical resources for a smooth teaching/learning process.	108	54	488	1.52	0.895
Your classrooms have enough and comfortable seating for students	598	33	119	3.73	0.565
Your classrooms are equipped with multimedia	450	58	142	3.62	0.511
You have internet facility throughout the campus	449	14	187	3.11	0.395
Your classroom are airy and ventilated	388	69	193	2.71	0.612
A highly sensitive "liability system" is desirable for sustainable performance of academia	119	76	455	1.51	0.712
You understand that your academia is fully pleased with their job	109	66	475	1.72	0.589
Your academia feels bright and energetic while on campus	478	69	103	3.71	0.911
Your academia understands how efficient their work is generally yield for the organization	208	34	408	1.41	0.792
Seeking point of view of students about your academia is an significant step taken by the HOD	592	83	75	3.83	0.532
Your academia is unwilling to provide themselves with adequate information while teaching	412	36	202	2.91	0.513

Above table shows the students answers regarding statement about academia, the mean scores (3.23, 3.51, 3.41) pointed out positive relationship between three item statements absolutely respondents asked question in class, contrived, therefore mean (3.51) reported that that academia performance looks better by the allotment of workload equally among other staff, and mean score (3.42) accumulate trend that academia teaches the course of their preference to some extent.

Furthermore, mean scores (3.18, 3.31) indicated that majority of the respondents agreed with the statement connection as teaching new course is demanding and assigned course is according to the concentration of academia is more stressful, while mean score (1.13, 1.71, 2.93) describes disagreement with items in questionnaire that academia performance is being appreciated by the departmental heads and academia performance must be evaluated on regular basis, moreover, academia feels depressed in the campus environment due stress. Furthermore, contractual academia has same benefits as the regular" ones have.

"The mean scores (3.51, 3.74, 3.52) supported the statements. This means that academia contractual academia has the same performance as that of regular one and also your contractual academia enjoys the same amount of respect as that of regular one along with academia treats you and others with respect. Furthermore, the mean scores (1.21) depicted disagreements with statements "academia has a cordial collaboration among their colleagues and academia positively views their colleagues" while in classroom.

"The mean scores (3.73, 2.95) revealed academia never feels isolated in the campus overall and academia communication with head, colleagues, friends and students seems strained. (1.52, 1.12, 1.75) sounds frustrated with their academic work, while mean score (1.12) shows that academia feels irritated in the class while the 1.76 shows that academia becomes impatient on small" inconveniences.

"The mean scores (3.55, 3.07) showed a absolutely significant relation with the statement that the university environment was safe for you and your academic circles and classroom space was sufficient for all activities. Furthermore (1.31, 1.53, 1.87) revealed a denial of the statements, that academia had strong relation at campus. Meanwhile, academia has enough support staff for their assigned work and academia easily gets resources for using in" the classroom.

"The mean scores (3.76, 2.98) pointed out a significantly positive response towards statements, that classrooms have enough and contented seating for students. Therefore, classroom is equipped with sufficient audio and visual aid facilities. However, the mean scores (1.80, 1.50, 1.07) turned up as negating the statements of classroom is properly cooling /heating systems. Further, academia feels physically, expressively and morally endangered, and classrooms have sufficient substantial resources for a smooth teaching/learning" process.

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

The technique was used to check the association between on dependent and multiple independent variables.

Table 4: Summary of regression analysis of academia heads

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.6703	0.4521	0.4425	0.0423

The results prove that goodness or fitness of the study with the variables under discussion.

Table 5: ANOVA of academia heads

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	29.477	15	1.92	27.277	.000
	Residual	16.342	226	0.062		
	Total	45.030	241			

gnificant relationships have been emerged as the result of the data obtained to meet the objectives.

Table 6: Influence of various stress indicators on performance on academic heads: A multiple linear regression analysis.

Coefficients						
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model Indicator		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	P. Value
1	(Constant)	3.736	.563		6.541	0.000
	Autonomy in Work (AW)	.457	.226	.191	1.760	0.005
	Quality of Work (QW)	.319	.212	.139	1.476	0.006
	Flexibility in Work (FW)	.279	.143	-.067	2.375	0.007
	Organizational Behavior (OB)	.131	.131	.059	3.11	0.000

Financial Benefits (FB)	.156	.158	-.039	-2.672	0.003
Social Interaction at Work (SIW)	.137	.213	-.074	-1.87	0.040
Provision of Privacy (PP)	.423	.183	.296	2.494	0.019
Communication Channel at Work (CCW)	.364	.153	.313	2.578	0.017
Working Conditions (WC)	.422	.165	-.016	-2.160	0.028
Furniture (F)	.202	.124	-.011	-3.023	0.032
Equipment Facility (EF)	.238	.174	-.126	-2.496	0.027
Space Organization (SO)	.232	.147	-.071	-1.89	0.031
Personal Space (PS)	.140	.139	-.112	-2.002	0.032
Individual Control (IC)	.186	.164	.070	3.059	0.003
Information Load (IL)	.418	.112	-.362	-3.401	0.000
Energy Drain (ED)	.240	.182	.196	2.196	0.037

Table 7: Summary of regression analysis of academia

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.7868	0.6249	0.6106	0.0003

"The above value proves the Goodness of fit test of the model of Academia.

Table 8: ANOVA summary of academia

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	425.255	15	28.01	23.49	0.000
1	Residual	501.473	406	1.23		
	Total	949.859	421			

F value 23.49 is highly significant as =0.000 which means the researchers have rightfully selected the demographic variables to be studied for examination of the dependent variable.

Table 9: Influence of various stress indicators on performance on Academia: A Multiple linear regression analysis

Coefficients						
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model Indicator		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	P. Value
2	(Constant)	-2.017	0.394		-4.104	0.000
	Autonomy in Work(AW)	0.323	0.117	.157	11.243	0.000
	Quality of Work(QW)	0.247	0.077	-.152	3.720	0.004
	Flexibility in Work(FW)	0.188	0.069	-.047	2.638	0.006
	Organizational Behavior(OB)	0.197	0.083	.089	2.767	0.011
	Financial Benefits(FB)	0.145	0.047	-.036	3.484	0.033
	Social Interaction at Work(SIW)	0.077	0.069	-.061	-2.086	0.027
	Provision of Privacy(PP)	0.288	0.062	.207	-4.111	0.000
	Communication Channel at Work(CCW)	0.252	0.055	.321	3.981	0.000
	Working Conditions(WC)	0.356	0.084	-.036	-5.270	0.000
	Furniture (F)	0.133	0.074	-.023	3.223	0.049
	Equipment Facility(EF)	0.045	0.047	-.122	-2.952	0.033
	Space Organization(SO)	0.156	0.071	-.061	7.755	0.000
	Personal Space(PS)	0.103	0.059	-.101	2.928	0.005
	Individual Control(IC)	0.125	0.080	.060	-3.658	0.000
	Information Load(IL)	0.121	0.060	-.332	2.973	0.043
	Energy Drain(ED)	0.187	0.094	.172	-3.394	0.001

DISCUSSION

The consequence of the university examination indicated that pressure to academicians in public sector universities is higher when contrasted the academicians working on top echelons. Results prove that higher echelons enjoy authority and such autonomy give them liberty that eventually helps them to vent out all the stress. The data revealed that there are categorise of the factors causing for work stress in public sector universities. Hence it can be inferred that the occurrence of academia stress" cannot be repudiated. The above results and writings may prompt to understand the significance of our conviction about framework, with respect to educating at university level. If our academia has high degree of self efficacy then they can cope all work

pressures what so ever mentioned above. So there is a dire need to enhance self efficacy or self confidence in easy words among the academicians. Anyhow, many demographic and background factors are perhaps beyond the scope of this study and needs an entire course of research action.

CONCLUSION

It can easily be inferred now that certain remedial measures are mandatory to help the academicians of public sector universities to boost their morale for long term outcomes in positive manner. Teaching of new course, funding for research, student performance is also found directly related to interest of teacher, who is motivated, out of stress, no burden of new and extra course persume them for giving proper guideline of related courses.

RECCOMENDATAION

- Academic heads are responsible to know the stress level of their academia through survey, their disappointment in related matter can be put down through assessing their stress level, academia must be included in decision making, their opinion and suggestions must be evaluated in response to minimize their stress.
- Academia head must know the potential of any academia before assigning any task that is contradictory to their nature and control, by this was stress can be prevent from academia.
- Academia head must assign course related to their expertise, academia willingness in this regard is much important that they will teach course according to their own interest and capacity.

REFERENCES

Abbas, A., Asadullah, M. & Rogers, A. (2012). Impact of organizational role stressors on faculty stress and burnout, 4ème Colloque International (ISEOR-AOM), 1, 1-18. Retrieved from http:/www.halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/.../STRESS_BURNOUT-ISEOR_ AOM.pdf

Ali, S. (2008). Faculty Development Program for Universities of Pakistan: The Need to Develop a Model. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of the Punjab: Lahore.

Ali, S., Haider , Z., Munir, F., Khan, H. and Ahmed, A. (2013). Factors Contributing to the Students' Academic Performance: A Case Study of Islamia University Sub-Campus *American J. Educational Research*, 1(8), 283-289.

Ayaz, M, K., and Ali, M, C. (2014). Impact of stress of a public sector university. *Journal of research and reflections in education*, 8(1), 48-54

Beehr, T.A. & Newman, J.E. (1978). Job stress, employee health and organizational effectiveness: A facet analysis, model, and literature review. Personnel Psychology. 31: 665-699.

Bhui, K., Dinos, S., Galant-Miecznikowska, M., de Jongh, B., &Stansfeld, S. 2016. Perceptions of work stress causes and effective interventions in employees working in public, private and non-governmental organisations: a qualitative study. *BJPsych Bull*. 40(6): 318–325

Borko, H. (2004). Professional Development and Teacher Learning: Mapping the Terrain. Educational Researcher, 33(8), 3-15.

Cheng. (2006). Management skill of university teacher. (4th Ed) London Thomson company culture.

Cooper, C.L(2000). Testing of teacher performance; New York, NY: Oxford University

Curtis, A., (2011). Burnout syndrome of faculty: An empirical study in denizli in Turkey, *Social and behavioural Sciences*, 318-322.

Endicott, J., Nee, J., Harrison, W., & Blumenthal, R. (1993). Quality of life enjoyment and satisfaction questionnaire: A new measure, Psychopharmacology Bulletin, 29(2), 321- 326. Retrieved from www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/ 8290681

Eysenck, O. (1988). A motivational study on Personality: London Macmillan pre

Famian , M.J. (1984) The Development of an Instrument to Measure Occupational Stress in Teachers, The Teacher Stress inventory Journal of Occupational Psychology.pp.277-293.

Fuller, W. A. Sampling Statistics. Wiley Series in Survey Methodology, 2009.

Goldenburg, G. and Waddell. (2007). Occupational Stress and coping Strategies among teachers. *Journal of advance in Nursing*, 15(5), 531-543

Goswami, T. G. (2015). Job stress and its effect on employee performance in banking sector. *Indian Journal of Commerce & Management Studies*, 6(2), 51-56

Imran, R., Majeed, M., and Ayub, A. (2015). Impact of organizational justice, job security and job satisfaction on organizational productivity. *Jounal of Economics, Business and Management,* 3, 840-845. doi: 10.7763/JOEBM. 2015.V3.295

Khan, A., Bin Md Yufoffb, R., Azam, K. (2014). Factors of job stress among university teachers in Pakistan: A conceptual review. Journal of Management Info 9JMI), 1(2), 28-30

Kousar, T., & Sohail, T. (2013). Occupational Role Stress and Health Related Quality of Life among Secondary School Teachers. *Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 1(1), 1-17.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.

Lewin, K. (1947). Group decision and social change. In T. M. Newcomb & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Murali, S. B., Basit, A., Hassan, Z. (2017). Impact of job stress on employee performance. *International Journal of Accounting & Business Management* (2), 2289-4519

Mustafa S. M (2013). Key factors in performance management: employee point of View. E2013 Bachelor s thesis submitted to HamkUniveristy of Applied sciences. Unpublished.

Nadeem Bhatti, N., Hashmi, M. A., Raza, S. A., Shaikh, F. M., Shafiq, K. (2011). Empirical Analysis of Job Stress on Job Satisfaction among University Teachers in Pakistan. International business research, 4(3), 264-270.

Newman, K., and Langbelle, E. Z. (2012). Stress in organizational life. *Journal of Psychology*, 495- 513.

Osipow, S. (1983). Stress Coping Strain Model in Nigeria, Lagos.Longman publication. Parveen, R., (2005). Research methodology. Practice-hall of india private limited New Delhi.

Pareek, U. (1983). Organizational Role Stress Scale. In L. D. Goodstein & J. W. Pfeiffer (Eds.). The 1983 annual for facilitators, trainers, and consultants (pp. 119-123). San Diego, Calif: University Association.

Paul, R., and Lawrence, J. (2002). Faculty at Work: Motivation, Expectation, and Satisfaction. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Raza, S. A., Majid, Z., Zia, A. (2010). Perceptions of Pakistani University Students about Roles of Academics Engaged in Imparting Development Skills: Implications for Faculty Development. *Bulletin of Education & Research.* 32(2), 75-91.

Raza, S.A. & Naqvi, S. A. (2011). Quality of Pakistani University Graduates as Perceived by Employers: Implication for Faculty Development. *Journal of Quality and Technology Management*, 7 (1), 57-72.

Schaubroeck, G. (2000) Changing of Work Nature and Stress.: Journal of Mnagerial Psychology,Vol . 15 No. 3, pp.227-42.

Siegrist, J. (2016). Effort-Reward Imbalance Model. In Stress, concept, cognition, emotion and behaviour, Handbook of Stress Series (1), Pages 81-86. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780128009512000091

Stanhope, J. (2017). Effort–Reward Imbalance Questionnaire. *Occupational Medicine*, 67(4), 314-315. https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqx023

Thao, L., T., T and Hwang., C. 2015. Factors affecting employee performance – evidence from Petrovietnam Engineering Consultancy J.S. [Online}. Available at: [Date Accessed: 9 April 2017]

Toohey. (1995). The communicational model of Stress in employees. *Organizational Behavior* ,9(3) 203-207.

Travers, C.J., & MacMillan. R. B. (2013). Mental health, Job satisfaction and occupational stress among UK teacher: *Work and Stress,* 7(3), 209-231.