International Journal of Applied Engineering Research ISSN 0973-4562 Volume 10, Number 17 (2015) pp 38320-38331

A Study On Stress, Job Involvement, Job Satisfaction And Burnout In Faculties Of Government And Self Finance Colleges At Chennai, Tamilnadu, India

Mrs. Shibe Rimo

Research Scholar in Department of Management Studies Dr. M. G. R Educational and Research Institute Maduravoil, Chennai.

Dr. Ashvini Ravi

Professor, Department of Management Studies Dr. M. G. R Educational and Research Institute Maduravoil, Chennai.

Dr. P. S. Venkateswaran,

Professor, Department of Management Studies, PSNA College of Engineering and Technology, Dindigul. Venkatespsna07@gmail. com

Abstract:
In the present study, researcher investigates the stress, job involvement, job satisfaction and burnout in faculties of Government (GC) and self finance colleges (SFC). This study also tries to find out the coping strategies they adopt and find out the relationship between them. For this study, a total of 491 faculties were taken as samples. This study reveals that a strong positive and significant relationship between Job involvements and stress of self finance college male faculties and weak significant relationship between Job involvements and stress of self finance college female faculties. Self finance college faculties (both male and female) have burnout due to their stress than the Government college faculties.

Key words: Faculties, Stress, Burnout, Coping Strategies

1. Introduction:

Today, every organisation wants to reach its goal in fast, efficient and effective way. Heavy competitions among the organisations create more pressure on the employees. The working environment of the organisation is changing due to the socio, economic and technical development (NIOH, 2002). Modern organisations are going for downsizing using robotics and computer aided machines, less number employees have to do more works, which creates stress on them (Conti et al., 2006; Roed and Feveng, 2007; Vahtera et al., 2004). Some of the employees feels stress on them due to their over work load and behave differently (Manthei & Gilmore, 1996, McKenna, 1987).

Kyriacou, (2001) defines Job stress, as the experience of negative emotional states such as anxiety, worry, frustration and depression attributed to work related factors. In the present study, researcher tries to find out the stress, job involvement, job satisfaction and burnout in faculties of Government and self finance colleges.

2. Review of Literature

Lawless (1992) found that job stress makes the workers feel stress and it causes for low productivity and health related problems. The technological changes and computerization, mass retrenchment, heavy competition, expectation of high productivity, over work force makes the work place as a difficult place to work and causes job stress. Researcher identifies the study variables from the past studies and given below.

2. 1 Occupational Stress

According to Kyriacou (2001), 'faculty stress may be defined as the experience by a faculty of unpleasant, negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety, tension,

frustration or depression, resulting from some aspect of their work as a faculty. Chaplain (1995) investigated the sources of stress and job satisfaction amongst Government College.

Griffith, Steptoe and Cropley (1999) in the UK explored coping strategies and job stress among faculties and found that high job stress was associated with low social support at work and greater use of coping by disengagement and suppression of competing activities. Smith and Bourke (2002) in Australia explored work-related stress and job satisfaction among Self finance college faculties and identified four aspects of faculty stress: staff tensions and conflict, time pressure, students and classroom conditions, and lack of rewards and recognition. Teaching context, workload and satisfaction were found to affect stress directly. Working conditions associated with job stress include heavy workloads, role ambiguity, under-utilization of abilities, and lack of participation in decision making, health and safety hazards and job insecurity (Higgins et al., 1993). The job stress variables have been identified with the help of previous researchers (Selye, 1987; Spielberger and Reheliser, 1995; Uma and Kion, 2004). In the present study, job stress variables have been drawn from various reviews (Arnetz 1992; Edmundz 2000)

2. 2 Job Involvement

Lodhal & Kejner (1965) defined Job involvement as a person is identified psychologically with his work. Kanungo (1982) stated that job involvement refers to the degree to which individuals psychologically identify with their present jobs and Blau (1985) argued that job involvement frequently includes identifying with the job, actively participating in the job and perceiving job performance to be important to self-worth. Lawler (1986) sees job involvement as significant key factor for creating and increasing motivation of employees in view of organization. Job involvement is important element that has significant impact on individual employee and organizational outcomes (Lawler, 1986).

Job involvement has been considered instrumental in employee motivation: a fundamental factor in establishing a competitive edge in business markets (Pfeffer, 1994). Employees whose job involvement is high respond more negatively to job stressors (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1995). O'Driscoll & Randall, (1999) found that highly involved employees are more satisfied with their jobs and they tend to be highly committed to their professions. Job involvement has major impact on productivity and efficiency of employee and work has vital role in increasing job involvement of individual if it plays significant role in the life of employee. (Probst & Tahira, 2000).

2. 3 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined as "how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs" (Spector, 1997). Faculty satisfaction always depends on student outcomes, academic achievement, and cost of instruction (Hagedorn, 2000). August & Waltman, 2004; Hagedom & Sax, 2004; Reybold, 2005; Rosser (2005) identified four significant areas in the faculty satisfaction: rewards and salary, work and career satisfaction, relationships with students, colleagues and administrators, and benefits and job security. Smart (1990) focused on faculty intentions and tested a model that examined three areas of satisfaction: organizational, salary, and career. He found that higher levels of satisfaction with both organizational and career measures reduce faculty intentions to leave their current institutions, while salary satisfaction is significant only for nontenured faculty.

2. 4 Burnout

The burnout syndrome is described as emotional exhaustion which is the result of chronic stress and particularly occurs in people who are in contact with other people professionally. It comprises three components: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and lack of personal accomplishment/achievement (Montgomery & Rupp, 2005). Among the most important factors that affect faculties is role ambiguity, role conflict (Kantas, 1995), workload, time pressure (Tsiakkiros & Piasiardis, 2002), lack of autonomy and self-motivation (Olivier & Williams, 2005), lack of participation in decision-making (Kantas, 1995), competitive relationships between the faculty and his/her colleagues or superiors, lack of recognition of the professional role, methods of disengagement from a stressful situation (Riolli & Savicki, 2002), levels of personal satisfaction, the fulfillment or frustration of expectations and the clash of values. Fernet, Guay, Senectal, & Austin, (2012) found that changes in faculties' classroom over-load and students' disruptive behavior are negatively related to motivation, which in turn negatively predict changes in emotional exhaustion. Schwab, Jackson, & Schuler, (1986) suggested that

demographic characteristics such as age, sex, class level, marital status and the cultural context play a significant role in faculty burnout.

3. Research Methods

The objective of the study is to investigate the stress, job involvement, job satisfaction and burnout in faculties of Government (GC) and self finance colleges (SFC). The data for have been collected with the help of structured interview schedule. A pre-test was conducted among 20 Government and 20 Self finance college faculties. Based on the pre-test, certain modifications were carried out. The final draft of the schedule was prepared to collect the primary data from the faculties. To collect the data 5 GC and 5 SFC were selected and 500 questionnaires were distributed and 491 usable questionnaires were received.

The purposive sampling method was used to collect the data. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part was designed to collect the respondent's demographic details such as age, gender, level of education, and income category, etc. The second part measured faculties' perceptions of stress and burnout. Stress and burnout were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree. The collected data were processed with the help of statistical tools such as descriptive statistics, t test, regression and correlation. The study was conducted in the period of March 2015 to July 2015. The major limitation of the study is not taken engineering faculties for the study. Liner relationship between the variables was assumed.

No scientific sampling procedure followed to consider for the sampling method.

4. Analysis and Interpretation

Table 1: Demographic Profile of the respondents

Parameter		Government College faculties (N=272)		Self finance College faculties (N=219)	
		No. of respondents	Percent	No. of respondents	Percent
Gender	Male	97	35. 7	134	61. 2
	Female	175	64. 3	85	38. 8
Education	Post Graduate	116	42. 6	57	26. 0
	Professional	112	41. 2	109	49. 8
	Doctoral degree	44	16. 2	53	24. 2
Marital status	Married	187	68. 8	187	85. 4
	Unmarried	79	29. 0	27	12. 3
	Widow/Widower	6	2. 02	5	2. 3
Experience (in years)	Below 2	34	12. 5	19	8. 7
	3-6	58	21. 3	34	15. 5
	7-10	81	29. 8	26	11. 8
	11-14	45	16. 6	86	39. 3
	14 and above	54	19. 8	54	24. 7

Source: Primary data

Table 1 shows the demographic profile of the respondents. In Government College 35. 7 percent of the respondents are male and 64. 3 percent are female. 16. 2 percent are Doctoral degree and 42. 6 percent are having Post Graduate. 41. 2 percent are Professional. 68. 8 percent are married and 29 are unmarried. 29. 8 percent are having 7-10 years of teaching experience. 21. 3 and 19. 8 percent are having 3-6 years and 14 and above years of experience respectively.

In Self finance College 61. 2 percent of the respondents are male and 38. 8 percent are female. 24. 2 percent are Doctoral degree. 49. 8 percent are Professional and 26 percent are having Post Graduate. 85. 4 percent are married and 12. 3 are unmarried. 39. 3 percent are having 11-14 years of teaching

experience. 15. 5 and 24. 7 percent are having 7-10 years and 14 and above years of experience respectively.

Table 2: Level of Stress related variables, Job involvement and Job Satisfaction

S. No	Parameters	Government College faculties(N=272)		Self finance College faculties (N=219)	
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	**Job Pressure(7 Items)**	Cronbach's Alpha:0. 822		Cronbach's Alpha:0. 871	
	Job insecurity	2. 84	1. 074	3. 10	1. 082
	Colleagues	2. 94	0. 861	3. 02	0. 890
	Students	3. 18	0. 805	3. 19	0. 830
	Work Overload	3. 28	0. 887	3. 55	0. 885
	Higher officials (HoD, Principal)	3. 53	0. 782	3. 79	0. 870
	Management	3. 39	0. 824	3. 67	0. 880
	Office staff	3. 48	0. 839	3. 61	0. 885
2	**Income(5 Items)**	Cronbach's Alpha:0. 727		Cronbach's Alpha:0. 814	
	Loss of Job	3. 17	1. 081	3. 80	1. 028
	Medical Expenses	3. 15	0. 828	3. 53	1. 052
	Day to day expenses	3. 69	0. 877	3. 71	0. 892
	Poor income	3. 26	1. 029	3. 12	0. 877
	Low fringe benefits	3. 04	0. 876	3. 15	0. 816
3	**Physical health symptoms (9 items)**	Cronbach's Alpha:0. 824		Cronbach's Alpha:0. 867	
	Fatigue	3. 36	0. 984	3. 33	0. 837
	Headache	3. 38	0. 937	3. 52	0. 956
	Upset stomach	3. 53	0. 909	3. 61	0. 753
	Muscle tension	3. 64	0. 910	3. 83	0. 911
	Change in appetite	3. 61	0. 860	3. 65	0. 841
	Teeth grinding	3. 65	0. 975	3. 51	0. 956
	Change in sex drive	3. 44	0. 943	3. 70	0. 769
	Feeling dizzy	3. 73	0. 990	3. 83	0. 767
	Fatigue	3. 60	0. 896	3. 41	0. 825
4	**Psychological health symptoms(4 Items)**	Cronbach's Alpha:0. 807		Cronbach's Alpha:0. 781	
	Irritability or anger	4. 44	1. 025	3. 33	0. 963
	Feeling nervous	4. 13	0. 897	3. 37	0. 974
	Lack of energy	3. 59	0. 956	3. 59	0. 865
	Feeling as though you could cry	4. 27	0. 940	3. 42	0. 734
5	**Relationships(5 Items)**	Cronbach's Alpha:0. 851		Cronbach's Alpha:0. 911	
	Divorce	3. 81	0. 833	3. 87	0. 853
	Death of Spouse	3. 65	0. 802	3. 67	0. 856
	Poor relationship with relatives	3. 53	0. 823	3. 60	0. 873
	Loneliness	3. 22	1. 097	3. 22	1. 094
	Poor relationship with Friends and Neighbors	3. 38	0. 926	3. 40	0. 915
6	**Distress symptoms (10 Items)**	Cronbach's Alpha: 0. 756		Cronbach's Alpha:0. 824	
	Poor concentration	3. 37	1. 034	4. 6	0. 938
	Short-temper	3. 78	0. 827	4. 03	0. 679
	Churning stomach	3. 93	0. 841	4. 05	0. 752
	Anxiety	3. 69	0. 926	3. 67	0. 919

	Sore lower back	3. 56	0. 823	3. 33	0. 718
	Tight shoulders	3. 59	0. 87	4. 35	0. 751
	Depression	3. 55	0. 848	3. 46	0. 778
	Fuzzy thinking	3. 57	0. 849	3. 56	0. 818
	Edginess	3. 65	0. 891	3. 65	0. 894
	Irritability	3. 63	0. 86	3. 64	0. 964
7	**Job satisfaction (10 Items)**	Cronbach's Alpha:0. 923		Cronbach's Alpha:0. 870	
	Creativity in teaching	3. 49	0. 734	3. 65	0. 785
	Full recognition for my successful teaching.	3. 92	1. 154	4. 28	0. 979
	I receive proper respect	3. 64	0. 865	3. 76	0. 907
	Working conditions are comfortable	3. 82	0. 836	3. 97	0. 809
	I feel secure in my job.	3. 60	0. 883	3. 67	0. 862
	I am well paid in proportion to my ability.	3. 63	0. 858	3. 75	0. 905
	The study materials are easily available to do best.	3. 89	0. 947	3. 78	0. 945
	My immediate superior explains what is expected of me.	3. 53	0. 836	3. 54	0. 755
	Pay compares with similar jobs in other districts.	3. 57	0. 845	3. 61	0. 790
	I receive appreciation from my immediate superior.	3. 56	0. 826	3. 57	0. 832
8	**Job Involvement(5 Items)**	Cronbach's Alpha:0. 873		Cronbach's Alpha: 0. 839	
	I love my job	3. 73	0. 782	3. 56	0. 818
	Passion	3. 94	0. 824	3. 65	0. 894
	Happy with current job	3. 68	0. 839	3. 64	0. 964
	Feel worth about present job	3. 57	1. 081	3. 50	0. 785
	Want to continue the present job	3. 35	0. 828	4. 28	0. 979
9	**Burnout(3 Items)**	Cronbach's Alpha:0. 847		Cronbach's Alpha:0. 894	
	Personal accomplishment	3. 46	0. 822	3. 61	0. 830
	Emotional exhaustion	3. 52	0. 850	3. 92	0. 875
	Depersonalisation	3. 79	0. 848	3. 78	0. 830

The table 2 reveals that Cronbach's Alpha, mean and standard deviation of all the statements in the nine variables of Government and self finance colleges at Chennai, Tamilnadu. The internal consistency is also proved since the Cronbach Alpha is greater than its minimum threshold of 0. 60.

Table 3-Comparison of Mean, Occupational Stress Scores of Government and Self finance College faculties

S. No	Occupational Stress variables	Government College faculties		Self finance College faculties		"t" value
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
1	Job Pressure	22. 64	6. 072	23. 93	6. 322	-11. 2763*
2	Income	17. 31	4. 691	16. 27	4. 665	9. 0612*
3	Physical health symptoms	31. 94	8. 404	32. 89	7. 615	-8. 7227*
4	Psychological health symptoms	16. 43	3. 818	17. 71	3. 536	-10. 053*
5	Relationships	*17. 49*	4. 481	*17. 76*	4. 591	*-1. 3525*
6	Distress symptoms	36. 32	8. 769	37. 64	8. 211	-11. 8066*
7	Job satisfaction	36. 65	8. 784	37. 58	8. 569	-8. 4419*
8	Job Involvement	18. 47	4. 354	18. 63	4. 445	-. *704*
9	Burnout	10. 69	5. 118	11. 93	5. 123	-10. 9384*

Source: Primary data

As shown in Table 3, t-test is performed to ascertain whether there is any difference in occupational stress of faculties according to various stress factors. When the means of two groups compared, the difference between comparison groups is found statistically insignificant. Since 'P' value is less than 0. 05, there is a significant difference of Job pressure between Government and self finance College faculties. Based on the mean score 23. 93, Self finance College faculties are having more job pressure than the Government college faculties. From the table, it is evident that there is a significant difference of income between Government and self finance College faculties because 'p' value is less than 0. 05. Based on the mean score 17. 31. Government College faculties are having more monthly income than the Self finance college faculties.

When the means of two groups compared, the mean score (Physical health symptoms-32. 89) of Self finance college faculties are higher than the Government college faculties and the 'P' value is less than 0. 05. In the case of Psychological health symptoms self finance college faculties (mean score-32. 89) are higher than the Government College faculties and the 'P' value is less than 0. 05.

When the means of two groups compared, 'P' value is greater than 0. 05, there is no significant difference between Government and Self finance College faculties, in the case of relationships, Job Involvement. Hence null hypothesis is rejected. Self finance College faculties are having higher mean score values (Distress symptoms; 37. 64, Job satisfaction; 37. 58) than the Government college faculties. Hence, Self finance College faculties are having more Distress symptoms and Stress related disorders than the Government college faculties. In the case of burnout, self finance college faculties (mean score-11. 93) are higher than the Government College faculties and the 'P' value is less than 0. 05.

Table 4-Correlation between occupational stress and Job-involvement of Government and Self finance college faculties

Type of college and Gender	Parameters	Mean	Std. Deviation	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)
Government College faculties(Male) (N =97)	Stress	3. 840	0. 2134	0. 202	0. 348
	Job Involvement	3. 242	0. 5332		
Government College faculties(Female) (N =175)	Stress	3. 543	0. 5515	0. 330	0. 217
	Job Involvement	3. 617	0. 5942		
Self finance College faculties(Male) (N=134)	Stress	3. 578	0. 1922	0. 776	0. 001**
	Job Involvement	3. 276	0. 5882		
Self finance College faculties(Female) (N=85)	Stress	3. 424	0. 7344	0. 289	0. 039*
	Job Involvement	3. 750	0. 9051		

** Correlation is significant at the 0. 05 level (2-tailed).*

*** Correlation is significant at the 0. 01 level (2-tailed).*

From the above table 4, correlation is undertaken between stress and Job involvement. It was hypothesized that an insignificant relationship exists between stress and Job involvement. The result reveals that, there exists a weak positive and insignificant relationship between Job involvements of Government college male and female faculties and stress(r=0. 202; P >0. 05 & r=0. 330; P>0. 05). From the result, there exists a strong positive and significant relationship between Job involvements and stress(r=0. 776; P<. 05) of self finance college male faculties and weak significant relationship between Job involvements and stress(r=0. 289; P<. 05) of self finance college female faculties.

Table 5-Correlation between Occupational stress and job satisfaction of Government college faculties

Parameters		Male(N =97)		Female(N=175)	
Occupational stress	**job satisfaction**	**Pearson Correlation**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	**Pearson Correlation**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**
Occupational stress	Creativity in teaching	0. 546	0. 001**	0. 731	0. 001**
	Full recognition for my successful teaching.	0. 281	0. 432	0. 169	0. 347
	I receive proper respect	0. 682	0. 019*	0. 570	0. 042*
	Working conditions are comfortable	0. 639	0. 046*	0. 615	0. 035*
	I feel secure in my job.	0. 502	0. 145	0. 379	0. 219
	I am well paid in proportion to my ability.	0. 407	0. 231	0. 290	0. 361
	The study materials are easily available to do best.	0. 663	0. 033*	0. 183	0. 001**
	My immediate superior explains what is expected of me.	0. 384	0. 038*	0. 584	0. 020*
	Pay compares with similar jobs in other districts.	0. 523	0. 402	0. 380	0. 568
	I receive appreciation from my immediate superior.	0. 412	0. 201	0. 403	0. 137

** Correlation is significant at the 0. 05 level (2-tailed).*

*** Correlation is significant at the 0. 001 level (2-tailed).*

From the above table 5, it is evident that occupational stress of the male and female faculties have a positive and significant relationship with creativity in teaching (r=0. 546; P<0. 001& r=0. 731; P<0. 001). Occupational stress of the male and female faculties has a positive and insignificant relationship with 'Full recognition for my successful teaching'(r=0. 281; P>0. 05& r=0. 169; P>0. 05), 'I feel secure in my job' (r=0. 502; P>0. 05& r=0. 379; P>0. 05), 'I am well paid in proportion to my ability'(r=0. 407; P>0. 05& r=0. 290; P>0. 05), 'Pay compares with similar jobs in other districts' (r=0. 523; P>0. 05& r=0. 380; P>0. 05) and 'I receive appreciation from my immediate superior'(r=0. 412; P>0. 05& r=0. 403; P>0. 05). Occupational stress of the male and female faculties has a positive and significant relationship with 'I receive proper respect', 'Working conditions are comfortable', and 'My immediate superior explains what is expected of me' (P<0. 05). Occupational stress of the male faculties have a strong positive and significant relationship with 'the study materials are easily available to do best' (r=0. 663; P<0. 05). For female faculties, occupational Stress has a weak but positive and significant relationship with the 'study materials are easily available to do best' (r=0. 183; P<0. 05).

Table 6-Correlation between Occupational stress and job satisfaction of Self finance College faculties

Parameters		Male(N=134)		Female(N=85)	
Occupational Stress	**job satisfaction**	**Pearson Correlation**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	**Pearson Correlation**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**
Occupational Stress	Creativity in teaching	0. 827	0. 042*	0. 770	0. 017*
	Full recognition for my successful teaching.	0. 140	0. 013*	0. 261	0. 045*
	I receive proper respect	0. 425	0. 044*	0. 374	0. 030*
	Working conditions are comfortable	0. 849	0. 001**	0. 630	0. 001**
	I feel secure in my job.	0. 662	0. 063*	0. 511	0. 029*
	I am well paid in proportion to my ability.	*0. 391*	*0. 727*	*0. 263*	*0. 344*
	The study materials are easily available to do best.	0. 416	0. 041*	0. 330	0. 026*
	My immediate superior explains what is expected of me.	*0. 210*	*0. 711*	*0. 327*	*0. 362*
	Pay compares with similar jobs in other districts.	0. 276	0. 035*	0. 314	0. 013*
	I receive appreciation from my immediate superior.	0. 715	0. 018*	0. 820	0. 029*

** Correlation is significant at the 0. 05 level (2-tailed).*

*** Correlation is significant at the 0. 001 level (2-tailed).*

From the above table 6, Occupational Stress of the self finance college male and female faculties have a very strong positive and significant relationship With creativity in teaching (r=0. 827; P<0. 05& r=0. 770; P<0. 05). Occupational Stress of the male and female faculties has a weak, but positive and significant relationship with Full recognition for my successful teaching (r=0. 140; P<0. 05& r=0. 261; P<0. 05), I receive proper respect (r=0. 425; P<0. 05& r=0. 374; P<0. 05). The study materials are easily available to do best(r=0. 416; P<0. 05& r=0. 330; P<0. 05) and Pay compares with similar jobs in other districts (r=0. 276; P>0. 05& r=0. 314; P<0. 05). Occupational Stress of the male and female faculties has weak, *Positive* and *insignificant* relationship with 'I am well paid in proportion to my ability'(r=0. 391; P<0. 05& r=0. 263; P>0. 05) and 'My immediate superior explains what is expected of me'(r=0. 210; P>0. 05& r=0. 327; P>0. 05). Occupational Stress of the male and female faculties has a strong, positive and significant relationship with working conditions is comfortable (r=0. 849; P<0. 001& r=0. 630; P<0. 001) and I receive appreciation from my immediate superior (r=0. 715; P<0. 05& r=0. 820; P<0. 05).

Table 7-Correlation between Occupational stress and burnout of Government and Self finance college faculties

		Mean	**Std. Deviation**	**Pearson Correlation**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**
Government College faculties(Male) (N =97)	Stress	3. 840	0. 2134	0. 265	0. 044*
	Burnout	3. 716	0. 9436		
Government College faculties(Female) (N =175)	Stress	3. 543	0. 5515	0. 357	0. 001**
	Burnout	3. 934	0. 9352		
Self finance College faculties(Male) (N=134)	Stress	3. 578	0. 1922	0. 612	0. 040*
	Burnout	4. 017	0. 9292		
Self finance College faculties(Female) (N=85)	Stress	3. 424	0. 7344	0. 727	0. 031*
	Burnout	3. 973	1. 2461		

** Correlation is significant at the 0. 05 level (2-tailed).*

*** Correlation is significant at the 0. 001 level (2-tailed).*

From the above table 7, correlation is undertaken between stress and burnout. It was hypothesized that a significant relationship exists between stress and burnout. The result reveals that, there exists a weak, positive and significant relationship between burnout and stress(r=0. 265; P <0. 05 & r=0. 357; P<0. 001) of Government college male and female faculties. From the result, there exists a strong, positive and significant relationship between burnout of and stress(r=0. 512; P<. 05; r=0. 627; P<. 05) of self finance college male and female faculties. This reveals that though the self finance college faculties (both gender) have burnout due to their stress than the Government college faculties.

Table 8-Correlation between Occupational stress and gender of Government & Self finance College faculties

	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	't' Value	Df	'p' Value
Government college faculties	Male(N =97)	384. 04	21. 339	1. 368	270	0. 137
	Female (N=175)	324. 26	23. 318			
Self finance College faculties	Male(N=134)	342. 41	23. 442	3. 624	217	0. 001
	Female(N=85)	375. 07	22. 510			

** Correlation is significant at the 0. 05 level (2-tailed).*

*** Correlation is significant at the 0. 001 level (2-tailed).*

From Table 8, the mean of the Government college male and female faculties are found 384. 04 and 324. 26 with Standard Deviations of 21. 339 and 23. 318 respectively. Hence, there is no significant (t=1. 368, P>0. 001) difference between gender and occupational stress among Government college faculties. Male faculties are not necessarily having higher stress levels than their female colleagues, vice versa.

It is evident from the result that the mean of the Self finance College male and female faculties are found 342. 41 and 375. 07 with standard deviations of 23. 442 and 22. 510 respectively. When the means of two groups compared, the difference between comparison groups is found statistically significant (t=3. 624, P<0. 001). The result showed that Self finance college male faculties are significantly more stressed than female faculties with their jobs.

Table 9-Impact of Coping Strategies on burnout among the faculties

S. No.	Burn out	Regression coefficient among faculties in		
		Government college faculties	Self finance college faculties	Pooled data
1.	Time-based strategies	0. 2245*	0. 1449*	0. 1846*
2.	Information-based strategies	0. 0844	0. 1108	0. 0911
3.	Money-based strategies	0. 2667*	0. 1406*	0. 2446*
4.	Direct services	0. 2886*	0. 1309*	0. 2539*
5.	Culture change strategies	0. 1642*	0. 1247*	0. 1338*
	Constant	0. 7148	0. 9098	0. 8145
	R^2	0. 8439	0. 7142	0. 8339
	F-statistics	8. 8969*	7. 8969*	10. 0446*

** Significant at five per cent level.*

The significantly and positively influencing coping strategies on burnout among the faculties in Government college are time-based, money-based strategies and direct services and culture change strategies. A unit increase in the implementation of the above-said coping strategies results in an increase in

burnout by 0. 2245, 0. 2667, 0. 2886 and 0. 1642 units respectively. The changes in the implementation of coping strategies explain the changes in burnout among the faculties in Government college to an extent of 84. 39 per cent.

Among the faculties in Self finance college, a unit increase in the implementation of time-based, money-based strategies, direct services and culture change strategies results in an increase in burnout among them by 0. 1449, 0. 1406, 0. 1309 and 0. 1247 units respectively. The changes in the implementation of coping strategies explain the changes in stress to an extent of 71. 42 per cent. The analysis of pooled data reveals the importance of time-based, money-based, direct services and culture change strategies in the determination of burnout among the faculties.

5. DISCUSSION

In this study researchers investigated occupational stress and burnout among faculties of Government and SF colleges with job involvement, job satisfaction and coping strategies.

The main finding is that self finance college male faculties are more stressed than female faculties.

- The result reveals that, there exists a weak positive and insignificant relationship between Job involvements of Government college male and female faculties with stress.
- From the result, there exists a strong positive and significant relationship between Job involvements and stress of self finance college male faculties and weak significant relationship between Job involvements and stress of self finance college female faculties.
- Self finance college faculties (both male and female) have burnout due to their stress than the Government college faculties.
- Self finance College faculties are having more job pressure than the Government college faculties.
- Government college faculties are having more monthly income than the Self finance college faculties.
- Physical health symptoms of self finance college faculties are higher than the Government college faculties.
- Psychological health symptoms of self finance college faculties are higher than the Government college faculties.
- There is no significant difference between Government and self finance college faculties, in the case of relationships and job involvement.
- Self finance college faculties are having more distress symptoms and stress related disorders than the Government college faculties.
- In the case of burnout, self finance college faculties are higher than the Government college faculties.
- The significantly and positively influencing coping strategies on burnout among the faculties in Government college are time-based, money-based strategies and direct services and culture change strategies.
- The changes in the implementation of coping strategies explain the changes in burnout among the faculties in Government college to an extent of 84. 39 per cent.
- The significantly and positively influencing coping strategies on burnout among the faculties in self finance college are time-based, money-based strategies, direct services and culture change strategies.
- The changes in the implementation of coping strategies explain the changes in stress to an extent of 71. 42 per cent.
- Coping strategies may also be an important variable in relation to burnout. The results are consistent with a number of studies reported a relationship between faculty burnout and coping strategies (Betoret & Artiga, 2010).
- Moreover the study explored how stress and burnout of faculties were related to important variables, such as gender, income level. The findings indicated that male reported significantly higher level of occupational stress in SF colleges. This finding is confirmed in other studies (Rout & Rout, 2002) that refer to social role theory, gender roles and gender role expectations (Pines & Ronen, 2011).
- Faculties' effective use of coping strategies could serve as a factor which helps prevent work-related stress and burnout. Further research is needed to identify more specific

factors that lead to occupational stress and burnout.

6. CONCLUSION

Recently, faculties stress and burnout considered as an important issues among researchers and practitioners. This present study reveals that male faculties are more stresses than female faculties in self finance colleges. Faculties stress is a philosophical problem that must be attended with care to resolve this issue which may help to increase the morale and job interest of the faculties.

7. REFERENCES

1. Arnetz B. Wiholm, C., (1992), "Technological Stress: Psychological Symptoms in Modern Offices", Journal of Psychometric Research, 43(1), pp. 35-42.
2. August, L. & Waltman, J. (2004) Culture, Climate, and Contribution: Career Satisfaction Among Female Faculty. Research in Higher Education: 45(2) 177-192.
3. Betoret, F. D., & Artiga, A. G. (2010). Barriers perceived by teachers at work, coping strategies, self-efficacy and burnout. Spanish Journal of Psychology, 13, 637-654.
4. BLAU, G. The me asurement and prediction of caree r commitment. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 1985, 58, 277-288.
5. Chaplain, R. (1995), Stress and job satisfaction: a study of English primary school teachers, Educational Psychology, 15, 4, 473-489.
6. Conti, R., Angelis, J., Cooper, C., Faragher, B., Gill, C., 2006. The effects of lean production on worker job stress. International Journal of Operations and Production Management 26(9), 1013-1038.
7. Edmundz A. Morris, A (2000), "The Problem of Information Overload in Business Organization: A Review of literature", International Journal of Information Management, 20(1), pp. 17-28.
8. Fernet, C., Guay, F., Senectal, C., & Austin, S. (2012). Predicting intra individual changes in teacher burnout: The role of perceived school environment and motivational factors. Teaching and Teacher Education, 28, 514-525.
9. Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1995). Job stressors, job involvement and employee health: A test of identity theory. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 68, 1-11.
10. Griffith, J., Steptoe, A., & Cropley, M. (1999). An investigation of coping strategies associated with job stress in teachers. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 69, 517-531.
11. Sax, L. J., Hagedorn, L. S., Arredondo, M., & Dicrisi, F. A., III. (2002). Faculty research productivity: Exploring the role of gender and family-related factors. Research in Higher Education, 43(4), 423-446.
12. Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. New Directions for Institutional Research, 105, 5-20.
13. Higgins, C, Duxbury, L., and Lee, C. (1992), "Balancing Work and Family: A Study of the Canadian Private Sector, London, Oritario: National Centre for Research, Management and Development
14. Olivier, M., & Williams, E. (2005). Teaching the mentally handicapped child: Challenges teachers are facing. The International Journal of Special Education, 20, 19-31.
15. Kantas, A. (1995). Group processes-conflict-development and change-culture-occupational stress. Athens: Greek Letters.
16. Kanungo RN (1982). Measurement of Job and Work Involvement. J. Appl. Psychol. 67(3):341-349
17. Kyriacou, C. (2001). Faculty Stress: Directions for Future Research. Educational Review, 53(1), 27-35
18. Lawler, E. E. (1986). High involvement management: participative strategies for improving organizational performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
19. Lodahl, T., and Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49, 24-33.
20. Manthei, R. and Gilmore, A. (1996). Teacher Stress in Intermediate Schools. Educational Research, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 3-19. McKenna, 1987
21. Montgomery, C., & Rupp, A. (2005). A meta-analysis for exploring the diverse causes and

effects of stress in teachers. Canadian Journal of Education, 28, 461-488.

22. O'Driscoll, M. P. and Randall, D. M. (1999). Perceived organizational support, satisfaction with rewards, and employee job involvement and organizational commitment. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 48(2), 197-209.
23. Pfeffer, J. (1994). Competitive advantage through people. Boston: Harvard Business, School Press.
24. Pines, A. M., & Ronen, S. (2011). Gender differences in burnout. In A. S. Antoniou, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), New directions in organizational psychology and behavioral medicine (pp. 107-122). Burlington: Gower Publishing Company.
25. Probst, T. M. (2000). Wedded to the job: Moderating effects of job involvement on the consequences of job insecurity. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5, 63-73. Reybold, 2005
26. Riolli, L., & Savicki, V. (2002). Optimism and coping as moderators of the relationship between chronic stress and burnout. Psychological Repairing, 92, 1215-1226.
27. Roed, K., Fevang, E., 2007. Organizational change absenteeism and welfare dependency. The Journal of Human Resources 42(1), 156-193.
28. Rosser, V. J. (2005). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their work life and satisfaction. Research in Higher Education, 45(3), 285-309.
29. Rout, U. R., & Rout, J. K. (2002). Stress management for primary health professionals. New York: Kluwer Acadamic/Plenum Publishers.
30. Schwab, R., Jackson, S., & Schuler, R. (1986). Educator burnout: Sources and consequences. Educational Research Quarterly, 10, 14-30.
31. Selye, H., (1983), the stress concept: Past, Present and Future. In C. L. Cooper (Ed.) Stress: Myth, Theory and Research, Prentice Hall.
32. Smart, J. C. (1990). A causal model of faculty turnover intentions. Research in Higher Education, 31(5), 405-424.
33. Smith, M. & Bourke, S. (2002), Teacher stress: examining a model based on context, workload and satisfaction, Teaching and Teacher Education, 8, 1, 31-46
34. Spector, P. E. (1997). Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences.
35. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Spielberger, C. D., and Reheliser, E. C., (1995), "Measuring Work Stress: The Job Stress Survey", In R. Grandall and P. L. Perrewes(eds)., Occupational Stress: A Hand Work, Washington, DC: Taylors and Francis, pp. 51-69.
36. Tsiakkiros, A., & Pasiardis, P. (2002). Occupational stress of teachers and school principals. Paidagogical Review, 33, 195-213.
37. Uma Bhowon and J., Ali. Kion (2004), "Organizational Climate and Stress: A Study of Managers in Mauritius", Psychological Studies, January, pp. 45-51.
38. Vahtera, J., Kivimaki, M., Pentti. J., Linna, A., Vitranen, P., Ferrie, J. E., 2004. Organizational downsizing, sick ness absence and mortality: 10 town prospective cohort study. British Medical Journal 6, 328