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The Impact of Administrative Demand, Work Schedule and Environmental Factors on Job Stress Among Private Owned Universities in Nigeria

INTRODUCTION

Job life is one of the important parts of our daily lives which cause a great deal of stress. Job stress has become a prominent topic in behavioural science research. Researchers reviews (Brief, Schuler & Van Sell 1983; Quick & Quick 1984) confirm positive relationships between job stress, physical and psychiatric symptomaticity. Job stress is considered to be a factor that may affect organizational effectiveness through lowering employee performance (McGrath, 1976), absenteeism, tardiness, and turnover (Johnson, 1980).

Occupational stress, also known as job stress, has been defined as the experience of negative emotional states such as frustration, worry, and anxiety and depression-attributed to work related factor (Klyriacov, 2001). According to Beehr (1995) job stress is defined as “a situation in which some characteristics of the work situation are thought to cause poor psychological or physical health, or to cause risk factors making poor health more likely”. Stress in the work place is said to be pervasive and invasive. The 1992 annual United Nations report cited stress in work place as a “20th century disease”. Akinboye, Akinboye & Adeyemo (2002) describes job stress as “the harmful physical and emotional response that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker. Swent & Gmelch (1977) found that the main source of stress for educational administrators occurred in the work environment. Coleman (1976) found that job stress influences the employee’s job satisfaction and their overall performance in their work. This is due to the fact that most of the organizations now are demanding for the better job outcomes. In fact, modern times have been called as the “age of anxiety and stress”. Beehrand &Newman (1978) explained stress as a situation which will force a person to deviate from normal functioning due to the change (i.e. disrupt or enhance) in his / her psychological and or physiological condition such that the person is forced to deviate from normal functioning.

Alexandros – Stamatios, Matilyn &Cary (2003) opined that management role or administrative demand of an organization is one of the aspects that cause work related stress among workers. Workers in an organization do face occupational stress through the role stress that the management gave. Role stress means anything about an organizational role that produces adverse consequences for the individual (Kahn &Quinn, 1970).

Management will have their own role that stands as their related. Role related are concerned with how individual perceive the expectations other have of them and includes role ambiguity and role conflict.

Several studies have confirmed that the combination of high demands on workers produces job stress
and is also related to heart disease. Alexandros – Stamatios, Matilyn & Cary (2003) in their study, found that the more latitude men had in making decisions on their job, the lower was their death rate from coronary heart disease. In addition, they found that workers in high demand and low decision jobs had an elevated risk of heart disease mortality and the risk was greater for white-collar workers than for the blue-collar workers. Repetti (1993) also found that poor relationship between the superior and the workers contribute to the level of stress experienced by the workers. He found that the workers experienced more negative moods on days when they had distressing interactions with superiors and co-workers.

Environment according to McKenna (1994) can be defined as an active force that constantly poses challenges to the organization. These challenges may change radically from time to time. The environment has considered effects on the physical, psychological and physiological well being of an individual. They are two types of environment; the primary and secondary environment. The primary environment is the place where people spend most of their time, relate to others on a personal basis and engage in many personally important activities e.g. residence, classroom and place of work which is the concern. The secondary environment is the wider total environment that indirectly influences people’s lives. Mostly, when psychologists refer to environment, they have in mind specific aspect of the total environment which may have an impact either good or bad on our daily lives. Belbin (1993) identified two broad aspect of the environment which appear to affect work group behaviour. These are:

a. the physical environment such as plant, equipment, temperature, lighting, noise level, workplace layout etc. and

b. the psychological environment such as worker needs, reward and incentive systems, working group structure, supervisory practices, work group norms, work roles, workers attitudes, work conditions and so on

Robbins, (1991) attributed that lack of provision for basic working amenities like comfortable furniture, water medical facilities, toilet facilities, office equipments, research grants and opportunities, lecturer halls, instructional materials, security, transportation, personal incentive can result to job stress. Also, psychological problems such as anxiety, tiredness, job dissatisfaction, depression and even physiological ailments like high blood pressure, constant malaria, headache and so on are been experienced by both academic and administrative staff of the University as a result of stress.

The problem of this study therefore, is to investigate how administrative demand, work schedule and environmental factors contribute to job stress among some selected private University in Nigeria. The study also is also aimed at addressing the issue of how stress at work can be effectively managed, reduced, or prevented by the University administration in order to enhance the physical and mental health or improve their personal and work behaviour. For these reason the following hypotheses will be tested:

1. There is no significant difference between Administrative Demand, Work Schedule and Environmental Factors on job stress

2. There is no relationship between Administrative Demand, Work Schedule and Environmental Factors and job stress
3. There is no significant joint contribution of Administrative Demand, Work Schedule, Environmental Factors and job stress

METHOD

Design

The study adopted as descriptive survey design of ex-post facto type. This is so because the researcher is only interested in determining the influence of the independent variables (Administrative Demand, Work Schedule and Environmental Factors) on the criterion variable (job stress).

Population, Sample and Sampling techniques

The population for this study was made up of workers (Academic & Non-Academic) from whose ages ranged from 20 – 65 years, chosen from some selected private Universities in Nigeria. A sample of 250 workers was randomly selected. The mean age of the respondent was 39.2 while the standard deviation was 13.291.

INSTRUMENTATION:

The instrument consists of structured questions developed by the Researcher. Section A consists of demographic data like gender and school type, while section B consists of structured questions which measure job stress. The questions were made in such a way that it measured different aspect of job stress in relation to Administrative Demand, Work Schedule and Environmental Factors. Some questions were taken while some were deleted. A total number of 30 questions were taken in which ten questions were in each section. Participant responded to the questions statement in a 5 – point likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree – 2, Neither -3, Slightly Agree – 4.and Strongly Agree-5

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

The questionnaire was subjected to face validity and content validity by the assistance of experts in research method. Some questions were reconstructed, while some were deleted. A reliability coefficient of 0.76 was obtained via a test-retest method after an internal of 2 weeks.

RESULTS

H0: There is no significant difference between Administrative Demand, Work Schedule and Environmental Factors on job stress.

Table 1: One way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of Administrative Demand, Work Schedule and Environmental Factors on Job stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Demand Between Group</td>
<td>27362.13</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>13.613</td>
<td>2.058</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result in table 1 indicated there is a significant difference between the three variables and
job stress. A significant level existed in Administrative Demand and job stress ($F_{201,48}=2.058; P<.05$); Work Schedule ($F_{201,48}=2.441; P<.05$) and Environmental Factors ($F_{201,48}=3.377; P<.05$). The hypothesis of no significant differences between Administrative Demand, Work Schedule and Environmental Factors on job stress is thereby discarded and the alternate is accepted. The finding implies that Job stress is affected by the 3 variables.

$H_{02}$ - There is no significant relationship between Administrative Demand, Work Schedule, Environmental Factors and job stress.

**Table 2:** Correlation Matrix of the Administrative Demand, Work Schedule and Environmental Factors and job stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>job stress</th>
<th>Administrative Demand</th>
<th>Work Schedule</th>
<th>Environmental Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>job stress</td>
<td>21.6754</td>
<td>4.4532</td>
<td>.650**</td>
<td>.676**</td>
<td>.751**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Demand</td>
<td>18.6900</td>
<td>2.3421</td>
<td>.650**</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.407**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Schedule</td>
<td>17.8965</td>
<td>1.9856</td>
<td>.676**</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.388**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Results indicated that job stress is positively related to Administrative Demand ($r = .650; P < .05$); Work Schedule ($r = .676; P < .05$) and Environmental Factors ($r = .751; P < .05$); Also, Administrative Demand is positively related to Environmental Factors ($r = .454; P < .05$), and Environmental Factors ($r = .407; P < .05$); and
Work Schedule is related to Environmental Factors = (r = .409; P > .05).

Hence, the hypothesis of no relationship is thereby discarded and the alternative is accepted.

**Ho₃** - There is no significant contribution of Administrative Demand, Work Schedule and Environmental Factors and job stress.

**Table 3:** Multiple Regressions (backward) showing Combined Contribution of Administrative Demand, Work Schedule and Environmental Factors and job stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Predictors: (Constant) Environmental Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Predictors (Constant) Work Schedule and Environmental Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Predictors (Constant) Administrative Demand, Work Schedule and Environmental Factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result above shows that Administrative Demand, Work Schedule and Environmental Factors would together contribute to Job Stress. In the Model above, Model 1 shows a co-efficient of (R) = .751, R² = .564 and adjusted R² of .558 was observed. This indicates 55.8% of job stress is responsible for by Environmental Factors. Model 2, however shows co-efficient of Multiple Regressions (R) = .853; R² = .728 and adjusted R² = .719. This means that combination of Environmental Factors and Work Schedule would responsible for 71.9% of Job Stress. While in Model 3. A coefficient (R) =.890; R²=.792; and adjusted R²=.782 and with this 78.2% of job stress is accounted for by these three.

**DISCUSSION**

The research study investigated the impact of Administrative Demand, Work Schedule and Environmental Factors on Job stress among selected private Universities in Nigeria. As a result of the three main null hypotheses were formulated and tested in the study. The results of this study are discussed in line with the hypotheses.

The result of the first hypothesis, which postulated that there is no significant difference between administrative demand work schedule and environmental factors, is discarded as the result revealed a significant difference. The findings of this study is in line with the findings of Alexandros – Stamatos, Matilyn & Cary (2003) who established that administrative demand (management role) is one of the
aspects that affect work related stress among workers/staff. It is also seen that the work schedule of the private university is hectic this is due to the fact that private universities are only mainly sustained through the monies generated within no subvention from the government and due to this, a lot of the worker are extremely stressed to work. This result is also similar to a research in UK which indicated that the majority of the workers were unhappy with the current culture where they work required working extended hours and coping with large work while simultaneously meeting production targets and deadlines (Townley 2000). The environmental factor is also noted ot have significant effect on job stress.

The second hypothesis which state that there is no relationship between administrative demand work schedule and environmental factors and job stress. It sis shown that a positive relationship between job stress and the three independent variables exist. Apart from this, there is a strong relationship between all the three variables. This is in line with stamps and Picdmonte (1986) that job satisfaction has been found significant relationship with job stress. In other study, Vinokur-Kaplan (1991) states that organization factors such as workload and working condition were negatively related with job satisfaction. The implication of the findings of this study indicates that job stress is affected by these three variables.

The third hypothesis postulated that there is no significant contribution of the Administrative Demand, work schedule and environmental factors and job stress. The result 2 in Model 3 indicates that 55.8%, 71.9% and 78.2% of the stress encountered by workers are due to these three factors. This result is similar to some recent research that has endeavoured to use an attribution of responsibility theory to explain teacher occupational stress (McCormick, 2000). The theory posits that teachers blame their occupational stress on various aspect of the work environment (such as students, school administration and school system) are separate domains to which teachers may attribute their stress (McCormick, 1997a, 1997b, 2000). Research by Brown and Ralph (1992) identified working / environmental conditions in terms of staff facilities, as a source of teachers’ stress. Punch &Tutteman (1996) reported a similar finding.

CONCLUSION

Based on the finding of this study, it could be concluded that Administrative Demand, Work Schedule and Environmental Factors are Determinants of Job Stress in Nigeria Private Universities. Unhealthy job stress among the people responsible in assisting the future generations’ education will ultimately affect their intellectual and social abilities. Failure of the educational institutions in providing a health working environment or even a working environment with the minimal level possible of unhealthy job stress would lead to many more problems in the near future, especially in the employees’ work performance in teaching students and administrative part of the university.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the outcome of this research, it is hereby recommended for effectiveness and efficiency that the work schedule needs to be flexible for the workers so as to avoid burn-out of workers. Their working conditions need to be improved by giving them adequate salary that commensurate with the demands of their jobs. Their promotion should be done as at when due to boost their morale. Workers should be involved in vital decisions concerning their jobs.
Also, the environment needs to be more conducive by the provision of adequate facilities or instruments to work with recreative activities or centres for relaxations. It is hoped that when workers are given adequate support by their employers or when their needs are adequately met many of them will experience less tension or stress at work. Lastly, there is a need for counselling psychologists, social workers, health practitioners need to mount campaign or organize workshops/seminar on anti-stress strategies since it is a known fact that stresses at work cannot be avoided.
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