Stress, Problem Solving Approach, and Job Satisfaction Among Faculty Members and Non-Teaching Personnel at Higher Education Institutions in Sulu

Nijara Hayudini Najar, Ed.D.
Sulu State College, Sulu, Philippines
nijaranajar2@gmail.com

Abstract

This study sought to determine the extent of correlation and the significant difference between job stress, problem solving approach and job satisfaction among faculty members and support personnel when data are grouped according to gender, age, civil status, length of service, highest educational qualification, academic rank/position and status of employment. This study answered the following research questions on the bases of the following hypotheses: 1) There is no significant relationship between levels of job stress, problem solving approach and job satisfaction among faculty members and support staff at higher educational institutions in Sulu; 2) There a no significant difference in levels of job stress among faculty members and support personnel at higher educational institutions when data are classified according to Age; Gender; Civil status; Length of service; Academic rank/position; Educational qualification; and Employment status; 3) There is no significant difference in levels of problem solving approach among faculty members and support personnel when data are classified according to Age; Gender; Civil status; Length of service; Academic rank/position; Educational qualification; and Employment status; 4) There a significant difference in levels of job satisfaction among faculty members and support personnel when data are classified according to Age; Gender; Civil status; Length of service; Academic rank/position; Educational qualification; and Employment status. This study employed the Descriptive-correlation research design with 200 samples amongst faculty members and support personnel currently employed at higher educational institutions in Sulu during School Year 2015-2016.

The research instruments used were patterned and adapted from Safety Health Executive (SHE) Indicator Tool (Cousins et al., 2004) in Kinner and Wray; Problem-Solving Style (key.kf/files.wordpress.com, 2015) whose validity and reliability had been established and Job satisfaction (Drukpa, 2011). The mean and standard deviation were used to determine the extent of job stress, problem solving approach and job satisfaction. The t-Test for independent samples and One-Way ANOVA were used to determine the significant differences between the levels of job stress and problem-solving approach. Test of Multiple Regression was used to determine the significant relationship between the levels of job stress, problem solving approach and job satisfaction among faculty members and support staff.

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the nature of work is rapidly changing. Working very intensively and keeping pace with work speed to ensure job satisfaction are crucial. Job stress now poses a significant threat to employee health and, consequently, to the health of both private and public organizations, particularly in higher education institutions. Indeed, a substantial majority of employees report experiencing more on-the-job stress than previous generations Princeton Survey Research Associates. Obviously, Stress is everywhere, but as a relatively new phenomenon. How can this define and explain its extraordinary cost to private and government entities? The suffering caused by stress is real, but can this be accurately examined the relationship between stress, steps that can be taken to prevent it (the coping mechanisms), and job satisfaction? whatever, stress it has grown immensely in recent years. Which brings us to question- what is happening in educational institutions that is causing stress? the Reports shows that stress has a greatest effect on those at very bottom of the socio-economic and educational ladders. Whilst it is arguable that the term "stress" is so ubiquitous that it has been entirely cut adrift from both professional discourse and real-life experience, it still retains a profoundly serious phenomenon. real or imagined, misunderstood or misused, rare or widespread, the problem of stress cannot be ignored. Stress is the reaction people have to excessive pressures or other demands placed upon them. It arises when they worry that they cannot cope (Health and Safety Executive, Raymond 2000). Stress occurs where demands made on individuals do not match the resources available or meet the individual's needs and motivation… stress will be the result if the workload is too large for the number of workers and time available. Equally, a boring or repetitive task which does not use the potential skills and experience of some individuals will cause them stress. The emotional, cognitive, behavioral and physiological reaction to aversive and noxious aspects of work, work environments and work organizations. It is a state characterized by high levels of arousal and distress and often by feelings of not coping (European Commission, DG, Guidance on work-related stress: 1999). Cox, T. (2007) describes stress as a psychological state derived from the person's appraisal of their ability to cope with the demands which are made of them. It arises when individuals perceive a discrepancy between the physical or psychological demands of a situation and the resources of his or her biological, psychological or social systems (Sarafino, 2012 in McLeod, S. A., 2015). In educational institution, job stress involves a transaction between the teacher or a support personnel and his work environment. That is, his physical and emotional responses when there is a conflict between the job demands on him and the amount of control he has over meeting these demands. In general, the combination of high demands in a job and a low amount of control over the situation, it is where the teacher or support personnel may experience stress. Blaug et al. (2007) through the "The work Foundation" identified workload as the most pervasive factor linked to work-related stress. Accordingly, there is little change in the relative importance of any of the factors linked to work-related stress since 2000. Factors other than workloads include cuts in staff, change, long hours, bullying, shift work and sex or racial harassment. Moreover, in 2007, Manjula, C. mentioned as fear of job duplication, layoffs due to an uncertain financial stability, increased demands for overtime due to staff shortage are sources of negative stressors. Employees who start to feel the 'pressure to perform' can get caught in a downward spiral of increasing effort to meet rising expectations with no increase in job satisfaction. The relentless requirement to work at optimum performance takes its toll in job dissatisfaction, employee turnover, reduced efficiency, illness and even death. Absenteeism, illness, alcoholism, 'petty internal politics', bad or baseless decisions, indifference and apathy, lack of motivation or creativity are all by-products of an over stressed workplace (p. 11).

Job satisfaction varies and researchers, for example Peretomode (1991) and Whawo (1993), have suggested that the higher the prestige of the job, the greater the job satisfaction. Many workers, however, are satisfied in even the least prestigious jobs. That is, they simply like what they do. In any case, job satisfaction is as individual as one's feelings or state of mind. Job satisfaction can be influenced by a variety of factors, for example, the quality of one's relationship with their supervisor, the quality of the physical environment in which they work, the degree of fulfillment in their work, etc. However, there is no strong

acceptance among researchers, consultants, etc., that increased job satisfaction produces improved job performance. Layard in Blaug et al. (2007) examines the link between stress and happiness, vis-à-vis satisfaction, where human happiness is both objective and quantifiable. He uses this to provide empirical evidence to demonstrate that increased wealth and prosperity do not necessarily make for happier citizens, even though people living in rich nations do tend to be happier than those living in poor ones. Layard identifies some factors that affect happiness, with work being the most significant, since in addition to providing income, it is work which brings added meaning to life, creating self-respect and other social relationships. However, the reverse is also true: work can generate stress and unhappiness, which can be attributed to our inherent desire for social status. In higher educational institution's workplace, stress may result from varied outlets. These may include: a) Factors unique to the job like workload (overload and under load), pace/variety/meaningfulness of work, autonomy (e.g., the ability to make your own decisions about your own job or about specific tasks), shift work/hours of work, physical environment (noise, air quality, etc.), isolation at the workplace (emotional or working alone); and b) Role in the organization such as role conflict (conflicting job demands, multiple supervisors/managers), role ambiguity (lack of clarity about responsibilities, expectations, etc.) and level of responsibility. On the other hand, the problem of stress in the workplaces among higher education institutions requires concrete responses from the administrators because there is clearly a growing responsibility for them to contribute to the prevention and management of stress in the workplace. A recent report by the National Association of Mental Health in Blaug et al. (2007) confirms that the individual employee's personality and coping strategy' can have direct, moderating or perceptual effects on stress outcomes. That is, a coping strategy to stress must be well-considered. Problem solving as coping strategy may be defined as a behavioral process which (a) makes available a variety of response alternatives for dealing with a problematic situation, and (b) increases the probability of selecting the most effective response from among these alternatives. Five stages of problem solving, namely: (a) general orientation or "set," (b) problem definition and formulation, (c) generation of alternatives, (d) decision making, and (e) verification (D'Zurilla, Thomas J.; Goldfried, Marvin R.,1971).Employees will engage in both emotion-focused and problem-focused coping processes to manage or deal with the conditions and situations in their organizational environment (Hart, P.M. & Cooper, C.L., 2001). In the higher educational institutions like private and public colleges in Jolo, Sulu, employees are assumed to experience stressful work conditions and thus, tend to react in various ways. Therefore, owing to the propositions aforementioned above, this study was conducted to gather empirical data on job stress, problem solving approach and job satisfaction among faculty members and support personnel who are currently employed at the higher education institutions in Jolo, Sulu. The data obtained for this research were used accordingly to support or deny such claims.

METHOD

This chapter deals with the research methodology that was adopted in the conduct of this study. It covers research design, research locale, respondents of the study, sampling procedure data gathering procedure and tools, research instrument, validity and reliability, and statistical treatment of data.

Research Design

A descriptive research design through a correlational research method was used in this study, that is with the intent to describe, quantity, and infer as well as to discover relationship among variables and to allow the prediction of future events from present knowledge or phenomenon of college faculty members and support personnel, namely:

1.) The level of stress among faculty members and support personnel at higher education institutions in Sulu in the following categories: Demand. Control, Support by immediate superior, Support by peers

Relationship, Role, and Change., 2) The level of problem solving approach among faculty members and support personnel at higher education institutions in Sulu in the following categories: Sensing, Intuitive, Feeling, and Thinking3) The level of job satisfaction among faculty members and support personnel at higher education institutions in Sulu in the following categories: Work, Income, working 4) The significant relationship between levels of job stress, problem solving approach and job satisfaction among faculty members and support personnel at higher education institutions in Sulu, 4) The significant difference in levels of job stress among faculty members and support personnel when data are classified according to Age; Gender, Civil status, Academic rank/position, Length of service, educational qualification, and Employment status, 5.)The significant difference in levels of problem-solving approach among faculty members and support staff when data are classified according to Age, Gender, Civil status, Academic rank/position, Length of service, educational qualification, and Employment status, and the 6.) The significant difference in levels of job satisfaction among faculty members and support difference when data are classified according to Age, Gender, Civil status, Academic rank/position, Length of personnel service educational qualification, and Employment status.

Faculty members and support personnel as respondents were the main source of data which were quantified to answer the research questions in this study. Library and internet research were the sources of information that were used to enrich the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of this research. The data from the respondents were collected through the use of questionnaires.

Research Locale

This study was conducted in the province of Sulu specifically among faculty members and support personnel at higher educational institutions during the School Year2017-2018. These higher educational institutions included both public and private colleges that are under the direct supervision of the Commission on Higher Education (CHED). Faculty members included in this study are those college professor and instructors teaching at the different academic departments regardless of courses/subjects they are handing. However, the support personnel used in this study include the support staff who are working as clerks, encoders, library and laboratory aides that are prorated in various offices such as College Registrar, Accounting, Budget, Library, Science and Nursing Laboratories, Student Affairs, Student Admission, Counseling, and College Clinic and Health Services.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents of this study were the college faculty members and support personnel who are currently employed at the higher educational institutions in Sulu
during the school year 2017-2018. Figure 2. Distribution of the target Samples Among Faculty Members and Support Personnel.

Public	Frequency	Frequency	Frequency	percent
MSU-SULU	50	5o	100	100%
Sulu State College	50	50	100	100%
Private				
Notre Dame of Jolo College 50	50	50	100	100%
Southern Mindanao Islamic Institute	50	50	100	100%

Sampling Design

A purposive sampling method was employed in this study. Representatives of one hundred (100) samples from the faculty and one hundred (100) from the support personnel were purposively chosen based on the availability of teachers and support personnel. A total of two hundred (200) teachers and support personnel constituted the samples of this study. The use of purposive sampling in this study was ensure the representation of Age, Gender, Civil status, Academic rank/position, Length of service, educational qualification, and Employment status of both faculty and support personnel.

Data Gathering Procedure

The following steps were followed in the course of data gathering. 1) A permit to administer the questionnaire was sought from the Dean of the school of Graduate of the Sulu State College and then from the College President/Chancellor of the participating HIES, and 2) The laughing and administering as well as the retrieval of the questionnaire were conducted personally by the researcher.

Research Instrument

A self-report questionnaire was the main instrument that was employed to gather data on job stress, problem solving approach and job satisfaction of faculty members and support personnel. The instrument to be used in this research was patterned and adapted from safety health Executive (SHE) Indicator Tool (Cousins et al, 2004 in Kinman and Wray, 2013), Problem-Solving Style (ikepyki files. Wordpress.com, 2015) whose validity and reliability had been established and job satisfaction (Drukpa, 2011). The research instrument that was used in this study consisted of four parts. Part 1 of the questionnaire focused on obtaining the demographic profile of the respondents which include Age; Gender, Civil Status; Academic rank/position; length of service; Educational qualification; and Employment status. And the part II dealt with the collection of data on job stress along the following levels such as demand, control, support by immediate superior, support by peers; relationship; role, and change. Part III Geared towards obtaining data on problem solving approach on each of the following levels namely: sensing, intuitive, feeling and thinking. While part IV was designed to obtain data job satisfaction which include work, income, working condition, self-esteem policy and management, intrinsic rewards and interpersonal relation.

Validity and Reliability

The instrument that was used in this research was patterned and adapted from the standardized instruments which have been used in previous studies. There are the safety Health Executive (ikepyki.files.com, 2015) and job satisfaction (Drukpa, 2011) whose validity and reliability had been established however, to suit its applicability to the local settings, this questionnaire was subjected for perusal of at least two experts from among the faculty members of the school of Graduate Studies of Sulu State College

Statistical Treatment of Data

Point	Scale	Descriptors
4	3.50-4.49	High Extent
3	2.50-3.49	Moderate Extent
2	1.50-2.49	Low Extent
1	1.00-1.149	No Extent

Both descriptive and inferential statistical tools were appropriately employed in the treatment of data that were gathered for this study, namely: 1) Mean, Percentages and standard deviation were employed to determine the following:

a. The profile of faculty members and support staff in terms of Age, Gender, Civil Status; Academic rank/position; length of service. Educational qualification; and Employment status;

b. Level of stress among faculty members and support personnel at higher educational institutions in each of the following categories; Demand, Control; Support by immediate superior; support by peers; Relationship; Role, and Change;

c. Level of Problem-solving approach among faculty members and support personnel at higher educational institutions in each of the following categories; Sensing; Intuitive; Feeling; and thinking;

d. Level of problem job satisfaction among faculty members and support personnel at higher educational institutions in each of the following categories: work, income, working condition, self-esteem, policy and management, intrinsic rewards and interpersonal relation.

1) T-test for independent samples was employed to determine the significant differences in the levels of job stress, problem solving approach and job satisfaction when data are grouped according to gender;

2) One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed to determine the significant differences in the level of job stress, problem solving approach and job satisfactions when data are grouped according to Age; Civil Status; Academic rank/position; length of service; and educational qualification.

3) Multiple Regression using standard method (Enter) was used to determine the significant correlation between the levels of job stress, problem solving approach and job satisfaction.

The following rating scales intervals were adopted in the analyses of the results of the computations yielded by both descriptive and Inferential statistical tools.

A.) Rating scales interval on respondents' levels of job stress and problem-solving approach based on modified Likert Scale:

Point	Scale Value	Descriptors
5	4.50-5.00	Very satisfied
4	3.50-4-4.49	Satisfied
3	2.50-3.49	Moderate
2	1.50-2.49	Least Satisfied
1	1.00-1.49	Not Satisfied

B.) Rating Scales Interval on respondents' job satisfaction based on 5-point Likert scales

C.) Correlation coefficient Scales; Adopted from Hopkins, will (2002)

Values	Descriptors
0.9-1.00	Nearly perfect correlation
0.7-0.90	Very High Correlation
0.5-0.70	High Correlation
0.3-0.50	Moderate Correlation
0.1-0.30	Low Correlation
0.0-0.10	Nearly Zero Correlation

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of results based on the data gathered for this study. It also tackles the extent of faculty and support staff of job stress in relation to problem solving approach as well as their differences when data are grouped according to age, gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, status of employment, academic rank and position. Based on the appropriate scoring and statistical treatments of data obtained for this study, the following are the presentations, analyses and interpretations of results which correspond to each of the research questions.

1. What is the socio-demographic profiles of faculty members and support personnel at higher education institutions in Sulu in terms of: 1.1. Age; 1.2. Gender; 1.3. Civil status; 1.4. Length of service; 1.5. Academic rank/position; 1.6. Educational qualification; and 1.7. Employment status?

When data are categorized according to the demographic profile in terms of gender, female teachers and support personnel components constitute 57% and 56% while their male counterparts constitute 43% and 44% of the total 200 samples. In terms of age, 48% of faculty and 38% personnel belong to age range of 30 years old and below. 48% among the teachers are single while 55% of the personnel are married employees. In terms of years of experience at 10 years and below make 69% among faculty and 66% among personnel. 81% instructor, clerk with 48%, MA/MS (Full-pledged) degree holders with 41% while 47% with AB/BS. Other components obtained the percentage scores as shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Summary table of the demographic profile of faculty and support staff

Demographic Profile	Sub Categories					
		Faculty		Personnel		
		f	%	f	%	Total
Gender	Male	43	43%	44		87
	Female	57	57%	56		113
Age	30 years and below	48	48%	38		86
	31-40 years	28	28%	30		58
	41-50years	16	16%	23		39
	51 years &above	8	8%	9		17
Civil Status	Single		48%	42		90
	Married		46%	55		101
	Separated		4%	3		7
	widowed		2%	0		2
Length of service	1o years & below		69%	66		135
	11-20 years		22%	26		48
	21 years & above		9%	8		17

Academic Rank (Faculty)	Instructor Asst. Professor Asso. Professor Professor		81% 14% 4% 1%			81 14 4 1
Position (Support Staff)	Encoder Clerk Laboratory Aide Director/ Head/Chief of Office others			38 48 2 6 6		38 48 2 6 6

REFERENCES

Baker, T. L. (1999). Doing social research. McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Broad, K., & Evans, M. (n.d.). A review of literature on professional development content and delivery modes for experienced teachers. University of Toronto. Retrieved from http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/site/userFiles/file/AReviewofLiteratureonPD.pdf

Brown, S. (n.d.). Assessment for learning. Retrieved from http://www.glos.ac.uk/offload/tli/lets/lathe/issue1/articles/brown.pdf

Cooper, C. L., Rout, U., & Faragher, B. (1989). Mental health, job satisfaction, and job stress among general practitioners. BMJ, 298(6670), 366–370. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.298.6670.366

Cross, D. (1989). Observation and teacher evaluation. In A forum anthology (Vol. 4).

Daleon, S. O., Baccay, E. S., & De Guzman, A. F. (1989). Fundamentals of statistics. National Bookstore, Inc.

de Jong, L. (2011). Questionnaire work-attributed stress. Retrieved from home.concepts.nl/~kl47693/downloads/files/QWAS201101v03.pdf

de Mello Alves, M. G., Chor, D., Faerstein, E., Werneck, G. L., & Lopes, C. S. (2004). Short version of the "job stress scale": A Portuguese language adaptation. Revista de Saúde Pública, 38(2), 1–7. http://www.fsp.usp.br/rsp

Downie, N. M., & Heath, R. W. (1984). Basic statistical methods (5th ed.). Harper and Row Publishing, Inc.

Finocchiaro, M. (1988). Teacher development a continuing process. In A forum anthology (Vol. 4).

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2003). How to design and evaluate research in education (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Hart, P. M., & Cooper, C. L. (2001). Occupational stress: Toward a more integrated framework. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology: Vol. 2. Personnel psychology (pp. 93–114). Sage Publications.

Huysman, J. T. (2008). Rural teacher satisfaction: An analysis of beliefs and attitudes of rural teachers' job satisfaction. Journal of Research in Rural Education, 23(3), 1–16. http://www.umaine.edu/jrre/20-3.htm

Irilis, J. A. (2009). Organizational climate and confluence of burnout on the performance of teachers in selected elementary schools in Sulu 1 and Basilan [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Sulu State College.

Kinman, G., & Wray, S. (2013). A survey of stress and well-being among staff in higher education. University and College Union. http://www.ucu.org.uk

Kho, O. W. Y. (1988). Towards self-evaluation: A framework for teacher development. In A forum anthology (Vol. 4).

Maggioli-Díaz, G. (2003). Options for teacher professional development (Digest EDO-FL-03-11). ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/0311maggioli.html

Manjula, C. (2007). A study on personality factors causing stress among school teachers [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Mother Teresa Women's University.

Mansoor, M., Fida, S., Nasir, S., & Ahmad, Z. (2011). The impact of job stress on employee job satisfaction: A study on telecommunication sector of Pakistan. Journal of Business Studies Quarterly, 2(3), 50–56.

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. (n.d.). Rationale for NIOSH generic job stress questionnaire. U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/workorg/ _pdfs/rational-for-niosh-generic-job-stress-q

Nezu, A. M., & Perri, M. G. (1989). Social problem-solving therapy for unipolar depression: An initial dismantling investigation. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57(3), 408–413. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.57.3.408

Ololube, N. P. (2006). Teachers job satisfaction and motivation for school effectiveness: An assessment. Essays in Education, 18(1), 1–19.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Slate, J. R., & Schwartz, R. A. (1998). Cognitive, affective and demographic predictors of learners' academic achievement (Digest). ERIC Clearinghouse.

Reeff, J. P., Zabal, A., & Blech, C. (2006). The assessment of problem-solving competencies: A draft version of a general framework. German Institute for Adult Education. Retrieved from http://www.die-bonn.de/espritd/dokumente/doc-2006/reeff06_01.pdf

Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal
of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields

Rich, D. (2002). 7 habits of good teachers today. Retrieved from http://www.helloworld.org/teaching/good_classroom.html

Smith, A., Brice, C., Collins, A., Matthews, V., & McNamara, R. (2000). The scale of occupational stress: A further analysis of the impact of demographic factors and type of job (Contract Research Report 311/2000). Health and Safety Executive. http://www.hse.gov.uk/research/crr_pdf/2000/crr00311.pdf

Tsai, H.-H. (2010). Development of an inventory of problem-solving abilities of tertiary students majoring in engineering technology. World Transactions on Engineering and Technology Education, 8(3), 283–288.