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**Abstract**

The objective of this paper was to assess the various occupational stressors of female faculty members of private higher educational institutions of Meerut city. However, both males and females working in these institutions faced stress, but the stress is more vibrant for females due to crucial family roles and responsibilities. The researcher had explored a total of twenty-one (21) variables or the occupational stressors related to the female faculty members of private higher educational institutions of Meerut City. Many people worked in these institutions and faced a certain level of stress especially the females. So the study was practically viable from their perspective.  The research was highly original, being empirical, and primarily the primary data was used to collect the responses.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Stress is a burden or pressure faced by an individual that distracts him emotionally, physically, and psychologically. Today's age of 'Competitive Environment' is not only related to the comfort zone with numerous artificial and physical but encounters infinite problems and burden on the human body and mind. Stress is the talk of the town nowadays. It is creating a hindrance for all of the socio-economic groups of the society at a great level and visible in all the human beings (Sindhu, 2014).

Higher education in India has been categorized into 'Private' and 'Public or Government.' The stress is more evident and prominent in private higher educational institutions. The primary occupational stressors of the teaching fraternity of higher education are the unpleasant environment in the class and other unrelated academic and nonacademic sort of activities (Srivastava & Shukla, 2015).

Immense cutthroat competition in the higher education industry has increased the stress level among the faculty members and motivated the researchers (Chaudhry, 2013). Especially the female faculty members in these private institutions feel highly stressed as they have to undergo a work-life balance there.

Meerut city in western UP is one of the most significant higher education domains with one state university, three private universities, one agricultural university, and numerous affiliated private technical institutions offering professional programs. They employ a large pool of academicians, but the problem is that the faculty members face severe occupational stress, which has been caused due to an infinite number of stressors in these institutions, which directly or indirectly hamper their academic excellence and family.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Various researchers have already conducted studies related to the significant occupational stressors of faculty members at the national and international levels. The major highlights of some of the relevant studies about the current research are as follows:

**Akbar & Naseem (2012)** conducted a general study related to academic stress and proposed that private academicians experience more stress than public sector academicians. They also focused on some concrete associations among age, gender, designation, education, etc., with the overall stress. In their study, they reveal the major occupational stressors and their preference as per the responses from the respondents. These stressors have been highly purposeful for the conduction of this research.

**Suganthi & Lakshmi (2013),**  in their study, reveal that major occupational stressors are less staff in the institutions, lack of cooperation among the faculty members. These stressors lead to depression, anger, blood pressure, sleeping disorder, etc.; among the faculty members, socio-economic life has been adversely affected. Furthermore, workload and stress are directly affected.

**Indoo Singh (2014)** emphasized various occupational stressors ( medical and engineering college faculties) categorized in various groups and subgroups. She furthermore advocates for collective efforts of management and faculty members to reduce the overall effect of these occupational stressors. This study has been excellent support for exploring the various factors for this research paper.

**Shivani & Krishnan (2019)** proposed that tension exists among faculties in Himachal Pradesh at all types of higher academic institutes. The occupational stressors among their respondents were delays or inconsistencies in payment of salaries, workload, insufficient monetary compensation, too much subject matter to be taught, and excessive work hours. Nonetheless, the minor causes of stress among faculty members were the poor attitudes of students towards classroom tasks and assignments, unfavorable students to staff ratios, position disputes, study and publications, promotion requirements, poorly ventilated office, administrative problems, and lack of instructional facilities.

**Babita Kumari (2019)** has emphasized some of the areas where the institution's authorities focus their attention towards reducing the complexities regarding the stress of faculty members by giving appropriate priorities for establishing their institutions.

**C. Naga Ganesh (2020)** conducted a similar type of study and portrayed that stress in teaching faculties of higher educational institutions has been the general phenomenon nowadays due to the involvement of these faculty members in various other duties and responsibilities part from the academic profiles. Faculty members are also worried about their career growth, research orientation, and problems they face because of role ambiguity. Overall, a faculty member's job in these higher education institutions is not easy nowadays as competition is rising consistently.

The above studies have been highly important for exploring the various occupational stressors related to female faculty members of private higher educational institutions, but these occupational stressors are vast in number to be considered. Hence, there is an immense need to study these stressors in a manageable proportion, especially in a city like Meerut, predominantly a higher education hub in western UP.

**OBJECTIVES**

The two primary objectives of the research are as follows:

* To investigate the a variety of occupational stressors related to female faculty members in private HEI’s of Meerut City.
* To pull out the primary underlying occupational stressors of female faculty members in private HEI's of Meerut city.

**METHODS AND MATERIALS**

In the early phase, secondary data (research papers) had been explored to ascertain the various occupational stressors (variables or attributes) related to the female faculty members of private higher educational institutions (HEI). Some factors were also determined after discussion with known faculty members (respondents) from the sample itself. 100 responds taken who were the female faculty members of private higher educational institutions of Meerut City (IIMT University, Shobhit University, Subharti University, MIET, Vidya Knowledge Park, Pt. DDUMC, DVSGI). Female faculty members at higher positions like Directors, Deans, ProVC, Registrar, DSW, etc., had been excluded through ‘Academic Coordinators and HOD’s’ were included in the research.

**DATA ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION**

# Total occupational stressors (variables) explored:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1: Occupations Stressors Identified** | | |
| **S. No** | **Variable Name** | **Variable Details** |
| 1 | GWP | Groupism & Work Politics |
| 2 | RAB | Role Ambiguity & Biasness |
| 3 | AWL | Abundance Work Load |
| 4 | IRI | Inadequate Resources & Infrastructure |
| 5 | PIR | Poor Interpersonal Relationship |
| 6 | LRI | Low Rewards & Increments |
| 7 | APCS | Absence of Promotion & Career Succession |
| 8 | UDO | Unrealistic Deadline Obligation |
| 9 | UTAP | Unrelated Tasks & Admission Pressure |
| 10 | OJI | Overall Job Insecurity |
| 11 | USD | Unreasonable Salary Deduction |
| 12 | DSP | Discrimination in Salaries & Payout |
| 13 | IWLC | Imbalance Work life Conditions |
| 14 | WHW | Working on Holidays & Weekends |
| 15 | ROTWS | Regular Overtime Work Schedule |
| 16 | DWC | Dissatisfactory Working Conditions |
| 17 | UWE | Unhealthy Working Environment |
| 18 | CCS | Consistent Conflicts with Seniors |
| 19 | UPS | Untimely payment of Salaries |
| 20 | NALU | No Academic Leaves for Up gradation |
| 21 | ERCCW | Excessive Reporting, Clerical & Calling Work |

Source: Author’s own tabulation on the basis of Secondary data.

1. **Extraction of Communalities:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3: Communalities** | | |
| Variables | Initial | Extraction |
| Groupism & Work Politics | 1.000 | .925 |
| Role Ambiguity & Biasness | 1.000 | .823 |
| Abundance Work Load | 1.000 | .777 |
| Inadequate Resources & Infrastructure | 1.000 | .827 |
| Poor Interpersonal Relationship | 1.000 | .884 |
| Low Rewards & Increments | 1.000 | .804 |
| Absence of Promotion & No Career Succession | 1.000 | .852 |
| Unrealistic Deadline Obligation | 1.000 | .777 |
| Unrelated Tasks & Admission Pressure | 1.000 | .901 |
| Overall Job Insecurity | 1.000 | .752 |
| Unreasonable Salary Deduction | 1.000 | .863 |
| Discrimination in Salaries & Payout | 1.000 | .967 |
| Imbalance Work life Conditions | 1.000 | .800 |
| Working on Holidays & Weekends | 1.000 | .873 |
| Regular Overtime Work Schedule | 1.000 | .866 |
| Dissatisfactory Working Conditions | 1.000 | .954 |
| Unhealthy Working Environment | 1.000 | .825 |
| Consistent Conflicts with Seniors | 1.000 | .827 |
| Untimely payment of Salaries | 1.000 | .825 |
| No Academic Leaves for Up gradation | 1.000 | .735 |
| Excessive Reporting, Clerical & Calling Work | 1.000 | .617 |
| Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. | | |

Source: SPSS output on the basis of Primary data.

1. **Component Matrix:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4: Component Matrix** | | | | | | |
| Variables | Component | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Groupism & Work Politics | -.324 | .009 | -.057 | -.722 | .102 | -.534 |
| Role Ambiguity & Biasness | .674 | .554 | -.001 | -.079 | .110 | -.208 |
| Abundance Work Load | .601 | .589 | .197 | .119 | .119 | -.033 |
| Inadequate Resources & Infrastructure | .705 | .261 | -.149 | -.263 | -.061 | .408 |
| Poor Interpersonal Relationship | -.605 | .550 | -.058 | -.018 | .447 | .110 |
| Low Rewards & Increments | -.113 | -.079 | .837 | .152 | -.039 | .244 |
| Absence of Promotion & No Career Succession | -.695 | .513 | -.056 | -.070 | .302 | .080 |
| Unrealistic Deadline Obligation | .766 | .261 | -.232 | .157 | .129 | -.162 |
| Unrelated Tasks & Admission Pressure | -.648 | .545 | -.027 | -.042 | .386 | .182 |
| Overall Job Insecurity | .531 | .644 | .231 | -.022 | .003 | -.046 |
| Unreasonable Salary Deduction | .681 | .201 | -.139 | -.323 | -.137 | .467 |
| Discrimination in Salaries & Payout | -.501 | .685 | -.174 | .195 | -.423 | -.019 |
| Imbalance Work life Conditions | .646 | .382 | .484 | -.014 | -.030 | .044 |
| Working on Holidays & Weekends | -.703 | .543 | -.023 | -.097 | .193 | .189 |
| Regular Overtime Work Schedule | .231 | -.205 | -.563 | .670 | -.033 | .061 |
| Dissatisfactory Working Conditions | -.476 | .681 | -.182 | .155 | -.455 | .005 |
| Unhealthy Working Environment | .571 | .536 | .277 | .211 | .113 | -.278 |
| Consistent Conflicts with Seniors | -.377 | -.142 | .507 | .608 | .156 | -.116 |
| Untimely payment of Salaries | -.482 | .599 | -.109 | .174 | -.411 | -.152 |
| No Academic Leaves for Up gradation | .718 | .344 | -.269 | .085 | .094 | -.114 |
| Excessive Reporting, Clerical & Calling Work | .200 | -.114 | -.384 | .316 | .563 | .028 |
| Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. | | | | | | |
| Total 6 components extracted. | | | | | | |

Source: SPSS output on the basis of Primary data.

1. **Total Variance Explained:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5: Total Variance Explained** | | | | | | | | | |
| Component | Initial Eigen values | | | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | | | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings | | |
| Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1 | 6.731 | 32.054 | 32.054 | 6.731 | 32.054 | 32.054 | 4.868 | 23.181 | 23.181 |
| 2 | 4.327 | 20.604 | 52.657 | 4.327 | 20.604 | 52.657 | 3.753 | 17.871 | 41.053 |
| 3 | 2.079 | 9.901 | 62.558 | 2.079 | 9.901 | 62.558 | 2.915 | 13.881 | 54.934 |
| 4 | 1.842 | 8.771 | 71.329 | 1.842 | 8.771 | 71.329 | 2.324 | 11.065 | 65.999 |
| 5 | 1.473 | 7.016 | 78.345 | 1.473 | 7.016 | 78.345 | 2.031 | 9.669 | 75.668 |
| 6 | 1.024 | 4.874 | 83.219 | 1.024 | 4.874 | 83.219 | 1.586 | 7.551 | 83.219 |
| 7 | .667 | 3.178 | 86.397 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | .531 | 2.530 | 88.927 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | .394 | 1.876 | 90.802 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | .353 | 1.681 | 92.484 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | .283 | 1.346 | 93.830 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | .252 | 1.200 | 95.029 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | .213 | 1.015 | 96.044 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | .191 | .908 | 96.952 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | .166 | .788 | 97.740 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | .143 | .682 | 98.422 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | .117 | .557 | 98.979 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | .090 | .428 | 99.408 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | .080 | .381 | 99.788 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | .034 | .160 | 99.949 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | .011 | .051 | 100.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. | | | | | | | | | |

Source: SPSS output on the basis of Primary data.

1. **Component Score Covariance Matrix:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6: Component Score Covariance Matrix** | | | | | | |
| Component | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 1 | 1.000 | .000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 2 | .000 | 1.000 | .000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 3 | 0.000 | .000 | 1.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 4 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.000 | .000 | .000 |
| 5 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | .000 | 1.000 | 0.000 |
| 6 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | .000 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.   Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.   Component Scores. | | | | | | |

Source: SPSS output on the basis of Primary data.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

The second objective of this research was to determine and to extract the underlying basic factors responsible for occupational stress among the respondents. Hence the ‘Rotated Component Matrix’ as a part of SPSS output had been obtained.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 7: Rotated Component Matrix** | | | | | | |
| Variables | Component | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Groupism & Work Politics | -.159 | .157 | -.008 | -.024 | -.024 | **-.935\*** |
| Role Ambiguity & Biasness | **.850\*** | -.051 | .002 | .242 | .149 | -.127 |
| Abundance Work Load | **.860\*** | .035 | .013 | .136 | -.023 | .131 |
| Inadequate Resources & Infrastructure | .442 | -.128 | -.129 | **.758\*** | .022 | .154 |
| Poor Interpersonal Relationship | -.013 | **.912\*** | .172 | -.131 | .041 | -.062 |
| Low Rewards & Increments | .047 | .021 | -.147 | -.302 | **-.774\*** | .298 |
| Absence of Promotion & No Career Succession | -.119 | **.852\*** | .280 | -.129 | -.019 | -.126 |
| Unrealistic Deadline Obligation | .685 | -.247 | -.116 | .205 | .428 | .091 |
| Unrelated Tasks & Admission Pressure | -.067 | **.918\*** | .207 | -.091 | -.036 | -.035 |
| Overall Job Insecurity | **.824\*** | .043 | .117 | .201 | -.132 | .013 |
| Unreasonable Salary Deduction | .356 | -.169 | -.119 | **.819\*** | -.043 | .150 |
| Discrimination in Salaries & Payout | .020 | .368 | **.909\*** | -.045 | .006 | .046 |
| Imbalance Work life Conditions | **.772\*** | -.162 | -.097 | .161 | -.360 | .115 |
| Working on Holidays & Weekends | -.145 | **.841\*** | .352 | -.039 | -.117 | -.071 |
| Regular Overtime Work Schedule | -.066 | -.279 | .061 | -.071 | .686 | .552 |
| Dissatisfactory Working Conditions | .015 | .345 | **.913\*** | .009 | -.010 | .037 |
| Unhealthy Working Environment | **.898\*** | -.062 | .032 | -.107 | -.004 | .041 |
| Consistent Conflicts with Seniors | -.074 | .109 | -.034 | -.793 | -.245 | .345 |
| Untimely payment of Salaries | .027 | .281 | **.850\*** | -.144 | -.011 | -.048 |
| No Academic Leaves for Up gradation | .670 | -.176 | -.043 | .290 | .409 | .059 |
| Excessive Reporting, Clerical & Calling Work | .084 | .153 | -.401 | -.076 | .600 | .247 |

Source: SPSS output on the basis of Primary data.

**Interpretation:** The cutoff point was taken as 0.75 and finally 16 variables\* were extracted in all as indicated in Table 6. All the variables which were appearing under one component had not been repeated in the subsequent component.

As a final outcome, the six major underlying factors are as follows:

* **FACTOR 1** comprises of ‘Role Ambiguity & Biasness’, ‘Abundance Work Load’,’Overall Job Insecurity’, ‘Imbalance Work Life Conditions’ and ‘Unhealthy Working Environment’.
* **FACTOR 2** comprises of ‘Poor Interpersonal Relationship’,’Absence of Promotion & Career Succession’, ‘Unrelated Tasks & Admission Pressure’ and ‘Working on Holidays & Weekends’.
* **FACTOR 3** comprises of ‘Discrimination in Salaries & Payout’, ‘Dissatisfactory Working Condition’ and ‘Untimely Payment of Salaries’.
* **FACTOR 4** comprises of ‘Inadequate Resources & Infrastructure’ and ‘Unreasonable Salary Deductions’.
* **FACTOR 5** is ‘Low Rewards and Increments’
* **FACTOR 6** is ‘Groupism & Work Politics’

**CONCLUSION**

The present study precisely and prudently stated that female faculty members of private higher educational institutions feel severe stress in their jobs. The total numbers of occupational stressors are comparatively more for them as compared to the government higher educational institutions. The researcher through the study of secondary data has explored total twenty one occupational stressors for female faculty members. The industry has emerged more and more competitive nowadays demanding enhanced productivity in all parameters but the presence of certain stressors make the resultant impact negative in these institutions. Findings has revealed some fundamental stressors like ‘Poor Working Conditions’, ‘Unjustified and Unreasonable Work’ , ‘Salary Related issues’ , ‘Absence of Motivational factors for Job’ , ‘Lack of Cooperation & Coordination among employees’ and ‘Groupism and Work Politics’ for the female faculty members, however respondents have been reluctant to provide the responses and they have requested for not revealing their identity. Eventually it has been suggested that for the betterment of their institutions, the management and authorities must work out some implementable strategies for reducing these stressors and treat the faculty members as true academicians and researchers.

**LIMITATIONS AND SCOPE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

Primary limitation of this research is making use of of convenience sampling for collecting primary data. Secondly, the respondents are bit reluctant to offer the responses regarding their workplace, hence the questions related to the demographic profile have been ignored. Lastly, the time frame to conduct this study has been highly limited. Furthermore there is an immense scope for future research in this domain as higher education industry is growing day by day and especially the private universities. This research can even be conducted in other higher educational hubs taking more variables under consideration which have been emerged especially after the pandemic (COVID-19).
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