

**Stress And Wellbeing Among Teachers Who Are Suffering With
Physical Health Problems**

Dr. A. V. Rajasekhar

*School Assistant, English. Education Department,
Vizianagaram,:rajasekhar.altivenkata@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

The relationship between stress and psychosocial outcome measures, Well being that has become topic of growing interest in medical and psychiatric practice, is hardly examined in psychiatric outpatients. Therefore, in the present study is focused on the stress and Well being among teachers who are facing health problems. Well being is the physical, psychological, physiological and social well-being of a person. Stress is a painful and imbalanced state of mind. Our body has a natural response to threats. If something dangerous is happening, our body's will produce a reaction to let us know that we need to run away this has been labeled the "stress response". Stress is simply a reaction to a stimulus that disturbs our physical or mental equilibrium. General wellbeing of human beings in a society. Well being is related to individuals, both for internal and external development. Well being is also related to many areas of the individual, institutional and environmental fields.

Keywords: Wellbeing, Stress response, Threats, Society

1-INTRODUCTION

The relationship between stress and psychosocial outcome measures, Well being that has become topic of growing interest in medical and psychiatric practice, is hardly examined in psychiatric outpatients. Therefore, in the present study is focused on the stress and Well being among teachers who are facing health problems. Well being is the physical, psychological, physiological and social well-being of a person. Stress is a painful and imbalanced state of mind. Our body has a natural response to threats. If something dangerous is happening, our body's will produce a reaction to let us know that we need to run away this has been labeled the "stress response". Stress is simply a reaction to a stimulus that disturbs our physical or mental equilibrium. General wellbeing of human beings in a society. Well

being is related to individuals, both for internal and external development. Well being is also related to many areas of the individual, institutional and environmental fields.

2.-METHODOLOGY

2.1. Objectives of the study

- ❖ Objective: 1. to know about the significant difference between different categories of independent variables related to stress creators between normal teachers and unhealthy teachers.
- ❖ Objective: 2. to know about the significant difference between different categories of independent variables related to stress creators among unhealthy teachers.
- ❖ Objective: 3. to know about the significant difference between different categories of independent variables related to well being between normal teachers and unhealthy teachers.
- ❖ Objective: 4. to know about the significant difference between different categories of independent variables related to well being among unhealthy teachers.

2.2. Hypotheses of the study

1. There are no significant differences between different categories of independent variables related to stress creators between normal teachers and unhealthy teachers.
2. There are no significant differences between different categories of independent variables related to stress creators among unhealthy teachers.
3. There are no significant differences between categories of independent variables related to well being between normal teachers and unhealthy teachers.
4. There are no significant differences between categories of independent variables related to well being among unhealthy teachers.
5. There will be a significant relationship between the dimensions of stress creators and the dimensions of well being among unhealthy teachers.

2.3. Testing Scales (Questionnaires) :Stress creators in teaching (S.C.I.T)

Stress creators in teaching (S.C.I.T) questionnaire was constructed and standardized by Dr. B. Indira (1996) to study, teachers stress questions in this questionnaire were re standardized in 2009. The investigator considered the following dimensions for measuring teachers Stress. They are (1) Intensity of work, (2).Student behaviour (3).Professional growth (4). Extrinsic Annoyers and (5) Total stress.

2.3.A. Professional quality of life scale(Pro QOL)

This scale was taken from The Concise Manual for the Professional Quality of life, 2nd Edition. The questionnaire was constructed and standardized by Stamm, B.H. (2010), and published by the ProQOL.org. Professional well being consists of both positive and negative aspects. Positive aspect questions come under compassion satisfaction. Negative aspect questions come under compassion fatigue. This compassion fatigue is further classified in to two different dimensions namely burnout and secondary traumatic stress.

2.4. Research approach

The samples were collected from the unhealthy school teachers using the random sampling technique N=525. Compared this data with normal teachers who have not any long time health problems N= 372. In the first phase of research unhealthy teachers were compared with normal teachers in the dimensions of stress and quality of life. In the second phase unhealthy teachers who are suffering with different physical health problems were analyzed in the dimensions of stress and quality of life. Finally researcher find correlation between stress and well being for un healthy teachers.

III-Results

Table no:3. 1
Test values of S.C.I.T. Dimensions in Normal and Unhealthy Teachers

Stress Dimensions	Teachers group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T-test	Sig.
Intensity of work	Normal teachers	372	21.14	6.320	2.885**	0.004
	Un healthy Teachers	525	22.64	5.604		
Student's Behaviour	Normal teachers	372	19.65	5.489	2.732**	0.007
	Un healthy Teachers	525	20.93	5.177		
Professional growth	Normal teachers	372	24.58	7.458	1.501	0.134
	Un healthy Teachers	253	25.52	6.854		
Extrinsic Annoyers	Normal teachers	372	43.31	12.187	2.210*	0.028
	Un healthy Teachers	525	45.56	11.037		

Stress total	Normal teachers	372	108.68	28.667	2.500*	0.013
	Un healthy Teachers	525	114.65	25.859		

*P<0.05 & **P<0.01 Significant level

In the above table i.e. table no-1 dimension Intensity of work in stress creatures in teaching mean value of un healthy teachers is(M=22.64) higher than normal teachers (M=21.14)the corresponding t-test value(t=2.885) is this is statistically highly significant at 0.01 level. In the dimension student's behaviour in stress creatures in teaching mean value of unhealthy teachers is(M=20.93) higher than normal teachers (M=19.65)the corresponding t-test value(t=2.732) is this is statistically highly significant at 0.01 level. In the dimension Professional growth in stress creatures in teaching mean value of un healthy teachers is(M=25.52) higher than normal teachers (M=24.58)the corresponding t-test value(t=1.501) is this is statistically not significant. In the dimension extrinsic annoyers in stress creatures in teaching mean value of un healthy teachers is (M=45.56) higher than normal teachers (M=43.31) the corresponding t-test value(t=2.210) is this is statistically significant at 0.05 level. Over all stress in teaching mean value of un healthy teachers is(M=114.65) higher than normal teachers (M=108.68)the corresponding t-test value(t=2.500) is this is statistically significant at 0.05 level.

Table no: 3.2.

Test values of Pro QOL Dimensions in Normal and Unhealthy Teachers

QOL Dimensions	Teachers group	N	Mean	S.D	T-test	Sig.
Compassion satisfaction scale	Normal teachers	372	41.45	6.972	0.232	0.817
	Un healthy Teachers	525	41.31	7.030		
Burnout scale	Normal teachers	372	20.57	5.930	1.943*	0.053
	Un healthy Teachers	525	21.56	5.747		
Secondary Traumatic Stress Scale	Normal teachers	372	27.64	5.965	1.708*	0.088
	Un healthy Teachers	525	28.47	5.104		
QOL total	Normal teachers	372	89.51	10.384	2.364*	0.018
	Un healthy Teachers	525	91.48	8.473		

*P<0.05 Significant level

In the above table i.e. table no -2 dimension compassion satisfaction in well being mean value of normal teachers ($M=41.45$) is higher than unhealthy teachers ($M=41.31$) teachers the corresponding t-test value is ($t=0.232$) this is statistically not significant. In the dimension burnout in well being mean value of unhealthy teachers ($M=21.56$) is higher than normal teachers ($M=20.57$) teachers the corresponding t-test value is ($t=1.943$) this is statistically significant at 0.05 level. In the dimension secondary traumatic stress in well being mean value of unhealthy teachers ($M=28.47$) is higher than normal teachers ($M=27.64$) teachers the corresponding t-test value is ($t=1.708$) this is statistically significant at 0.05 level. Overall well being mean value of unhealthy teachers ($M=91.48$) is higher than normal teachers ($M=89.51$) teachers the corresponding t-test value is ($t=2.364$) this is statistically significant at 0.05 level.

4.-Discussion

Over all stress in teaching unhealthy teachers is higher than normal teachers. The corresponding t-test value is statistically significant at 0.05 level. The null hypothesis states that there are no significant differences between different categories of independent variables related to stress creators between normal teachers and unhealthy teachers. So the null hypothesis rejected.

Unhealthy teachers having higher Intensity of work than normal teacher's. Unhealthy teacher's higher stress caused by student's behaviour than normal teacher's. Unhealthy teachers stress caused by Professional growth higher than normal teachers. Unhealthy teacher's extrinsic annoyers in stress creatures is higher than normal teachers Over all stress in teaching mean value of unhealthy teachers is higher than normal teachers.

Dimensions intensity of work, student behaviour are statically highly significant extrinsic annoyers and total stress are statically significant.

Overall well being mean value of unhealthy teachers is higher than normal teachers. The corresponding t-test value is statistically significant at 0.05 level. The null hypothesis states that there are no significant differences between categories of independent variables related to well being between normal teachers and unhealthy teachers. So the null hypothesis rejected. In well being normal teachers compassion satisfaction is higher than unhealthy teachers. Unhealthy teachers burnout is higher than normal teachers. Unhealthy

teachers secondary traumatic stress is higher than normal teachers. Dimensions burnout and secondary traumatic stress are statically significant.

Dimensions intensity of work, professional growth, extrinsic annoyers and total stress in unhealthy teachers stress creators in teaching are statistically extremely significant at 0.001 level. Dimension student behavior is statistically significant. The null hypothesis states that there are no significant differences between different categories of independent variables related to stress creators among unhealthy teachers. So the null hypothesis rejected.

Intensity of work in stress creators in teaching among unhealthy teachers affects digestive problems is the highest. Other health problems descending orderly headache, heart problems and hypertension. Physical health problem diabetes having the least effect among all health problems. Student's behaviour in stress creators in teaching, unhealthy teachers affects headache is the highest. Other health problems descending orderly as follow digestive problems, hypertension and heart problems. Physical health problem diabetes having the least affects among all health problems. Professional growth in stress creators in teaching among unhealthy teacher's affects diabetes is the highest. Other health problems descending orderly as follow headache, heart problems and hypertension. Physical health problem diabetes having the least affects among all health problems. Extrinsic annoyers in stress creators in teaching among unhealthy teachers affects headache the highest. Other health problems descending orderly as follow digestive problems, heart problems and diabetes. Physical health problem hypertension having the least affect among all health problems. Stress worst affects headache highest. Other health problems descending orderly as follow digestive problems, heart problems and hypertension Physical health problem diabetes affects least among all health problems.

Dimension burnout is statistically highly significant at 0.01 level. Dimension secondary traumatic stress is statistically extremely significant at 0.001 level. The null hypothesis states that there are no significant differences between categories of independent variables related to well being between among unhealthy teachers. So the null hypothesis rejected.

Compassion satisfaction the highest in digestive problems. Other health problems descending orderly as follow diabetes, headache and hypertension Heart problems having the least satisfaction among all health problems. Burnout the highest in hypertension. Other

health problems descending orderly as follow digestive problems, headache and diabetes. Physical health heart problems heaving the least Burnout among all health problems.

Secondary traumatic stress is the highest in headache. Other health problems descending orderly as follow diabetes, heart problems and digestive problems. Hypertension heaving the least traumatic stress among all health problems.

Inter and intra correlation values are shown in the table number 5. The correlation values i.e., between and among pro S.C.I.T and Q.O.L. are listed in the table. The correlation value of a dimension, with the same dimension is always 1. The compassion satisfaction dimension correlated with all the other dimensions obtained negative values. All other values, except this, are positive correlation values and all the values are significant. Except for the correlation between compassion satisfaction and burn out dimensions which is statistically significant at 0.05 level, all the other values are statistically highly significant at 0.01 level. Values are moderate in the beginning, and gradually increase. High values are recorded at the end of the correlation table. Null hypothesis states that there will be a significant relationship between the dimensions of stress creators and the dimensions of well being among unhealthy teachers. So the null hypothesis accepted.

5.Conclusion

There is an old saying “Health is wealth”. Lifelong medicated long time diseases shows worst impact on work place i.e. in class room or school. Increasing stress in work place decreasing well being of professionals. Prevention is better than cure, so teachers must aware their health. Teachers are able to manage stressful environment in their work place. Necessary trainings, techniques and coop up strategies to reduce stress and improve well being to be provided to the teachers.

Reference

- Becker, M., Diamond, R., Sainfort, F. (2013). A new patron focused index for measuring quality of life in persons with severe and persistent mental illness.*Springer Quality of Life Research*, volume 2.
- Bhandarkar, K.M. (2006). Statistics in education made easy,*Neelkamal Publication, New Delhi, India*.
- Indira, B. (1996). Stress Creators in Teaching (SCIT), A study of Teacher Stress in relation to Teaching Competency among Degree College Lecturers in Vizianagaram District, *M. Ed Dissertation, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam*.

- Jinmyoung Cho., Peter Martin., Jennifer Margrett., Maurice Mac Donald & Leonard W. Poon.(2011).The Relationship between Physical Health and Psychological Well-Being among Oldest-Old Adults,*Journal of Aging Research*.
- Mallikharjun, Y. (2013) Diabetes and BP make inroads to rural Andhra Pradesh, *The Hindu*, March 15, 2013.
- Mohd. RazaliSalleh,.(2011).Life Event, Stress and Illness, *Malays Journal of Medical sciences*
- Molly H. Fisher(2011).“Factors Influencing Stress, Burnout, and Retention of Secondary Teachers”, *University of Kentucky publication*.
- Selye, H. (1980). Selye’s guide to stress research: NY: *Van Nostrand Reinhold*. New York.
- Stamm, B.H. (2010). The Concise Manual for the professional Quality of life, 2nd Edition, Published The ProQOL.org, P.O. Box 4362, Pocatello.
- Stephoe .A, Deaton.A& Stone .A.A.(2015).Subjective wellbeing, health, and ageing. Lancet.Publication.
- Wendy D.Andreal ., Ritu Sharma., Amanda D. Zelechowski, & Joseph Spinazzola.(2011).Physical Health Problems After Single Trauma Exposure: When Stress Takes Root in the Body, *Journal of the American Psychiatric Nurses* A. V. Raja Sekhar
-