OPEN ACCESS

A Study On Work Pressure And Self-Management Strategy Of College Teachers In Cuddalore District

Mrs. S. Deepa[1] , Dr. D.H. Thavamalar[2]

[1]Research Scholar Department of Commerce Annamalai University Annamalai Nagar
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce Annamalai University Annamalai Nagar (Depute to Govt. Arts and Science College, Mutlur)

Abstract

Work pressure, often used interchangeably with job stress, is a multifaceted concept that describes the psychological and physical strain an individual experiences in their professional life. College teachers in India face significant occupational pressure due to a combination of factors, including heavy workloads, administrative burdens, lack of resources, and job insecurity. This pressure often leads to high levels of stress, burnout, and dissatisfaction, negatively impacting both their personal well-being and professional performance. The objective of the study was the various sources of work pressure and its managing strategy among the Arts and science college teachers in Cuddalore of Tamil Nadu. The study based on perception of sample respondents. The purpose of the study, researcher was selected 300 faculties using convenance sampling techniques at different levels were chosen randomly from various departments and functional areas of college keeping in view their total strength and range of activities. It is found that the work pressure of 'Student Expectations and Parental Involvement' Economic and Job Security Concerns' and 'Administrative and Committee Responsibilities' in the college are High Levels. The test values indicating the difference in teachers' perceptions regarding the Strategies to Manage Work are demographic and institution characteristics. work pressure is positive relationship with Strategies to Manage Work pressure in arts and science college in Cuddalore District of Tamil Nadu.

Key words: workloads, Work pressure , work stress, burnout.

Introduction

Work pressure is a ubiquitous part of professional life, defined as the demands placed on an employee to meet specific goals, deadlines, and performance standards. In its positive form, healthy work pressure acts as a powerful motivator. It can push individuals to develop new skills, focus their efforts, and ultimately feel a sense of accomplishment and satisfaction when a challenging task is successfully completed. This type of pressure is viewed as a challenge something to rise to and is a key ingredient for productive and engaging work. Negative work pressure refers to the chronic, excessive demands placed on an employee that exceed their coping capacity, resources, or control, resulting in work-related stress. Unlike positive pressure (or challenge), which is motivating and energizing, negative pressure is a harmful, draining force that leads to physical, psychological, and organizational deterioration. It arises when job requirements such as long hours, an unsustainable workload, conflicting demands, or job insecurity are consistently perceived as a threat rather than a manageable challenge.

The line between motivational pressure and detrimental stress is often thin. When work demands consistently exceed an individual's capacity, resources, or sense of control, the pressure transforms into work-related stress. This is no longer an energizing force; instead, it becomes overwhelming and can lead to a state of emotional and physical exhaustion known as burnout. The role of a college teacher is integral to the development of a nation's human capital, demanding a unique blend of intellectual rigor, pedagogical skill, and administrative diligence. However, in the rapidly evolving landscape of higher education, the profession has become synonymous with chronic work pressure and occupational stress. The contemporary academic faces an increasingly demanding "triple-

role" challenge: excellence in teaching, productivity in research (publications and grants), and significant involvement in institutional service and administration.

Statement of the problem

The role of college teachers has significantly expanded beyond traditional teaching to encompass extensive responsibilities in academic research, administrative duties, continuous curriculum updates, student mentorship, and quality assurance protocols. This multifaceted, demanding environment has resulted in a substantial increase in work pressure and occupational stress among faculty. Evidence suggests that this chronic, high level of work pressure negatively affects college teachers' well-being, leading to increased rates of burnout, anxiety, and physical health issues. Furthermore, this stress compromises their professional effectiveness, resulting in decreased job satisfaction, lower teaching quality, reduced engagement in research, and potentially higher rates of teacher turnover. If left unaddressed, this issue poses a direct threat to the quality of higher education and the stability of academic institutions.

While the existence of work pressure is acknowledged, there is often a lack of institution-specific and context-specific understanding of the primary stressors driving this pressure among college teachers and the effectiveness of existing coping strategies and management interventions (both individual and organizational). Without this clear understanding, college administrations cannot develop and implement targeted, evidence-based strategies to mitigate the negative consequences of work pressure. Therefore, this study aims to identify and analyze the specific sources and levels of work pressure experienced by college teachers and to evaluate the current strategies employed for managing this pressure, ultimately proposing effective, organizational, and individual-level interventions to enhance teacher well-being, job satisfaction, and professional performance.

Review of literature

Lewin et al (1939) linked autocratic leadership to increased stress and decreased performance, particularly in high-demand environments. Selye (1974) delved into the characteristics of work environments that foster eustress, emphasizing the importance of clear goals, constructive feedback, and opportunities for skill development. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) emphasized the importance of individual coping resources in managing the adverse effects of stress on performance. Folkman and Lazarus (1988) investigated the effectiveness of various coping strategies in mediating the relationship between job demands and strain, finding that active coping strategies were associated with better well-being and performance.

Hobfoll (1989) noted that even positive pressure can become detrimental if prolonged or if resources are insufficient. Landsbergis et al (1992) provided extensive evidence linking chronic job strain to adverse health outcomes and reduced productivity over time. Bass and Avolio (1994) showed that transformational leadership can reduce the perception of stress and enhance employee performance under high-pressure conditions. Conversely, authoritarian or unsupportive leadership can amplify the detrimental effects of pressure. Demerouti et al (2001) further underscored the cumulative impact of persistent high pressure, leading to exhaustion and disengagement.

ay et al (2006) explored the impact of digital communication on work-life balance and perceived pressure, noting that constant connectivity can blur boundaries and increase stress, potentially affecting performance. Ragu-Nathan et al (2008) examined the concept of techno-stressors and their implications for employee performance and well-being in the modern workplace. Salahudin and et al (2023) their study was to determine that workload has a significant effect on employee performance and work stress. work stress directly has a significant effect on employees' performance. Wenny Desty Febrian, and Silva Nurhalisah (2024) aim to find out and analysed the effect of workload, work stress, and authoritarian leadership style on employee performance.

Significance of the study

The issue of work pressure among college teachers has gained increasing attention in recent years due to its profound impact on both individual educators and the broader academic system. Understanding the significance of how work-related stress affects teaching performance is essential for policymakers, educational institutions, and stakeholders seeking to enhance the quality of higher education. In sum, this study is significant as it addresses a critical yet often overlooked aspect of higher education the human cost of academic labor. By exploring the influence of work pressure on teacher performance, the study aims to provide actionable insights that benefit educators, institutions, policymakers, and students alike. Reducing work pressure and supporting teacher well-being is not only an ethical responsibility but also a strategic investment in the future of education.

Objectives of the Study
The objectives of the study are the level of Work Pressure of Arts and Science College Teachers and how do manage the Work Pressure in Cuddalore District

Hypotheses of the Study
Based on the objectives, the hypotheses were framed that (i)There is no association between level of work pressure and demographic profile, (ii) There is no association between Strategies to Manage the Work Pressure and demographic profile, and (iii)There is no relationship between level of work pressure and Strategies to Manage the Work Pressure

Methodology
The target population for data collection is the faculty working in arts and science college, Cuddalore District. The present study is an attempt to assess the extent of the various sources of work pressure among the college teacher. The work pressure Survey instrument developed variable in current situation of the select organization in their instrument. The questionnaire was developed using a five-point scale for each question and the respondents were requested to assign their rating on the scale ranging from very high to very low over the issue. The purpose of the study, researcher was selected 300 employees using convenience sampling techniques at different levels were chosen randomly from various departments and functional areas of Organization keeping in view their total strength and range of activities. The secondary data have been collected from various text books, journals, and special project reports. The collected primary data are subjected to various statistical techniques from descriptive statistics like Simple Percentage, Mean and Standard deviation, f-test, t-test and Correlation Analysis.

Analysis and Interpretation
The attitude was examined with the help of demographic and institutional variables of the respondents. Next, level of work pressure and it self-manage strategy in this study, an attempt has been made to find out the relationship between the sources of work pressure and Strategies to Manage the Work Pressure.

Table-1 Distribution of Respondents Based on Demographic Profile

S. No		Frequency	Percent
Age			
1	Up to 30 years	62	20.67
2	30 to 40 years	99	33.00
3	40 to 50 years	76	25.33
4	Above 50 years	63	21.00
	Total	300	100.00
Gender			
1	Male	164	54.67
2	Female	136	45.33
	Total	300	100.00
Education			
1	Post Graduate	18	6.00
2	Post Graduate with M.Phil	108	36.00
3	Post Graduate with Phd	120	40.00
4	Post graduate SLET/NET	54	18.00

	Total	300	100.00
Marital Status			
1	Married	241	80.33
2	Unmarried	59	19.67
	Total	300	100.00
Family Size of Respondent			
1	Upto 3 Members	75	25.00
2	4 to 5 Members	159	53.00
3	Above 5 Members	66	22.00
	Total	300	100.00
Family Nature			
1	Nuclear Family	169	56.33
2	Joint Family	131	43.67
	Total	300	100.00
Income			
1	Upto Rs 20000	22	7.33
2	Rs.20001to rs.40000	101	33.67
3	Rs 40001 to Rs.60000	52	17.33
4	Rs.60001 to Rs 80000	68	22.67
5	Above Rs 81000	57	19.00
	Total	300	100.00

Source: Primary Data

The above Table 1 shows that out of 300 sample respondents, 20.67 percent of the respondents was the age group below 30 years, 33.00 percent of the respondents was the age group between 30-40 years, 25.33 percent of the respondents was the age group between 40-50 years and 21.00 percent of the respondents was the age above 50 years. It is clear that majority of the faculties (54.8 present) working in the age between 31- 40 years, males constitute the major proportion of 54.67 percent and the females constitute 45.33 per cent. Qualification of the respondents, 6.00 percent of respondents have been education up to post graduate level, 36.00 percent of the respondents have been post graduate with M.Phil, 40.00 percent of the respondents have been post graduate with Phd, and 18.00 percent of the respondents have been post graduate with NET/SET. Marital status of the respondents, that majority of the respondents were married (80.33 percent) rest of unmarried. Majority of the respondents having 4-5 members in their family. 56.33 percent of respondents belong to Nuclear family and the rest 43.67 percent belong joint family. Monthly income of the respondents, 33.67 percent of the respondent's salary between Rs.21000-40000, and 22.67 percent of the respondent's salary is between Rs.61,000-80,000, 19.00 percent of respondents' salary is above Rs.80000, 17.33 percent of respondents was between Rs.41,000-60,000 and only 7.33 percent of respondents earning is below Rs.20, 000.

Table-2 Institution Characteristics

S. No		Frequency	Percentage
Cadre			
1	Associate professor	87	29.00
2	Assistant Professor	138	46.00
3	Guest Lecturer	75	25.00
		300	100.00
Experience			
1	below 10	56	18.67
2	10-15	86	28.67
3	15 -20	58	19.33
4	20-25	55	18.33
5	Above 25	45	15.00
	Total	300	100.00
Type of Institution			
1	Government	112	37.33
2	Aided	33	11.00

3	Private	155	51.67
		300	100.00
Administrative Position			
1	Principal	14	4.67
2	Department Head	32	10.67
3	Committee Head	43	14.33
4	Committee Members	67	22.33
5	Only Teaching	144	48.00
		300	100.00

Source: Primary Data

It is observed from the table 2 that Cadre of the employees', 29.00 percent of the respondents is associate professor, 46.00 per cent of the respondents is Assistant professor and 25.00 per cent of the respondents is Guest Lecturer. 28.67 per cent of the sample employees have 10-15 years of experience, 19.33 per cent of the respondents work experience have 15-20 years, 18.67 per cent of the respondents work experience have below 10 years, 18.33 per cent of the respondents' have experience 20-25 years and 15.00 per cent of the respondents had Work Experience above 25 years. Employers types of working institution, 37.33 percent respondents working in government college, 11.00 percent respondents working in Aided college and 51.67 percent respondents working in Private college. Various administration responsibilities of selected faculties, 4.67 percent of the respondents was Principal, 10.67 percent of the respondents was head of department, 14.33 percent of the respondents was head of various committee, 22.33 percent of the respondents was various committee Members and 48.00 percent of the respondents have not taken any responsibility.

Table -3 Results of Friedman ANOVA and Kendall Coefficient of Concordance Identifying Priority on Selecting this Job

S. No	Priority	Sum of Ranks	Average Rank	Rank
1	Ambition	1212	4.04	2
2	Time Flexibility	1311	4.37	3
3	Easy job	1785	5.95	8
4	Family situation	2034	6.78	9
5	Convenient job	1395	4.65	4
6	Interest in this job	1584	5.28	6
7	Conducive working environment	1860	6.20	7
8	Respect in society	807	2.69	1
9	Convenient working hours	1512	5.04	5
	Kendall Coefficient of Concordance 'W'		0.3879	
	Friedman ANOVA Chi-Square		1211.36*	

Source: Primary Data *Significant at 1% level.

Various Factor preferences of selecting this job by respondents are identified and analysed the opinion of the respondents by using a statistical model called Friedman ANOVA and Kendall Coefficient of Concordance. As shown in the Table 3 the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance is just 0.3879 with significant Friedman ANOVA chi-square of 1211.36 ($p < 0.01$). This shows the existence of similarity in ranking of priorities for selecting the job among respondents. So, the average rank scores are used to identify the primary priority of selecting this job among the college teachers in the study area. The average mean score is 2.69 for the first item and ranging between 4.04 and 6.78 for the remaining eight factors (factors with low rank is highly preferred). From the ordering of items based on average mean scores, it is understood that the first factor preference to select this job is 'Respect in Society' followed by 'Ambition', 'Time Flexibility in the Work Place', 'Convenient job', 'Convenient Working Hours', 'Interest in this Job' and 'Conducive Working Environment'(second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth and least respectively). It is concluded that the respondent's reasons for selecting this job due to time Respect in Society and Ambition in this Job.

Table 4 Level of Work Pressure

S. No	Work pressure	Mean	SD
1	Teaching Load and Preparation	3.64	0.99
2	Research and Publication Demands	3.32	0.96
3	Administrative and Committee Responsibilities	3.25	0.71
4	Student Expectations and Parental Involvement	4.28	0.65
5	Technological Demands	4.08	1.08
6	Economic and Job Security Concerns	4.01	0.95
7	Implementation of the Various Government Student Welfare scheme	4.56	0.53
	Overall	3.88	0.84

Source: Primary Data

The level of work pressure was measured of the selected respondents. For the purpose, to measure the level of work pressure among the respondents, various seven various factors with measurement values ranging from 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 against opinion statements 'very low', 'low', 'moderate', 'high' and 'very high' respectively. Therefore, opinion of the entire a respondent group is regarded as 'very low', 'low', 'moderate', 'high' and 'very high', if the mean scores is < 1.50, >= 1.50 and < 2.50, >= 2.50 and < 3.50, >= 3.50 and < 4.50 and <= 4.50 respectively. Table-4 indicates that the college teacher's perception towards the level of wok pressure among the arts and science college are very high in 'Implementation of the Various Government Student Welfare scheme', next, followed by 'Student Expectations and Parental Involvement', 'Technological Demands', Economic and Job Security Concerns' and 'Teaching Load and Preparation' are high level (Mean = 4.28, 4.08, 4.01 and 3.64 respectively, >= 3.50 and < 4.50, the range for high level). Regarding, 'Research and Publication Demands' and 'Administrative and Committee Responsibilities' in the college are at moderate Level (Mean = 3.32 and 3.25 respectively, >= 2.50 and < 3.50, the range for moderate level).

Table 5 Test for Difference Between Level of work pressure and Demographic Variables

S.NO	Variables	F/ t	p	Significant or not
F - test				
1	Level of work pressure and age	7.344	.000	Significant
2	Level of work pressure and educational qualification	8.120	.000	Significant
3	Level of work pressure and family size	4.706	.010	Significant
4	Level of work pressure and monthly income	5.318	.000	Significant
5	Level of work pressure Cadre	3.976	.020	Significant
6	Level of work pressure and experience	4.622	.001	Significant
7	Level of work pressure Type of institution	6.455	.000	Significant
8	Level of work pressure and Administrative Position	7.344	.000	Significant
t-test				

9	Level of work pressure and Gender	-2.848	.005	Significant
10	Level of work pressure and Marital Status	-3.911	.000	Significant
11	Level of work pressure and nature of family	-3.833	.000	Significant

Source: Primary Data

Table 5 shows that to determine the difference between teachers' perceptions of level of work pressure and their demographic profiles, an ANOVA for instances involving more than two groups, and t-tests for comparisons between two groups was used. The test values for college teachers' perceptions regarding work pressure in relation to age (F = 7.344, P > 0.05), Education (F = 8.120, P > 0.05), family size (F = 4.706, P > 0.05), Income (F = 5.318, P > 0.05), cadre (F = 3.976, P > 0.05), experience (F = 4.622, P > 0.05), institution type (F = 6.455, P > 0.05), role of administration (F = 7.344, P > 0.05), gender (t = 2848, P > 0.05), Marital status (t=3.911, P > 0.05) and nature of family (t=3.833, P > 0.05) were calculated.

Table 6 Strategies to Manage Work Pressure

S. No	Strategies to Manage Work Pressure	Mean	SD
1	Planning Daily Teaching and Administrative Tasks	4.11	1.02
2	Taking Short Breaks Between Classes to Refresh	4.56	0.99
3	By Learning Different Skills on the Job.	4.03	0.73
4	Support from College Management	3.23	0.68
5	Emotional Encouragement from the Principal.	3.49	1.11
6	Support from Colleagues	2.18	0.76
7	Positive Team Culture.	2.46	0.89
8	Arrangements of Personal and Professional Time	3.68	0.84
9	Personal Support from Family and Friends.	4.28	0.71
10	Stress Management Policies	3.33	0.65
11	Adjusting Workloads with others	2.42	1.08

Source: Primary Data

Table-6 indicates that the college teacher's perception towards the Strategies to Manage Work Pressure at the Work Place among the Arts and Science College Teachers are very high in 'Taking Short Breaks Between Classes to Refresh'. Next, followed by 'Personal Support from Family and Friends.', 'Planning Daily Teaching and Administrative Tasks', 'By Learning Different Skills on the Job.' and 'Arrangements of Personal and Professional Time' are high level (Mean = 4.28, 4.11, 4.03 and 3.68 respectively, >= 3.50 and < 4.50, the range for high level). Regarding, 'Positive Team Culture,' 'Adjusting Workloads with Others' and 'Support from Colleagues' in the college are at low Level (Mean = 2.46,2.42 and 2.18 respectively, >= 1.50 and < 2.50, the range for low level) and 'Emotional Encouragement from the Principal' is Moderate level.

Table 7 Test for Difference Between Perception of Strategies to Manage Work Pressure and Demographic Variables

S.NO	Variables	F/ t	p	Significant or not
F - test				
1	Strategies to Manage Work Pressure and age	4.826	.001	Significant
2	Strategies to Manage Work Pressure and educational qualification	8.946	.000	Significant
3	Strategies to Manage Work Pressure and family size	7.816	.000	Significant

4	Strategies to Manage Work Pressure and monthly income	3.924	.004	Significant
5	Strategies to Manage Work Pressure Cadre	5.724	.004	Significant
6	Strategies to Manage Work Pressure and experience	5.066	.001	Significant
7	Strategies to Manage Work Pressure Type of institution	15.282	.000	Significant
8	Strategies to Manage Work Pressure and Administrative Position	8.703	.000	Significant
t-test				
9	Strategies to Manage Work Pressure and Gender	4.779	.000	Significant
10	Strategies to Manage Work Pressure and Marital Status	3.324	.001	Significant
11	Strategies to Manage Work Pressure and nature of family	2.848	.005	Significant

Source: Primary data

Table 7 shows that to ascertain the difference between teachers' perceptions of Strategies to Manage Work pressure and their demographic profiles, using one-way ANOVA for instances involving more than two groups, and t-tests for comparisons between two groups. The test values indicating the difference in teachers' perceptions regarding the Strategies to Manage Work pressure are as follows: age ($F = 4.826$, $P > 0.05$), Education ($F = 8.946$, $P > 0.05$), family size ($F = 7.816$, $P > 0.05$), Income ($F = 3.924$, $P > 0.05$), cadre ($F = 5.724$, $P > 0.05$), experience ($F = 5.066$, $P > 0.05$), institution type ($F = 15.282$, $P > 0.05$), role of administration ($F = 8.703$, $P > 0.05$), gender ($t = 4.779$, $P > 0.05$), Marital status ($t = 3.324$, $P > 0.05$) and nature of family ($t = 2.848$, $P > 0.05$).

Table- 8 Correlation Between Sources of Work Pressure and Its Impact

		X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	Y1
X1	Pearson Correlation	1	.133*	.014	.118*	-.089*	-.007	.221*	.279*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.002	.745	.007	.043	.878	.000	.000
X2	Pearson Correlation	.133*	1	.265*	.273*	.032	-.185*	.219*	.147*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002		.000	.000	.467	.000	.000	.001
X3	Pearson Correlation	.014	.265*	1	.405*	.164*	.178*	.252*	.221*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.745	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
X4	Pearson Correlation	.118*	.273*	.405*	1	.185*	-.063	.595*	.269*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.007	.000	.000		.000	.149	.000	.000
X5	Pearson Correlation	-.089*	.032	.164*	.185*	1	.307*	.174*	.274*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.043	.467	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
X6	Pearson Correlation	-.007	-.185*	.178*	-.063	.307*	1	.171**	.186*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.878	.000	.000	.149	.000		.000	.000
X7	Pearson Correlation	.221*	.219*	.252*	.595*	.174*	.171*	1	.353*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
Y1	Pearson Correlation	.279*	.147*	.221*	.269*	.274*	.186*	.353*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	

Source: Primary Data,   (*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level)

From the table 4 shows that the result of inter-correlation matrix of explanatory variables namely Teaching Load and Preparation (x1), Research and Publication Demands (x2), Administrative and Committee Responsibilities (x3), Student Expectations and Parental Involvement (x4), Technological Demands (x5) Economic and Job Security Concerns (x6) and Implementation of the Various Government Student Welfare scheme(X7) with dependent variables positive impact (y1) are highly significant and positively correlated. It is concluded that work pressure is positive relationship with Strategies to Manage Work pressure in arts and science college in Cuddalore District of Tamil Nadu.

Conclusion

The findings of this study conclusively affirm that work pressure among college teachers is not merely an individual endurance test but a pervasive, systemic issue rooted in the contemporary demands of higher education. This pressure, often manifesting as burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment), significantly jeopardizes faculty well-being, diminishes teaching quality, and contributes to high turnover, thereby threatening the core mission of academic institutions. Sustainable relief from work pressure requires a fundamental cultural shift within higher education. Institutions must move beyond viewing faculty well-being as a personal responsibility and instead adopt an integrated, policy-driven approach that prioritizes the health and human capital of their teachers. By making tangible adjustments to workload and fostering a truly supportive, autonomous, and transparent work culture, colleges can effectively reduce stress, prevent burnout, and ultimately enhance the quality and stability of the entire academic enterprise.

Reference

1. Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., & Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. Academy of Management Journal, 39(5), 1154-1184.
2. Baer, M., & Oldham, G. R. (2006). The curvilinear relation between experienced creative time pressure and creativity: Moderating effects of openness to experience and support for creativity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(4), 963-971.
3. Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.
4. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Sage Publications.
5. Day, A., Scott, N., & Rivers, K. (2006). Work-life balance: Views of women in management. Women in Management Review, 21(3), 200-213.
6. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 499-512.
7. Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1988). Coping as a mediator of emotion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54(3), 466-475.
8. Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. American Psychologist, 44(3), 513-524.
9. Karasek, R. A., & Theorell, T. (1990). Healthy work: Stress, productivity, and the reconstruction of working life. Basic Books.
10. Landsbergis, P. A., Schnall, P. L., Deitz, D. K., Friedman, R., & Pickering, T. (1992). The patterning of psychological attributes and catecholamine excretion in employed adults. Psychosomatic Medicine, 54(5), 522-536.
11. Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. Springer Publishing Company.
12. LePine, J. A., LePine, M. A., & Jackson, C. L. (2004). Challenge and hindrance stress: Resources and performance in a complex task. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89(5), 883-892.
13. Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. The Journal of Social Psychology, 10(2), 269-299.
14. Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). Psychological Capital: Developing the human competitive edge. Oxford University Press
15. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. Annual Review of Psychology, 52(1), 397-422.
16. Quick, J. C., & Quick, J. D. (2004). Preventive stress management in organizations. American Psychological Association.

17. Ragu-Nathan, T. S., Tarafdar, M., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Tu, Q. (2008). The consequences of technostress for end users in organizations: Conceptual development and empirical validation. Information Systems Research, 19(4), 417-433.

18. Roy, A., van der Weijden, T., and de Vries, N. (2017), Relationships of work characteristics to job satisfaction, turnover intention, and burnout among doctors in the district public-private mixed health system of Bangladesh. BMC Health Services Research, 17(1), 421.

19. Salahudin, Syahir Natsir and Harnida Wahyuni Adda (2023), The Effect of Workload and Motivation on Employees' Performance through Job Stress as A Mediating Variable, Tadulako International Journal of Applied Management, 5(3),115-124.

20. Selye, H. (1974). Stress without distress. J. B. Lippincott Company.

21. Spector, P. E. (1997). Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences. SAGE Publications.

22. Wenny Desty Febrian and Silva Nurhalisah, (2024) Determination of Workload, Work Stress, and Authoritarian Leadership Style on Performance, Dinasti International Journal of Digital Business Management, 5(2).

23. Zohar, D. (1999). When to do what: The example of effects of time pressure on performance. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20(2), 173-182.