

Work Stressors and Behaviors Across Occupations

Khawaja Fawad Latif, Aamir Nadeem, Imran Khalil and Shahzad Zeb

ABSTRACT

The study examined the influence of occupation on stressors and behaviors at work. The research involved respondents from four heterogeneous work groups, namely: Bankers, University Teachers, Marketers and Engineers. Scale reliability analysis was conducted whereas the respondents stress was analyzed using One-Way ANOVA. The findings revealed an overall significant difference in work stressors across the four occupations. Work Stressors including Managerial Role, Career and Achievement, Organizational Structure and Climate and Home-Work Interface were found to be different across the occupations under study, however no significant differences were revealed in Intrinsic Job factors and Relationship with others. Work Morale and Absence Behavior were significantly different across occupations; however the study did not find significant difference in Intention to Quit the Job in the various occupations. The study is of high practical value, as it can be a guide in future design of job roles and job specification, plus in designing stress interventions for better employee performance by being knowledgeable about the factors that result in stress and effect work behavior among employees. Where much of research had focused on individual occupation and fewer work stressors, the current study focuses on four occupations with six work stressors and different work behaviors across the occupations. The study provides new insights into the stress level of various occupants performing varied job roles, as very limited research has yet been conducted in Pakistan with respect to analysis of work stressors and job behaviors.

Key Words: Work Stressors, Work Morale, Absence Behavior and Intention to Quit.

INTRODUCTION

Nature of Work, job roles and occupations have witnessed a change over a period of time and have resulted in increased level of stress. Stress is a negative psychological behavior or mental process that has its observable effects on the employee at both the workplace and home. In case of being stressed, work and personal factors are pushed beyond the range of stability (Chang and Lu, 2009) thus resulting in a loss of focus and forcing the individual to react in ways that are not normal ultimately leading to loss of business efficiency and effectiveness.

Cunningham (2000) noted that Stress differs from person to person and called it a subjective phenomenon, what is challenging for one person could be considered stressful by another thus clarifying why people coming from the same work site and sharing the same objective stressors still experience different levels of stress (Change and Lu, 2009).

This strengthened the assumption that since different people have varied occupations presenting varied level of challenges and some occupations are more challenging than others; stress level would vary across occupations.

The study will analyze how changing occupation relates to stress level, followed by an analysis of work behaviors across occupations. The aim is to understand how varied occupation influence stress at work place and employee behaviors in an organizational setting, it is further hoped that practically the findings of this paper would help in alleviating stressors and negative behaviors.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Occupations and Work Stressors

Different Occupations are characterized by different levels of stressors; work has been carried out whereby researchers have studied work stress in relation to occupations. Work Stress is an emotional state that has detrimental results on organisms affecting the individual in all spheres of life. Typical Stressors at workplace are psychological; resulting in negative work behaviors that directly affect the individual's mental processes for instance learning, thus directly affecting organizational performance. Sutherland and Cooper (1992) found work stress as a negative quality, and failure to cope leads to negative mental and physical health, however Skinner, Edge, Altman and Sherwood (2003) noted that positive or negative effect of stress depends on coping with stress similarly Rossi, Perrewe and Sauter (2006) found that it is unclear whether or not stress has a negative impact on employee effectiveness..

Work stressors have included workload, work-family and family-work conflict, increasing work intensity, leadership styles, workplace conflict, organizational downsizing and restructuring, and organizational mergers; outcomes have typically considered job satisfaction, commitment, psychological health, work-family balance, and withdrawal behaviors (Burke, 2010). Karasek and Theorel (1979) took a different route and linked stress to the level of authority individuals have in the organization, They claimed work stress is stimulated by high psychological demands and low decision latitude, thus having control over decisions is significant to work and could help reduce stress level.

Ivancevich and Ganster (1986) proposed that work environment has a great influence on stress, as stress is an environmental stimulus described as a force applied to individuals however a contradicting viewpoint comes from Lazarus (1996) who argued that it is contingent upon the perception of the situation/event meaning stress is not there in the environment but it is the thinking. Stress necessarily involves a relationship between people and their environment, in other words an interaction between stressors and stress reactions (Oreoluwa and Oludele, 2010). Since different occupations have different work environment, thus stressors for various jobs are different, resulting in diverse stress levels and responses from individuals. The assertion is strengthened by French, Caplan and Harrison (1982) who proposed that stressor at workplace arise from incongruity between individuals and environment, they call it "the Personal – Environmental Fit Model", the model elucidated that lack of fit between the person and its environment would stimulate stress. It is further proposed that for each individual there are optimal level of environmental demands for his/her capability, meeting these demands lowers the stress level and failure to meet the demands would trigger an increase in the stress levels.

Cooper et al., (1988). comprehensive categorization of work stressors was adopted for the current study, it included six different categories of stressors that includes

- Factors intrinsic to the job
- Managerial role
- Relationship with others
- Careers and achievement
- Organizational culture
- Home - Work Interface

Stress exists in all occupations, however some occupations and organizations are possibly more stressful. Varying work contexts make specific demands onto the individuals/occupants of the jobs; recent studies have empirically researched stressors in relation to certain occupations. Topper (2007) found that stress among library workers was high and the library as an organization needs to provide training to cope with stress. Oreoluwa and Oludele (2010) specify heavy workloads that transform into long working hours cause exhaustion, fatigue; that eventually leads to burnout, a state of physical, mental and emotional exhaustion apart from this the threat of freedom, identity and autonomy is a potential source of stress among bankers. Reporting the sources of stress among Academic Staff Archibong et al., (2010) concluded career development to be the paramount source of stress for academic staff. Major Stressors for retail managers are intrinsic factors of the job, whereas workload, time constraints and target deadlines could be isolated as high work stressors (Broadbridge, 1999).

Love, Edwards and Irani (2010) revealed that those working as Engineers and other staff working on-site reported higher levels of poor mental health and greater work stress than consultants, those working on-site also experienced greater levels of self-stress. The above researches took one occupation and identified the sources of stress.

The current study seeks to examine the prevalence of stressors across occupations and hence it is proposed that the following hypothesis is being verified by the article:

“No differences exist in the prevalence of work stressors across occupations”

Occupations and Work Behaviors

Stress at workplace has negative implications for work behaviors and job performance. The negative consequences have been well researched for instance psychological withdrawal from the job leading to reduced job performance

Bettencourt and Brown (2003) similarly Broadbridge (1999) found that Stress contributes to deficient work performance and loss of productivity whereas on the contrary Mathur, Vigg, Sandhar and Holani (2007) studied in a manufacturing organization revealed a positive effect of stress on job performance, where job performance witnessed an increase with the increase in stress. Aligned with the findings of Mathur et al., Knight, Kim and Crutsinger (2007) found role stress to translate into positive effect on job performance in retail salespeople.

Studying the behavior of teachers in New South Wales, McCormick and Barnett (2011) suggested that teachers who consistently experience stress from badly behaving students are likely to have an emotional effect, and they could feel a range of emotions, notably anger, and an emotionally-charged teacher is less likely to be effective.

Absence Behavior

Several factors have been highlighted in various studies as a contributing factor to employee absenteeism. In a study by Judge, Joseph and Thoresen (1997) Extraversion was found to be positively related to absence behavior whereas Conscientiousness (Conscientiousness is characterized by personal competence, dutifulness, self-discipline, and deliberation) was found to be negatively related to employee absence; however the study failed to associate Neuroticism (Neuroticism refers generally to a lack of positive psychological adjustment and emotional stability) to employee absence behavior.

Chang and Lu (2009) found psychosomatic problems, factors intrinsic to the job and extrinsic to be contributors to employee absence. The costs of absenteeism to organizations and society are believed to be substantial as identified by Johns (1997) who proposed it to be obstructing profits and organizational performance. Study of Arsenault and Dolan (1983) found that occupation does have an influence over absenteeism.

Quitting Intention

Work Stress could be a significant contributor to the employee intention to quit his/her job, although the actual quitting of job depends on other factors as well. Actual quitting behavior is the primary focus of interest to employers and researchers, intention to quit is argued to be a strong indicator for such behaviour. Job stressors and lack of job satisfaction are among the factors that contribute to people's intention to quit their jobs (Moore, 2002).

Calisir, Gumussoy and Iskin (2011) determined that quitting intentions are elucidated by job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Besides this, role ambiguity and job stress have negative indirect influence on the intention to quit one's job although organizational commitment is strongly explained by job satisfaction, and job satisfaction is predicted by role ambiguity and job stress. Similarly In their research Sass, Seal and Martin (2011) found convincing results that teachers face a variety of stressors on a regular basis, These findings found association of how school stressors and social support influence job dissatisfaction and ultimately the intent to quit.

Work Morale

Where on one hand work stress cause dissatisfaction and reduced employee commitment, work morale is a belief and commitment to organizational goals that shape individuals behaviors resulting in actions beneficial to the business organization. High work morale is one of the crucial factors for business survival and growth whereas consequences of low morale influence both individuals and organizations (Trout and Rivkin, 2001). Morale is individual's attitude that shapes his/her behavior towards the task at hand, ascertaining the proposition is Pillay (2010) who found morale as "the state of the spirits of a person or group as shown by confidence, cheerfulness, discipline, and the performance of assigned tasks."

Assessing the relationship between experiences, stress and morale in teachers Hart (1994) summed that positive experiences to be stronger determinants of morale than psychological distress, whereas negative experiences were stronger determinants of psychological distress than morale. Psychological distress and morale contributed equally to teachers'

overall quality of work life. On the other hand Steiger (2006) found work stress to be a determinant of marital and family discord and approximately 60% of American physicians from American College of Physician considered leaving the practice. However in UK low morale among doctors was attributed to policies placing greater emphasis on cost-cutting and quantity of care rather than quality, the implication of which is that out of all the GPs who responded to the UK-wide survey only half (51.9%) would recommend a career as a GP to an undergraduate.

There have been limited studies that examine work morale across different occupations to make clear its linkage with occupation-specific work behaviors. Thus it is proposed, that this study also examines the following hypothesis for acceptance or rejection :

“No differences exists in the three specific work behaviors across occupations”

Studying the behavior of teachers in New South Wales, McCormick and Barnett (2011) found that teachers who consistently experience stress from badly behaving students are likely to have an emotional effect, and they could feel a range of emotions, notably anger, and an emotionally-charged teacher is less likely to be effective.

The Current Study

To identify occupation-specific stressors, heterogeneous occupations were surveyed. It is therefore for the purpose of this study four occupations: Bankers, Teachers, Marketers and Engineers were chosen to be a potential pool of respondents for the study. To distinguish the study from previous research in the field of work stress not only those heterogeneous occupations were chosen but also consideration was made that fields where people are in both service/product sector are selected.

In order to gauge the true responses, the entire questionnaires were filled by respondents on job, with no questionnaire being answered by those either on holidays or leave. As the effect of work stressor may be diluted, and would have an effect on the results of the study.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Four heterogeneous occupations in Peshawar, Pakistan were selected; Bankers, Teachers, Marketers and Engineers. Of the 160 copies of questionnaires that were disseminated (40 copies for each occupation), 144 copies were returned, of which 129 were useable. This gave an overall response rate of approximately 89.58%. Specifically, Teachers (87.5%) and Engineers (82.5%) had the highest response rate, followed by Marketers (77.5%), and Bankers (75%).

Measurement of Work Stressor

Work stressors were measured by the ‘Sources of Pressure Scale’ in Occupational Stress Indicator (OSI: Cooper, et al. 1988), which is composed of six stressor subscales, Responses were gathered in terms of the degree of pressure perceived by the respondent. 6-point Likert scale was used to gather responses (1 = Never a source of Pressure to 6= Always a source of Pressure). Higher scores revealed a higher degree of work stress

Table 1. The scales and their reliability

Subscales	Reliability (α)
Factors Intrinsic to the Job	0.67
Managerial Role	0.84
Relationship with Others	0.82
Career and Achievement	0.80
Organizational Structure and Climate	0.82
Home/Work Interface	0.87
Grand Alpha for all subscales (scale: Work Stressor)	0.94

Absence behavior

Absence behavior was assessed by two items developed by Chang and Lu (2009). Responses were recorded by the numbers participants provided, with larger numbers indicating higher occurrence of absence behavior. Scale reliability was 0.40, which seems relatively low. However, Nunnally (1978) claimed that fewer items may affect the structure of internal consistency, which does not imply low reliability.

Quitting Intention

Quitting intention was measured by four self-developed items (See Table 3). Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale (1-Strongly Agree to 5-Strongly Disagree). Higher scores indicated low intentions of quitting the job. Scale reliability was 0.88.

Work Morale

Work morale was measured by five items developed (See Table 3). Chang and Lu (2009). used to assess the respondents feeling about their morale at work. Responses were recorded on 5-point Likert scale (1-Strongly Agree to 5-Strongly Disagree). Higher scores indicated high work morale. Scale reliability was 0.72.

Table 2. ANOVA for Work Stressors (N = 129)

Scales	Bankers (N = 30)	Teachers (N = 35)	Marketers (N = 31)	Engine ers (N = 33)	F/p value
Work Stressor ($\alpha = 0.94$)					
Factors Intrinsic to the Job ($\alpha = 0.67$)					
Having far too much work to do	3.23	3.20	2.55	3.06	1.636, P = 0.184
Rate of Pay (Including work and fringe benefits)	3.73	3.43	2.45	3.30	4.39, P = 0.006**
Keeping up with new techniques, ideas, technology or innovations	2.83	3.37	2.55	2.76	2.003, P = 0.117
Having to Work very long Hours	3.53	3.31	3.23	2.97	0.759, P = 0.519
Too much or too little variety in work	3.27	2.80	2.84	2.79	1.012, P = 0.390
Business travels and having to live in hotels	2.43	2.49	3.23	2.94	1.722, P = 0.166
The accumulative effects of minor tasks	3.27	2.86	2.84	3.03	0.619, P = 0.604
Factors not under your direct control	3.47	3.80	3.42	3.61	0.479, P = 0.698
Making Important Decisions	3.37	3.89	2.81	3.21	3.26, P = 0.024*
Subtotal	3.23	3.23	2.87	3.07	1.609, P = 0.191
Managerial Role ($\alpha = 0.84$)					
Lack of Power and Influence	3.57	4.09	3.45	3.24	2.052, P = 0.110
Personal Beliefs conflicting with those of the organization	3.87	4.06	3.03	3.15	4.246, P = 0.007**
Ambiguity in the nature of job role	4.00	3.80	2.90	3.09	4.934, P = 0.003**
Conflicting job tasks and demands in the role I play	3.77	3.89	2.84	2.82	6.604, P = 0.000***
Inability to delegate	3.13	3.57	2.81	2.97	2.031, P = 0.113
Having to take risks	2.83	3.23	2.52	2.55	2.156, P = 0.097
Simply being seen as a boss	3.03	3.20	2.55	2.42	2.059, P = 0.109
Changes in the way you are asked to do your job	3.50	3.60	3.10	2.55	3.688, P = 0.014*
Simply being visible or available	2.63	3.23	2.81	2.64	1.770, P = 0.156
Having to adopt a negative role (Such as sacking someone)	4.10	3.86	2.81	3.30	4.628, P = 0.004**
Implications of Mistakes you make	4.00	3.86	2.74	3.18	4.930, P = 0.003**
Subtotal	3.49	3.67	2.86	2.90	8.107, P = 0.000***
Relationship with Others ($\alpha = 0.82$)					
Managing or supervising the work of other people	2.40	3.34	2.45	2.88	3.053, P = 0.031*
Coping with office politics	3.40	3.29	2.81	3.61	1.347, P = 0.262
Attending Meetings	3.40	2.97	2.52	2.67	2.342, P = 0.076
Lack of social support by people at work	3.93	2.74	2.39	2.79	7.110, P = 0.000***
Feeling isolated	3.20	2.94	3.23	3.00	0.342, P = 0.795
A lack of encouragement from supervisors	3.87	3.29	3.03	3.27	1.593, P = 0.194
Working with those of the opposite sex	2.00	2.14	2.52	2.52	0.979, P = 0.405
Misuse of time by other people	3.30	3.63	2.87	3.21	1.693, P = 0.172
Dealing with ambiguous and delicate situations	3.43	3.60	2.84	3.36	2.102, P = 0.103
Personality clashes with others	3.47	3.49	3.13	3.09	0.592, P = 0.621
Subtotal	3.24	3.14	2.77	3.03	1.480, P = 0.223
Career and Achievement ($\alpha = 0.80$)					
Over promotion – being promoted beyond my level of ability	2.90	3.23	2.32	2.94	2.112, P = 0.102
Under promotion – working at a level below my level of ability	3.97	3.60	2.68	3.67	3.611, P = 0.015*
Threat of Impending redundancy or early retirement	4.43	3.97	2.81	3.33	6.986, P = 0.000***
Being Undervalued	4.50	4.26	2.84	3.45	7.214, P = 0.000***
Changing Job to progress with career	3.20	3.83	2.42	3.12	4.724, P = 0.004**
Unclear promotion prospects	4.33	3.91	2.52	3.76	9.179, P = 0.000***
An Absence of potential career advancement	4.03	4.31	2.81	3.27	6.417, P = 0.000***
Attaining your own personal level of performance	2.80	3.74	2.68	3.00	3.886, P = 0.011*
Opportunities for Personal Development	2.83	4.26	2.87	2.91	7.942, P = 0.000***
Subtotal	3.66	3.90	2.65	3.27	12.359, P = 0.000***
Organizational Structure and Climate ($\alpha = 0.82$)					
Inadequate guidance and backup from superiors	3.67	4.06	3.23	3.48	1.863, P = 0.139
Lack of Consultation and Communication	3.40	4.11	2.97	3.30	4.020, P = 0.009**
Inadequate or poor quality of training / management development	4.03	4.31	3.32	3.67	3.361, P = 0.021*
Covert Discrimination / favoritism	4.20	3.91	3.29	3.67	1.942, P = 0.126
Mundane (Dull) administrative tasks or paperwork	3.63	3.29	3.19	3.70	0.978, P = 0.406*
Staff shortage and unsettling turnover rates	3.77	3.97	3.03	3.61	2.704, P = 0.048*
Inadequate feedback about my own performance	4.00	4.26	2.74	3.09	11.532, P = 0.000***
Insufficient finance or resources to work with	3.90	4.17	2.90	3.39	4.785, P = 0.003**
Sharing of work and responsibility evenly	3.03	3.29	2.94	2.73	1.197, P = 0.314
Morale and Organizational Climate	3.27	3.74	2.90	2.82	2.675, P = 0.050
Characteristics of the Organizations structure and design	3.23	3.83	2.94	2.91	3.091, P = 0.030*
Subtotal	3.64	3.90	3.04	3.30	7.085, P = 0.000***

Contd.

Home / Work Interface($\alpha=0.87$)					
Not having enough work to do	2.33	3.06	2.61	2.97	1.642, P=0.183
Taking my work home	2.97	3.83	2.81	2.85	3.545, P=0.017*
Not being able to 'Switch off' at home	3.70	3.80	3.19	3.18	1.636, P=0.184
My spouse attitude towards my job and career	3.27	3.14	3.29	3.12	0.095, P=0.962
Demands my work makes on my relationship with my spouse/children	3.60	3.17	3.00	3.27	0.926, P=0.430
Absence of emotional support from others outside work	3.83	3.17	2.45	3.06	5.799, P=0.001**
Demands that works makes on my private/social life	3.47	3.46	2.65	3.12	2.387, P=0.072
Lack of practical support from others outside work	3.43	3.63	2.65	3.03	3.072, P=0.030*
Home life with ambiguous or delicate situations	3.80	3.69	2.19	3.36	10.622, P=0.000***
Absence of stability or dependability in home life	3.93	3.89	2.65	3.33	6.537, P=0.000***
Pursuing a career at the expense of home life	3.90	3.60	2.52	3.18	6.522, P=0.000***
Subtotal	3.47	3.49	2.72	3.13	4.866, P=0.003**
Total (6 Subscales)	3.46	3.56	2.82	3.11	8.434, P=0.000***

Concluded

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$ *** = $p < .001$.

Table 3. ANOVA for Work Behaviors (N = 129)

<i>Scales</i>	Bankers (N = 30)	Teachers (N = 35)	Marketers (N = 31)	Engineers (N = 33)	F/p value
Absence Behavior($\alpha=0.40$)					
How many times do you absent yourself from work every month (e.g. illness or private business)?	1.63	0.83	1.13	1.61	5.751, P=0.001**
How much time do you take off every month? (i.e. without organizational approval)	0.30	0.29	0.13	0.97	5.084, P=0.002**
Total	0.96	0.55	0.62	1.28	7.009, P=0.000***
Intention of quitting job ($\alpha = 0.88$)					
1. I have been thinking of quitting the job?	3.40	3.11	3.74	3.58	1.521, P=0.212
2. If i had a new job opportunity, I would like to quit my current job immediately?	2.63	2.86	3.32	2.94	1.523, P=0.212
3. If i quit my current job, I would feel more satisfied or comfortable?	3.10	3.23	3.68	3.27	1.203, P=0.312
4. If I may choose again, I will not choose to work for the current organization.	2.70	3.20	3.87	3.61	5.407, P=0.002**
Total	2.95	3.10	3.65	3.34	2.455, P=0.066
Work Morale ($\alpha = 0.72$)					
1. The atmosphere at work is pretty bad.	3.53	3.54	3.58	3.82	0.429, P=0.732
2. Everyone around here don't look forward to come to work.	3.33	3.40	3.74	3.55	0.988, P=0.401
3. The Company is not going places.	3.30	3.11	3.81	3.48	3.071, P=0.030*
4. There is no future for this company.	3.67	3.74	4.42	4.00	3.729, P=0.013*
5. We do not pull together this company.	4.03	3.77	4.35	4.12	2.403, P=0.071*
Total	3.57	3.51	3.98	3.79	3.117, P=0.029*

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$ *** = $p < .001$.

RESULTS

Sample Demographics

Mean age of the entire sample ($N = 129$) was 30.16 ($SD = 6.70$). No difference across Ages of the respondents in the 4 occupation was found. Bankers (Mean = 30.77, $SD = 8.92$), Teachers (Mean = 30.63, $SD = 6.73$), Marketers (Mean = 31.13, $SD = 3.71$), and Engineers (Mean = 28.21, $SD = 6.41$). Male participants were in the majority (89.1%) across four occupations. Majority of the participants had Postgraduate degrees (48.1%) followed by Graduate (43.4%) and College (8.5%). In terms of Rank, majority of the respondents were Middle ranked employees (62.8%) followed by Senior, lower and top at 21.7%, 12.4 and 3.1% respectively.

Testing for Hypothesis 1

Significant differences were detected in four stressors across occupations, including: Managerial Role [$F(3, 129) = 8.10, p = 0.000$], Career and Achievement [$F(3, 129) = 12.35, p = 0.000$], Organizational Structure and Climate [$F(3, 612) = 7.08, p = 0.000$] and Home/Work Interface [$F(3, 612) = 4.86, p = 0.003$] whereas no significant difference were detected for Relationship with others and Factors intrinsic to the job. When considering all stressors together, a difference was detected across occupations [$F(3, 129) = 8.43, p = 0.000$].

LSD post-hoc (Homogeneity of Variances Assumed) was used to check difference among individual occupations. Analysis revealed that significant differences existed in work stress between Banker and Marketer ($p = 0.000$), Teacher and Marketer ($p = 0.000$), Banker and Engineer ($p = 0.039$), Teacher and Engineer ($p = 0.006$). Specifically Teachers (Mean = 3.56, $SD = 0.83$) and Banker (Mean = 3.46, $SD = 0.53$) had more stress followed by Engineers (Mean = 3.11, $SD = 0.61$), and Marketers (Mean = 2.82, $SD = 0.56$) had least amount of stress revealed. The above mentioned findings support Hypothesis 1, thus strengthening the assertion that there were differences in stressors across occupations.

Testing for Hypothesis 2

Analysis reveal that significant difference exist across occupations on Absence Behavior [$F(3, 129) = 7.00, p = 0.000$] and work morale [$F(3, 129) = 3.11, p = 0.029$]. However slight differences across occupation were observed on Quitting intention [$F(3, 129) = , p = 0.066$].

In terms of absence behaviour, Dennett T3 post-hoc analysis identified significant differences between Teachers and Engineers ($p = 0.003$), and between Marketer and Engineer ($p = 0.012$). Across the four occupations Engineer (Mean = 1.28, $SD = 0.97$) had relatively higher occurrences of absence behaviour followed by Banker (Mean = 0.96, $SD = 0.44$), Marketer (Mean = 0.62, $SD = 0.61$) and Teacher (Mean = 0.55, $SD = 0.59$).

In terms of Morale, LSD post-hoc analysis identified a significant difference between Banker and Marketer ($p = 0.022$) and Teacher and Marketer ($p = 0.007$). Finally, since higher mean scores depict higher work morale, Teachers (Mean = 3.51, $SD = 0.68$) had relatively lower work morale in comparison to Bankers (Mean = 3.57, $SD = 0.72$), Engineer (Mean = 3.79, $SD = 0.60$), and Marketers (Mean = 3.98, $SD = 0.52$). These findings support the second Hypothesis, i.e., there are differences in work behaviors across occupations.

DISCUSSION

This study revealed that work behaviors and stressors differed across occupations. Certain patterns have thus been identified with regards to occupational influences on work behaviors and stressors. The study holds significant value by providing a basis for contemplating on strategies that would aid in alleviating the negative consequence of stressors across varied occupations.

Occupational Influences on Stressors and Work Behaviors Bankers

Bankers were second only to Teachers in case of work stressors (Mean = 3.46, SD = 0.53). Career and Achievement (Mean = 3.66, SD = 0.72) and Organizational structure and Climate (Mean = 3.64, SD = 0.81) are the highest stress factors for Bankers whereas Factors

Intrinsic to the job were least stressful (Mean = 3.23, SD = 0.77). In depth analysis further reveals that Being Undervalued (Mean = 4.50, SD = 1.73) and Threat of Impending redundancy or early retirement (Mean = 4.43, SD = 1.67) are the two factors that cause highest amount of pressure for bankers. This could be attributed to the feeling of bankers that they put a lot of effort in bringing business to the bank and do not get enough recognition for their hard work whereas for latter pressure not meeting the sales targets could result in losing the job altogether. It is also noteworthy that both the above factors belong to Career and Achievement work stressor which is also the highest source of stress for bankers.

Bankers had the highest intention of quitting (Mean = 2.95, SD = 1.12) the job as compared to employees in all other occupations however they had a good work morale (Mean = 3.57, SD = 0.72) which is third in all the four occupations.

One of the reasons identified by Sowmya and Panchanatham (2011) for intention of quitting were that individual perceptions about politics at work significantly influence the jobs, and also affects how employees feel about their company, seniors and co-workers and directly impacts the productivity, satisfaction and intent to turnover of the workers. Furthermore it was identified that injustice and the subsequent lack of trust is more likely to erode cohesiveness thus leading to adverse consequences such as a high quit rate among employees.

Although in theory those with higher intention to quit would have low morale at work, but in this case the practice is different from theory and results show a better work morale. This may be due to factors that are beyond the scope of this study.

The absence behavior of the Bankers (Mean = 0.96, SD = 0.66) is second in comparison to the 4 occupations. Meaning that on average a banker takes almost 1 leave in a month due to illness or without organizational approval. It is important to note that Bankers are first in 4 occupations studied who absent themselves from work due to illness or private business (Mean = 1.63, SD = 0.92). Sowmya and Panchanatham (2011) study revealed absenteeism is because of the employee negligent behavior. It could also be attributed to the failure of bank employees to approve their holidays due to the work load that they have to take leave by mentioning illness or private business.

Teachers

Analysis revealed that teachers have highest amount of stress (Mean = 3.56, SD = 0.83), further analysis revealed that Teachers have highest stress in all the five factors (Factor Intrinsic to the Job, Managerial Role, Career and Achievement, Organizational Structure and Climate and Home/Work Interface) whereas they were second only to Bankers in case of Relationship with others. The study contradicts the finding of Chang and Lu (2009) who in their study revealed that teaching is a pleasant occupation, because it had the least work stressors.

As for Intention to Quit the Job, teachers had slightly low Intention to Quit the Job (Mean = 3.10, SD = 1.20) and relatively high work morale (Mean = 3.51, SD = 0.68). Teachers had the lowest occurrence of absence behavior (Mean = 0.55, SD = 0.59).

An Absence of Potential Career Advancement and Inadequate or poor Quality of Training/Management development were highest rated stressors by the teachers whereas the least work stressor for Teachers was that of Working with those of the opposite sex. Career Advancement as a higher source of pressure is attributed to organizational variables, specifically Lack of mentoring, limited social network and lack of organizational support as Arokiasamy, Ismail, Ahmad and Othman (2011) found that they were the significant contributors to the career advancement of the academics. Whereas the poor quality training/management was linked to performance by Sukirno and Siengthai (2010), they found that lecturers working in public universities tend to have a better performance compared to those who work in the private universities because of lack of facilities and training and development program in private sector. Whereas for the least source of pressure Määttä and Lyckhage (2011) in their study also illustrated that the informants at the university college described that gender in academia does not matters furthermore it was identified that gender was irrelevant and unproblematic

As for the absence behavior, teachers had the least number of absence recorded with Mean = 0.56, this could very well be equated to the need of teachers to make sure they are showing full attendance that actually ensures no teaching hours of the students are missed.

Teachers had relative low intention to quit the job and a higher morale at work, the positive behavior of teachers at work can be due to the prevalent disagreement among the teacher that their work atmosphere is pretty bad (Table 3). Although teachers reported highest amount of stress but still there is a low intention to quit the job and better work morale, if seen with an angle of the economic situation, since good jobs are hard to come by and there is a desperate need for money to survive, the intentions would have been contributed by the need for a job.

Marketers

Marketers had the lowest amount of work stressor (Mean=2.82, SD=0.56) making it a job with least source of pressure. In addition to this even on the 6 individual work stressors it had a lowest score in comparison to all the 4 occupations. Apart from this Marketers had the lowest intention of quitting the job (Mean=3.65, SD=1.11) with highest work morale (Mean=3.98, SD=0.72). As for Absence Behavior marketers (Mean=0.62, SD=0.61) had relatively low absence, it was third in the list of the four occupations.

The reason for better work morale, low intention to quit and low absence is highlighted by further analysis of data, which points out that marketers are happy with the atmosphere provided to them at work (Mean=3.58, SD=1.40) and Marketers (Mean=3.74, SD=1.06) rate their workplace as a place where they love to come in comparison to all other occupations. Above findings make marketing related jobs the most pleasant in comparison to the other four occupations.

However it is important to note that Lack of Power and Influence (Mean=3.45, SD=1.48) was the highest source of pressure whereas Over Promotion – Being Promoted beyond the level of ability (Mean=2.32, SD=1.04) was the least source of pressure.

In addition to this even on the 6 individual work stressors it had a lowest score in comparison to all the 4 occupations. Apart from this Marketers had the lowest intention of quitting the job (Mean=3.65, SD=1.11) with highest work morale (Mean=3.98, SD=0.72). As for Absence Behavior marketers (Mean=0.62, SD=0.61) had relatively low absence, it was third in the list of the four occupations.

The reason for better work morale, low intention to quit and low absence is highlighted by further analysis of data, which points out that marketers are happy with the atmosphere provided to them at work (Mean=3.58, SD=1.40) and Marketers (Mean=3.74, SD=1.06) rate their workplace as a place where they love to come in comparison to all other occupations. Above findings make marketing related jobs the most pleasant in comparison to the other four occupations.

However it is important to note that Lack of Power and influence (Mean=3.45, SD=1.48) was the highest source of pressure whereas Over Promotion – Being Promoted beyond the level of ability (Mean=2.32, SD=1.04) was the least source of pressure.

Soon et al (2005) report that Work life harmony is linked to better performance and more importantly in current study to reduced employee turnover, the above finding are strengthened by the results of the current study where marketer had very low stress relating to the Home/Work life interface (Refer to table 2) and low Intention to Quit the job (Refer to table 3).

Engineers

Following the Marketers, Engineers had the least work stressor (Mean=3.11, SD=0.61). Unclear promotion prospects, Under promotion – working at a level below the level of ability and Coping with office politics were significant stress contributors for engineers (Refer to table 1). Organisational Structure and climate was the most stressful factor among the 6 work stressors for Engineers.

Engineers (Mean=3.34, SD=0.86) had a low intention to quit the job, second only to marketers whereas they had high work morale (Mean=3.79, SD=0.60) in comparison to Bankers and Teachers. However absence behavior (Mean=1.28, SD=0.97) among Engineers was significantly higher as compared to the rest of the occupations under study.

Interestingly, Engineers had high work morale and high occurrence of absence behavior; however, no particular stressor was identifiable. In other words, factors causing this contrary behavior might not be attributed to stressors measured here, but to other variables outside the realm of the current survey.

Johnson and Senge (2010) found collaborative practices reduced isolation, enhance collegiality, and increased employee morale in Google engineers. With regard to low intention to quit the job, Calisir et al., (2009) found job stress exert negative indirect effects on the intention to quit one's job that is true in the current study where engineers are experiencing low job stress thus have low intention to quit the job.

CONCLUSION

The study revealed differences in Stressors and work behaviors across occupations. The findings have provided valuable insight for further studies through provision of recognition of the uniqueness of each occupation, and for the Human Resources Department and Senior Management, who can have better understanding of the effect of stress and can now satisfactorily design occupation-specific work stress interventions plus also will have to take care in designing Job roles and specification.

The Study revealed that teachers have highest amount of stress followed by Bankers and Engineers with Marketers experiencing the lowest amount of work stress. The study revealed that significant differences existed across occupations in Managerial Role, Careers and achievement, Organizational culture and Home - work interface category of work stressor whereas no differences existed between groups in the Factors intrinsic to the job and Relationship with others.

As for work behavior there were significant differences in Work Morale and Absence behavior of the four occupations, whereas not a significant difference was found in the intention to quit the job across the different occupations under study. Marketers had better work morale followed by Engineers, but it is interesting to note that better work morale was experienced in all the occupations. Whereas intention to quit the job was highest among bankers and lowest intention was found in marketers. Absence behavior was normal with almost 1 leave a month for Bankers, Teachers had low absence whereas engineers showed higher rate of absenteeism.

To conclude, it is hoped that the findings will be beneficial for the varied business stakeholder such as the Management, Employees and the customers, as it is hoped that findings reported here may serve as a catalyst for further research on occupational influences and by reducing the effect of the stressors and negative work behaviors.

REFERENCES

- Archibong, Aniedi, I., Bassey, Offiong, A. and Effiom, D. (2010). Occupational stress among university academic staff. *European Journal of Educational Studies*, 2(3), 217-225.
- Arokiasamy, L., Ismail, M., Ahmad, A. and Othman, J. (2011). Predictors of academics career advancement at Malaysian private universities. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 35(6), 589-605.
- Arsenault, A. and Dolan, S. (1983). The role of personality, occupation and organization in understanding the relationship between job stress, performance and absenteeism. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 56, 227-240.
- Bettencourt, L. and Brown, S. (2003). Role stressors and customer-oriented boundary spanning behaviours in service organization. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31(4), 394-408.
- Broadbridge, A. (1999). Retail Managers: Stress and the Work Family relationship. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 27(9), 374-382.
- Burke, R. (2010). Workplace stress and well-being across cultures, Research and Practice. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 17(1), 5-9.
- Calisir, F., Gumussoy, C. and Iskin, I. (2011). Factors Affecting Intention to Quit among IT professionals in Turkey. *Personnel Review*, 40(4), 514-533.
- Chang, K. and Lu, L. (2009). The influence of occupation on stressors and work behaviours. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(3), 591-605.
- Cooper, S., Sloan, S. and William, S. (1988). *Occupational Stress Indicator*. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.
- Cunningham, J. (2000). *The Stress Management Sourcebook*. OH: McGraw Hill Professional.
- French, J., Caplan, R. and Harrison, V. (1982). *The Mechanisms of Job Stress and Strain*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Hart, P. (1994). Teacher quality of work life: Integrating work experiences, psychological distress and morale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67(2), 109-132.
- Ivancevich, J. and Ganster, D. (1986). *Job Stress from theory to suggestions*. Binghampton: Haworth Press.
- Johns, G. (1997). Contemporary Research on Absence from Work: Correlates, Causes and Consequences. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational*

- Johnson, M. and Senge, M. (2010). Learning to be a programmer in a complex organization: a case study on practice-based learning during on-boarding process at google. *Journal of workplace learning*, 22(3), 180-194.
- Judge, T., Joseph, J. and Thoresen, C. (1997). Five Factor Model of personality and employee absence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(5), 745-755.
- Karasek, R. and Theorel, L. (1979). Job Demands, Job Decision Latitude, and Mental Strain: Implications for Job Redesign. *Administration Science Quarterly*, 24, 285-308.
- Knight, D., Kim, H. and Crutsinger, C. (2007). Examining the effects of role stress on customer orientation and jon performance of retail salespeople. *International Journal o Retail and Distribution Management*, 35(5), 381-392.
- Lazarus, R. (1996). The role of coping with the emotions and how coping changes over the lie course. In C. Magni, & S. McFadden, *Handbook o emotion, adult development and aging* (pp. 289-306). New York: Academic Press.
- Love, P., Edwards, D. and Irani, Z. (2010). Work Stress, support and mental health in construction. *Journal o Construction Engineering and Management*, 136(3), 650-658.
- Lucy, L., David, J., Mellor, D., Kathleen, A., Moore, K. and Loquet, C. (2004). How can Managers reduce employee intention to quit. *Journal o Managerial Psychology*, 19(2), 170-187.
- Maatta, S. and Lyckhage, E. (2011). The Influence of gender in axademia: acase study of a university college in Sweden. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 30(5), 379-393.
- Mathur, G., Vigg, S., Sandhar, S. and Holani, U. (2007). Stress as a correlate of job perormance: a study of manufacturing organizations. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, 4(2), 79-85.
- McCormick, J. and Barnett, K. (2011). Teachers attribution for stress and their relationships with burnout. *International Journal o Educational Management*, 25(3), 278-293.
- Moore, K. (2002). Hospital Restructuring: impact on nurses mediated by social support and a perception of challenge. *Journal of Health and HUman Services Administraion*.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric Theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Oreoluwa, A. and Oludele, A. (2010). Occupational Stress and the Nigerian banking industry. *Journal of Economics and Engineering*, 14-21.
- Pillay, S. (2010). Boosting Morale. *Leadership Excellence*, 27(4), 8.
- Rossi, A., Perrewew, P. and Sauter, S. (2006). *Stress and quality o working life: Current perspectives in occupational health*. Greenwich: Information Age Pub.
- Sass, D., Seal, A. and Martin, N. (2011). Predicting teacher retention using stress and support variables. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 200-215.
- Skinner, E., Edge, K., Altman, J. and Sherwood, H. (2003). Searching for the Structure of Coping: A Review and Critique of Category Systems for Classifying Ways of Coping. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(2), 216-269.

- Soon, A., Qualzi, H., Tay, C. and Kelly, K. (2005). Studies on the impact of Work-Life Initiatives on Employees & firm Performance. Executive Report for Public Release.
- Sowmya, K. and Panchnatham, N. (2011). Organizational Politics - Behavioural Intention of Employees. The Journal of Commerce, 3(1), 8-21.
- Steiger, B. (2006). Survey Results: Doctors say Morale is Hurting. Physician Executive, 6-15.
- Sukrino, D. and Siengthai, S. (2011). Does participative decision making affect lecturer performance in higher education? International Journal of Education Management, 25(5), 494-508.
- Sutherland, V. and Cooper, C. (1992). Job stress, satisfaction and mental health among general practitioners before and after the introduction of the new contract. British Medical Journal, 304, 1545-1548.
- Topper, E. (2007). Stress in the library workplace. New Library World, 108(11/12), 561-564.
- Trout, J. and Rivkin, S. (2001). Differentiate or Die: Survival in our Era of Killer Competition. London: John Wiley and Sons Inc.



Khawaja Fawad Latif: Lecturer at City University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar. M.A Human Resource Management from University of Westminster, London, UK. Area of interest: Job Satisfaction, Organizational culture and change, Learning and Development.
e-mail: kfls_83@hotmail.com



Aamir Nadeem: Assistant Professor at City University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar, Pakistan. Four years teaching experience at postgraduate level and has taught various modules of marketing and related disciplines. CSR/Business Ethics, Organizational Behavior, Services Marketing, and Internal Marketing are his major interest for research.
e-mail: an@cusit.edu.pk



Imran Khalil: Lecturer, Department of Computer Science & Information Technology, University of Engineering & Technology, Peshawar, Pakistan. Over ten years of teaching experience. Areas of interest: Information Technology, Human Resource Management, and Project Management.
e-mail: imrankhalil79@gmail.com



Shahzad Zeb: Worked as Lecturer at Iqra University Islamabad, FAST National University Islamabad and City University, Peshawar. Currently pursuing Ph.D in Management Sciences from Iqra University, Islamabad. Areas of interest include Organizational Development, Strategic Human Resource Management and Entrepreneurship.
e-mail: schazad106@hotmail.com