European Journal of Educational and Development Psychology
Vol.8, No.3, pp.54-69, September 2020
Published by ECRTD-UK
Print ISSN: 2055-0170(Print), Online ISSN: 2055-0189(Online)

THE EFFECT OF STRESS ON ACADEMIC STAFF JOB PERFORMANCE IN PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTHWESTERN NIGERIA: BOWEN UNIVERSITY AS A FOCAL POINT

[*]Oyewole, T.G., Adegoke, J.A., & Atoyebi, T.A.
Bowen University, Iwo, Nigeria

ABSTRACT: *This study investigated sources and types of stress and their impact on academic performance of lecturers in a private university in Southwestern Nigeria with a view to devising a more pragmatic approach to the management of stress in such institutions for optimal performance. The study was carried out through survey method by administering structured questionnaire on respondents randomly selected from the academic staff of Bowen University Iwo in September, 2019. One hundred and twenty (120) copies of the questionnaire were prepared and randomly distributed by hand to respondents drawn from various colleges and programs. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were employed in the analysis of the data collected. It was found out that both sources and types of stress have significant impacts on academic performance of lecturers when performance is considered from the points of view of teaching, publication and community service*.

KEY WORDS: stress, performance, teaching, publication, community service.

INTRODUCTION

More focus is now being directed at stress in the workplace to determine the degree to which it affects performance and productivity. This is not unconnected to the increasing investment in various resources needed for organizations to survive the current turbulent economic situations. The impact of stress appears to be escalating in many countries of the world, Nigeria inclusive. This may not be unconnected with the limitations in economic and other resources available to the various societies and the surge in demands for these resources. According to Le Fevre, Matheny and Kolt (2003), stress can be defined as the body's response to environmental situation, which can lead to change in physical, emotional, behavioral, or mental state. Stress emanates from different sources which include family, society, workplace, associations, inadequate resources, and infrastructure (Danku, Dzomeku, Dodor, & Adade, 2017). In recent years, there has been a rise in stress across all spheres of life, particularly in the workplace. Job performance on the other hand according to Ratnawat and Jha (2014), can be viewed as an activity in which an individual is able to accomplish the task assigned to him successfully, subject to the normal constraints of reasonable utilization of the available resources.

Job performance measures are also constantly changing as a result of globalization which comes along with constantly changing job demands. In the various tertiary institutions, curricula are being constantly reviewed and changing in line with societal expectations. These changes call for new

skills, competencies and methods of service delivery, which in turn require training and retraining of lecturers for state of the art service delivery. In recent times, stress has become a major issue that has seriously affected academic staff of tertiary institutions all over the world (Ubangari & Bako, 2014). However, scholars have come out with the view that stress in academic institutions can have positive and negative consequences depending on how it is managed (Ukwayi, Uko & Udida, 2013; Ubangari & Bako, 2014). Studies in recent years, have shown that stress has turned out to be an evolving dilemma in many organizations and hence caused unfavorable effects on employees' performance (Usoro & Etuk, 2016; Mohamed & Nagy, 2017). In some cases, higher levels of stress, which are not properly managed are connected to lower employees' performance (Ratnawat & Jha, 2014). In today's world, stress has turned into an overall marvel, which occurs in various forms in each work environment. In several workplaces, employees are working for more hours, due to rising levels of responsibilities as a result of new expectations and the fact that unemployment index is on the increase. Moderate stress works as stimulant to the manager when confronted with a difficult problem he must solve (Mohamed & Nagy, 2017). Similarly, moderate stress could be responsible for the creation of innovative activity when the individual is trying to solve a difficult problem. Stress is many times misunderstood and misinterpreted resulting into avoidable problems. Stress is a psychological and physical state that results when the resources of the individual are not sufficient to cope with the demands and pressures of the situation. Stress can be classified into two types: (a) Eustress: Positive, pleasant or curative stress. (b) Distress: Dysfunctional or negative stress. Stress can simply be understood as a condition where one experiences a gap between the present and desired state (Usoro & Etuk, 2016). This is what Winefield & Jarret (2001) calls a mismatch between the worker's expectation of what the job involves and what it actually involves. In most tertiary institutions nowadays, stress has become an integral part of lecturing job. The demand of lecturing job has increased the level of stress among lecturers in Nigerian universities. An optimal level of stress can be a source of positive motivation to succeed (Omoniyi, 2013). However, too much stress can cause physical and mental health problems (Omoniyi, 2013). Stress is therefore considered as a part of the normal fabrics of human existence (Omoniyi, 2013). It is also an inevitable part of challenges that prompt mastery of new skills and behavioral pattern (Usoro & Etuk, 2016).

LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Laiba, Anum, Muhammad and Kashif (2011), stress results in poor concentration, mental block and poor decision making skills which obviously is a negative relationship between job stress and employees job performance. In another study, Ukwayi, Uko and Udida (2013), it was found out that major stress symptoms include headaches, poor concentration and tiredness usually accompanied by dizziness and body pains. These have also been found to affect academic staff performance of tertiary institutions. It has also been discovered that high cost of living and inadequate facilities are among the main causes of stress among academic staff of tertiary institutions (Ukwayi, Uko & Udida, 2013). A fallout of excessive stress in tertiary institutions are challenges such as health problems and absenteeism which continue to lower the productivity of lecturers (Ukwayi, Uko & Udida, 2013). Furthermore, Leiyan and Kamaara (2017), while studying the influence of job design on workplace stress in public universities in Kenya identified role conflict and role ambiguity as having a positive significant effect on workplace stress. Kusi,

Mensah and Gyaki in 2014 found out that among the major causes of stress among university staff in Ghana were insufficient preparation for lectures, excessive workload and difficulties in supervising students' research projects (Kusi, Mensah & Gyaki, 2014).

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Two theories that are thought relevant to this study were reviewed in the course of the study. They are the Welford performance and demand theory (Welford, 1973) and Hertzberg two-factor theory (Hertzberg et al., 1959). As for Welford's performance and demand theory, stress arises whenever there is a disequilibrium between actual performance and expected performance or demand for performance which the affected person is unable to correct. A corollary to this theory is that of Person-Environment Fit model of job stress, developed by French, Caplan and van Harrison (1982), which sees stress as a consequence of two kinds of mismatch: a mismatch between the requirements of the job and the ability of the worker to meet those requirements. The Welford performance and demand theory, also believes that human beings and other organisms perform best under conditions of moderate demand. It is therefore believed that an individual's performance will not be optimized if they experience either too high or too low level of demand. Margetts (1975) offers a similar explanation in terms of stimulus input while arguing that living organisms adjust themselves to maintain a reasonable level of input stimuli. If the input of stimuli is excessive or insufficient for the individual organism, the excess or shortfall can result into stress. This stress can lead to the organism's homeostasis if not properly managed which can further result into a state of disequilibrium or breakdown. This theory is noted for its inverted U shape for explaining the relationship between demand and performance, which has some biological validity (Nakata et al., 2008). One of the critics of this theory is Bloona (2007), who argues that just like the response based theory, the Welford performance and demand theory leaves out individual characteristics which explain why people perform differently under the same stressor. Cox and Mackay (1976) while attending to this lacuna, proposed a more complex theory, which grew out of the need to systematically understand the interaction between the individual and his environment. They suggested that stress is due to a dynamic transaction between the individual and the environment. The primary focus of their theory is on individual's perceptual phenomena which are rooted in psychological process. The role of cognitive appraisal of potentially stressful situation was brought in here to determining how one will react to a stressor. A person is generally believed to be putting in his best into a situation until he realizes his limitation to cope when he begins to experience stress. McGrath (1976) had earlier observed that stress arises when a person experiences an imbalance between perceived demand and the perception of his capability to meet the demand. The presence of this perceptual factor brings in a wide variety of organismic variables such as personality which contributes to the existence of individual characteristics. This modified theory introduces the individual variation aspect to bridge the gap earlier identified. However, it was further argued that the modified theory considers the status of the individual in relation to his environment and also brings the individual characteristics which are often forgotten in laboratory studies, but it does not account for situations that place psychological demands without the immediate involvement of other more physiological processes (Cox, 1985).

In the case of Hertzberg's two factor theory, he hypothesized that there are two different sets of factors governing job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the workplace and they act independently of each other: hygiene factors, extrinsic motivators and motivation factors, or intrinsic motivators. The hygiene factors are also called de-motivators. Hertzberg's theory concentrates on the importance of internal job factors as motivating forces for employees and the absence of which can lead to stress. With this theory, he also in a way, tries to explain occupational stress in the workplace. He carried out his now famous survey on 200 accountants and engineers from which he derived the initial framework for his theory (Steers & Porter, 1987). The theory argues that job satisfaction depends on the motivator factors which include variables such as achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility advancement and growth. Conversely, dissatisfying experiences called hygiene factors resulted largely from extrinsic, no job related factors such as company policies, salary and supervisory style. Cox (1985) in his studies on stress posits that lack of job satisfaction results to stress and improving the hygiene factors by redesigning and enriching jobs will promote satisfaction. This will in turn reduce stress and improve performance. Hertzberg's work is credited for its stimulating thought of introducing motivation at the workplace and therefore giving people a better understanding of job related stress. Critics of this theory argues that it does not give sufficient attention to individual characteristics which are very important in understanding human behavior (Bloona, 2007). Critics of Hertzberg's theory argue that the two-factor result is observed because it is natural for people to take credit for satisfaction and attribute dissatisfaction to external factors. Furthermore, job satisfaction does not necessarily imply a high level of motivation or productivity. Hertzberg's theory has been broadly read and despite its weaknesses its enduring value is that it recognizes that true motivation comes from within a person and not from hygiene factors.

Statement of the Problem

Several studies had been carried out on the impact of stress on performance of staff in various organizations. Several sources/causes had also been identified. The results of these several studies point to the fact that stress, if not properly checked, can lead to a downward trend in the performance of employees in the workplace. Several recommendations had also been proposed, however, workplace stress, especially in tertiary institutions appears to continue to affect the productivity of lecturers which is in turn affecting the quality of graduates being churned out by universities. This is also bringing chaos into the labor market as employers are complaining about the employability of graduates of higher institutions as they still have to embark on long periods of re-training before most of these graduates can begin to deliver. Equally important is the lack of the necessary skills and competencies that will enhance entrepreneurial engagements should the graduates of these institutions want to establish their own businesses. The problem is therefore on how to identify the most prevalent causes/sources of stress in tertiary institutions, the extent of their impact and the optimal level of stress that will guarantee maximum productivity of both lecturers and their students.

Objectives of the study

The general objective of this research is to determine the effect of source and types of stress on academic staff job performance in private universities in Southwestern Nigeria while the specific objectives are to:

(i) identify the most prevalent stressors in tertiary institutions;
(ii) examine the sources of these stressors in academic institutions;
(iii) determine the impact of the identified sources and stressors on academic staff job performance in private universities in Southwestern Nigeria.

METHODOLOGY

This study was carried out through survey method by administering structured questionnaire on respondents randomly selected from the academic staff of Bowen university Iwo in September, 2019. One hundred and twenty (120) copies of the questionnaire were prepared and randomly distributed by hand to respondents drawn from various colleges and programs. This was done after the questionnaire was modified on several occasions as a result of the outcomes of pilot tests carried out which led to the fine-tuning of the questions. Eighty-two (82) copies of the questionnaire were retrieved from the respondents and found statistically viable for analysis. This gives a response rate of 68.33%, which may be due to stress occasioned by academic and administrative demands on lecturers in the university as a result of change from the Faculty system to the Collegiate system just introduced by the university authorities. The data collected were analyzed by the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 23.

Model specifications

To show the effect of sources of stress on academic staff performance, in terms of teaching, publication and community service, in private universities using Bowen university as a case study, the following model specifications were utilized for the study.

Teaching = f(WR, AR, RAR, RCR, DFR, ER, CR)
$$\text{Teaching} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 WR + \alpha_2 AR + \alpha_3 RAR + \alpha_4 RCR + \alpha_5 DFR + \alpha_6 ER + \alpha_7 CR + \varepsilon_t \quad \ldots(1)$$

Publication = f(WR, AR, RAR, RCR, DFR, ER, CR)
$$\text{Publication} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 WR + \beta_2 AR + \beta_3 RAR + \beta_4 RCR + \beta_5 DFR + \beta_6 ER + \beta_7 CR + \varepsilon_p \quad \ldots.(2)$$

Com_service = f(WR, AR, RAR, RCR, DFR, ER, CR)
$$\text{Com\_service} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 WR + \gamma_2 AR + \gamma_3 RAR + \gamma_4 RCR + \gamma_5 DFR + \gamma_6 ER + \gamma_7 CR + \varepsilon_c \quad \ldots(3)$$

Where WR stands for work-related sources, AR for administrative-related sources, RAR for role ambiguity-related sources, RCR for role conflict-related sources, DFR for demotivating factors-related sources, and ER for environmentally-related sources; and CR for cognitive-related causes.

$\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha_5, \alpha_6, \alpha_7$; $\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5, \beta_6, \beta_7$; $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4, \gamma_5, \gamma_6, \gamma_7$ are all constants, and a priori, greater than zero and $\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_p, \varepsilon_c$ are the stochastic errors of regression.

The second set of linear equations depicting performance in terms of teaching, publication and community service with the types of job stress are as stated below:

Teaching = f(SOC, PHY, ACAD, MAR, PSYCH, FIN)
$Teaching = \delta_0 + \delta_1 SOC + \delta_2 PHY + \delta_3 ACAD + \delta_4 MAR + \delta_5 PSYCH + \delta_6 FIN + \varepsilon_t$ …..(4)

Publication = f(SOC, PHY, ACAD, MAR, PSYCH, FIN)
$Publication = \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 SOC + \lambda_2 PHY + \lambda_3 ACAD + \lambda_4 MAR + \lambda_5 PSYCH + \lambda_6 FIN + \varepsilon_p$ ….(5)

Com_service = f(SOC, PHY, ACAD, MAR, PSYCH, FIN)
$Com\_service = \mu_0 + \mu_1 SOC + \mu_2 PHY + \mu_3 ACAD + \mu_4 MAR + \mu_5 PSYCH + \mu_6 FIN + \varepsilon_c$ …(6)

Where SOC is sociological stress, PHY is physical stress, ACAD is academic stress, MAR is marital stress, PSYCH is psychological stress and FIN is financial stress;

$\delta_0, \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3, \delta_4, \delta_5, \delta_6; \lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5, \lambda_6; \mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4, \mu_5, \mu_6$ are all constants, and a priori, greater than zero and $\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_p, \varepsilon_c$ are the stochastic errors of regression. The related linear regression analyses were carried out using SPSS version 23.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of academic staff who participated in the study. From the study, 56 (68.3%) of the participants were males while 26 (31.7%) were females. This implies that majority of those who made themselves available for the study were males. Furthermore, 98.8% of the respondents were above 26 years old, which shows that majority of them are mature enough to understand what workplace stress is all about. Also, 69 (84.1%) of the respondents are married, while 13 (15.9%) are either not yet married or divorced. In respect of educational background, 27 (32.9%) of the respondents already have their Masters' degree while 4 (4.9%) have their MPhil degrees with 51 (62.2) having their PhD degrees. This is a confirmation that all the respondents are highly educated and must have experienced some levels of stress before either in the academic environment or elsewhere. Looking at the academic experience of the respondents, it was discovered that those whose experience is 5 years or below were just 21 (25.6%) while others, that is, 61 (74.4%) had put in 6 to 36 years and above. As for job status, 41 (50%) of the respondents were on Lecturer II, 18 (22%) were on Lecturer I, 19 (23.2%) were on Senior Lecturer while 4 (4.9%) were on Readers or Professorial status.

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of Academic Staff

Gender	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	56	68.3	68.3	68.3
Female	26	31.7	31.7	100.0
Total	**82**	**100.0**	**100.0**	
Age				
Below 25 years	1	1.2	1.2	1.2
26-35 years	24	29.3	29.3	30.5
36-45 years	20	24.4	24.4	54.9
46-55 years	20	24.4	24.4	79.3
56 years and above	17	20.7	20.7	100.0
Total	**82**	**100.0**	**100.0**	
Marital Status				
Married	69	84.1	84.1	84.1
Single	12	14.6	14.6	98.8
Others	1	1.2	1.2	100.0
Total	**82**	**100.0**	**100.0**	
Highest Educational Qualification				
MA/MSc/MBA	27	32.9	32.9	32.9
MPhil	4	4.9	4.9	37.8
PhD	51	62.2	62.2	100.0
Total	**82**	**100.0**	**100.0**	
Job Experience				
Less than 5 years	21	25.6	25.6	25.6
6-10 years	23	28.0	28.0	53.7
11-20 years	23	28.0	28.0	81.7
21-30 years	4	4.9	4.9	86.6
31-35 years	7	8.5	8.5	95.1
36 years and above	4	4.9	4.9	100.0
Total	**82**	**100.0**	**100.0**	
Job Status				
Lecturer 2	41	50.0	50.0	50.0
Lecturer 1	18	22.0	22.0	72.0
Senior Lecturer	19	23.2	23.2	95.1
Reader	3	3.7	3.7	98.8
Professor	1	1.2	1.2	100.0
Total	**82**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

Table 1a shows the effect of sources of stress on the performance of academic staff of Bowen University in terms of teaching, publication and community service. From the Table, it is observed that sources of stress account for 22.1%, 32.8% and 50% of variations in performance respectively when considered in terms of teaching, publication and community service. This implies that community service is the most affected by sources of stress (50%) while teaching is the least affected (22.1%). In effect, if sources of stress in the university is not properly managed, engaging in community service will suffer most which may be counterproductive to the university in its immediate environment. This position is also corroborated by Table 1b which shows the analyses of variance of the effect of sources of stress on performance of academic staff of the university. The strength of the significance of the sources of stress is depicted by the F values: 2.998, 5.168, and 10.551 respectively for teaching, publication and community service. The corresponding p-values are 0.008, 0.000 and 0.000 which are all less than 0.05.

This implies that the sources, when taken together, are all significant on the models. Furthermore, Table 1c shows the coefficient of each of the sources when used as the factors impacting on academic performance. For the teaching model, the only source that contributes significantly to performance is cognitive-related sources (CR) with a p-value of 0.018 which is less than 0.05. However, with a coefficient of -0.212, it means that if cognitive-related causes increase, this will bring about negative teaching performance by academic staff. The other causes are not significant to teaching performance as their p-values are each greater than 0.05. In respect of the publication model, only one source also contributes significantly to performance, and this is the administrative-related sources (AR) which has a p-value of 0.038. However, with a coefficient of +0.238, it follows that administrative-related sources of stress are necessary for an improvement in publication performance. The other sources will also have positive impact on performance but the impact will not be that significant. Furthermore, for the community service performance, administrative-related (AR) and role ambiguity-related (RAR) sources will both have significant positive impact on performance. Their p-values are 0.000 and 0.039 while their coefficients are 0.423 and 0.244 respectively.

Table 1a Effect of sources of stress on Performance: Model Summaries

Models	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
Teaching	.470[a]	.221	.147	.44651	1.824
Publication	.573[a]	.328	.265	.53603	2.174
Community Service	.707[a]	.500	.452	.52987	1.529

a. Predictors: (Constant), CR, RCR, WR, AR, ER, RAR, DFR
b. Dependent Variable: Performance (Teaching, Publication and Community service)

Table 1b Effect of sources of stress on Performance: Analyses of variances (ANOVA)

Teaching Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	4.185	7	.598	2.998	.008[b]
Residual	14.754	74	.199		
Total	18.938	81			
Publication Model					
Regression	10.393	7	1.485	5.168	.000[b]
Residual	21.262	74	.287		
Total	31.656	81			
Community service Model					
Regression	20.736	7	2.962	10.551	.000[b]
Residual	20.776	74	.281		
Total	41.512	81			

a. Dependent Variable: Performance (Teaching, Publication and Community service)

b. Predictors: (Constant), CR, RCR, WR, AR, ER, RAR, DFR

c.

Table 1c Effect of sources of stress on Performance: Coefficients[a]

Teaching Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	2.997	.431		6.954	.000		
WR	.033	.107	.041	.314	.755	.605	1.652
AR	.064	.094	.092	.684	.496	.588	1.702
RAR	.175	.098	.253	1.792	.077	.528	1.894
RCR	.014	.115	.018	.125	.901	.516	1.939
DFR	.138	.113	.186	1.221	.226	.455	2.196
ER	.069	.096	.098	.726	.470	.580	1.724

CR	-.212	.088	-.296	-2.416	.018	.701	1.427
Publication Model							
(Constant)	1.272	.517		2.458	.016		
WR	.082	.128	.078	.637	.526	.605	1.652
AR	.238	.113	.263	2.118	.038	.588	1.702
RAR	.182	.117	.203	1.548	.126	.528	1.894
RCR	-.077	.138	-.074	-.556	.580	.516	1.939
DFR	.032	.136	.033	.235	.815	.455	2.196
ER	.155	.115	.169	1.348	.182	.580	1.724
CR	.094	.105	.101	.889	.377	.701	1.427
Community service Model							
(Constant)	-.292	.511		-.571	.570		
WR	.124	.127	.103	.978	.331	.605	1.652
AR	.423	.111	.408	3.806	.000	.588	1.702
RAR	.244	.116	.238	2.100	.039	.528	1.894
RCR	.135	.137	.113	.989	.326	.516	1.939
DFR	-.071	.134	-.064	-.527	.600	.455	2.196
ER	-.049	.113	-.046	-.430	.668	.580	1.724
CR	.193	.104	.182	1.855	.068	.701	1.427

a. Dependent Variable: Performance (Teaching, Publication and Community service)

After running the regressions, the equations now become:

Teaching = +2.997+0.033WR+0.064AR+0.175RAR+0.014RCR+0.138DFR+0.069ER-0.212CR …….(1)

Publication = +1.272 +0.082WR+0.238AR+0.182RAR-0.077RCR+0.032DFR+0.155ER+0.094CR …….(2)

Com_service = -0.292 +0.124WR+0.423AR+0.244RAR+0.135RCR-0.071DFR-0.049ER+0.193CR …….(3)

Table 2a shows the effect of types of stress on the performance of academic staff of Bowen University in terms of teaching, publication and community service. From the Table, it is observed that types of stress account for 11.7%, 42% and 58.9% of variations in performance respectively when considered in terms of teaching, publication and community service. This implies that community service is also the most affected by types of stress (58.9%) while teaching is the least affected (11.7%). In effect, if the types of stress in the university are not properly identified and managed, engaging in community service will be most affected and this can be counterproductive to the university in its immediate environment. This position is also corroborated by Table 2b which shows the analyses of variance of the effect of types of stress on performance of academic staff of the university. The strength of the significance of the sources of stress is highlighted by the F values: 1.660, 9.041, and 17.939 respectively for teaching, publication and community service. The corresponding p-values are 0.143, 0.000 and 0.000. This implies that with teaching performance, the types of stress identified in the study are insignificant, when taken together. However, for the publication and community service models, the types of stress highlighted are all significant. Furthermore, Table 2c shows the coefficient of each of the types of stress when used as the factors impacting on academic performance. For the teaching model, none of the types of stress contributes significantly to performance. This implies that they all have mild effect on performance which is not strong enough to cause any disruption. In respect of the publication model, sociological and marital stress contribute significantly to performance, and they have p-values of 0.044 and 0.015 respectively. This implies that with coefficients of +0.207 and +0.241 respectively, both sociological and marital stress can contribute positively to performance in publication. This confirms that some types of stress are necessary for publication performance. Furthermore, for the community service performance model, physical and academic stress contribute significantly with p-value of 0.010 and 0.015 respectively. They both have positive contributions with coefficients of +0.272 and +0.319 respectively. This also implies that physical and academic stress can improve community service performance if properly managed.

Table 2a Effect of types of stress on Performance: Model Summaries

Models	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
Teaching	.342[a]	.117	.047	.47212	1.837
Publication	.648[a]	.420	.373	.49490	2.214
Community Service	.768[a]	.589	.556	.47676	1.692

a. Predictors: (Constant), Financial, Sociological, Physical, Marital, Psychological, Academic
b. Dependent Variable: Performance (Teaching, Publication and Community service)

Table 2b Effect of types of stress on Performance: Analyses of variances (ANOVA)

Teaching Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	2.221	6	.370	1.660	.143[b]
Residual	16.718	75	.223		
Total	18.938	81			
Publication Model					
Regression	13.286	6	2.214	9.041	.000[b]
Residual	18.369	75	.245		
Total	31.656	81			
Community service Model					
Regression	24.465	6	4.077	17.939	.000[b]
Residual	17.047	75	.227		
Total	41.512	81			

a. Dependent Variable: Performance (Teaching, Publication and Community service)
b. Predictors: (Constant), Financial, Sociological, Physical, Marital, Psychological, Academic

Table 2c Effect of types of stress on Performance: Coefficients[a]

Teaching Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	3.447	.309		11.149	.000		
Sociological	-.074	.096	-.107	-.763	.448	.602	1.661
Physical	.086	.102	.145	.842	.403	.396	2.527
Academic	.195	.127	.307	1.540	.128	.296	3.377
Marital	.022	.092	.042	.243	.809	.393	2.542
Psychological	-.025	.103	-.045	-.245	.807	.348	2.872
Financial	-.019	.116	-.036	-.164	.870	.247	4.045
Publication Model							
(Constant)	1.979	.324		6.107	.000		
Sociological	.207	.101	.233	2.051	.044	.602	1.661
Physical	.048	.107	.063	.453	.652	.396	2.527
Academic	.096	.133	.117	.724	.471	.296	3.377
Marital	.241	.097	.350	2.499	.015	.393	2.542
Psychological	-.129	.108	-.177	-1.190	.238	.348	2.872
Financial	.129	.121	.189	1.067	.289	.247	4.045
Community service Model							
(Constant)	.930	.312		2.979	.004		

Sociological	.005	.097	.005	.055	.956	.602	1.661
Physical	.272	.103	.311	2.643	.010	.396	2.527
Academic	.319	.128	.339	2.494	.015	.296	3.377
Marital	.135	.093	.171	1.449	.152	.393	2.542
Psychological	-.168	.104	-.202	-1.612	.111	.348	2.872
Financial	.181	.117	.231	1.554	.124	.247	4.045

a. Dependent Variable: Performance (Teaching, Publication and Community service)

After running the regressions, the equations now become:

Teaching = +3.447-0.074SOC +0.086PHY +0.195ACAD +0.022 MAR-0.025 PSYCH-0.019 FIN ……(4)

Publication = +1.979+0.207SOC+0.048PHY+0.096ACAD+0.241MAR-0.129PSYCH+0.129FIN ……(5)

Com_service = +0.930+0.005SOC+0.272PHY+0.319ACAD+0.135MAR-0.168PSYCH +0.181FIN ……(6)

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Academic stress has been considered from the points of view of the impacts of sources and types of stress on the job performance of academic staff in a private university. This performance has been looked at from three angles: teaching, publication and community service. Considering the sources identified in the study together, all of them have significant impacts on academic job performance. For teaching (F value 2.998, p-value 0.008), and in the case of publication (F value 5.168, p-value 0.000), while for community service (F value 10.551, p-value 0.000). However, when these sources are considered individually, only cognitive-related sources CR (p-value 0.018) has a negative significant impact (21.2%) on teaching, while administrative-related sources AR (p-value 0.038) has positive significant impact (23.8%) on publication. Both administrative-related sources AR (p-value 0.000) (42.3%) and role ambiguity-related sources RAR (p-value 0.039) (24.4%) have positive significant impacts on community service. In respect of types of stress, when all of them are taken together, they have no significant impact on teaching (F value 1.660, p-value 0.143). However, with publication (F value 9.041, p-value 0.000) and community service (F value 17.939, p-value 0.000) as options of academic job performance, all the identified types of

stress have significant impact on performance. Furthermore, when considered individually, none of the types of stress has significant impact on teaching. However, for publication, both sociological stress SOC (p-value 0.044) and marital stress MAR (p-value 0.015) have significant impacts on publication, while both physical stress PHY (p-value 0.010) and academic stress ACAD (p-value 0.015) also have significant impacts on community service. It therefore follows from the above findings that sources of stress and types of stress should be properly identified and managed in an academic environment. This may further enhance the productivity of academic staff and the reputation of the institution locally and internationally.

References

Bloona, R. (2007). Coping with stress in a changing world: New York, McGraw-Hill.

Cox, T. (1985). The nature and measurement of stress. *Ergonomics*, 28, 1155-1163.

Cox, T., & Mackay, C. (1976). A psychological model of occupational stress. A paper presented to The Medical Research Council. Mental Health in Industry, London.

Danku, L.S., Dzomeku, V.M., Dodor, C.T., & Adade, T.C. (2017). Stress among private university lecturers in Ghana: Causes and coping strategies. *EPRA International journal of economic and business review*, 5(1), 95-101.

French, J.R.P. Jr., Caplan, R.D., & van Harrison, R. (1982). The mechanisms of job stress and strain. Chichester: Wiley.

Hertzberg, F., Mausner, H., & Snydermann, B. (1959). The motivation to work. New York: Wiley.

Karihe, J.N., Namusonge, G.S., & Iravo, M. (2015). Effects of working facilities stress factors on the performance of employees in public universities in Kenya. *International journal of scientific research and publications*. 5(5), 1-16.

Khan, A., Yusoff, R.B., & Azam, K. (2014). Factors of job stress among university teachers in Pakistan: A conceptual review. *Journal of management info* 2(1), 62-67.

Kusi, H., Mensah-Danso, D.K., & Gyaki, E. (2014). Work-related stress among the academic staff of the University of Education, Winneba Campus, Ghana. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(13), 15-23.

Laiba, D., Anum, A., Muhammad, A. N. & Kashif, D. K. (2011). Impact of stress on employees job performance in business sector of Pakistan 11(6) (n.p).

Le Fevre, M., Matheny, J. & Kolt, G.S. (2003). Eustress, distress and interpretation in occupational stress. *Journal of managerial psychology*. 18(7), 726-744.

Leiyan, N.N. & Kamaara, M. (2017). Influence of job design on workplace stress in public universities in Kenya: A case of Jomo Kenyatta university of agriculture and technology. *The strategic journal of business and change management*. 4(4), 453-474.

Margetts, E.L. (1975). Stress, homeostasis and human ecological continuum. *Journal of Society, Stress and Distress*. Vol 2. 22-36

McGrath, J.E. (1976). Stress and behavior in organization, In M.D. Dunnette (Ed) Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology 1351-1397. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Mohamed, S.M., & Nagy, F. (2017). Emotional intelligence and job stress among academic members at faculty of nursing: Cairo university. *IOSR Journal of nursing and health science*, 6(1), 10-19.

Nakata, M. Nakata, V. Gardiner, G. McKeough, J. Byrne, A. & Gibson, J. (2008). Indigenous digital collections: An early look at the organization and culture interface. *Australian Academic and Research Libraries Journal*, 39(4), 137-145.

Omoniyi, M.B.I. (2013). Sources of workplace stressors among university lecturers in Southwest Nigeria:Implication for counselling. 1st Annual interdisciplinary conference, 24-26 April, 2013 Azores, Portugal - Proceedings

Ratnawat, R.G. & Jha, P.C. (2014). Impact of job related stress on employee performance: A review and research agenda. *IOSR Journal of business and management*, 16(11), 1-6.

Steers, R.M. & Porter, L.W. (1987). Motivation and work behavior. McGraw-Hill.

Ubangari, A.A. & Bako, R. (2014). Relationship of stress and academic performance among university lecturers in Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of humanities and social science* 10(1), 98-104.

Ukwayi, J.K., Uko, E.S., & Udida, L.A. (2013). A critical analysis of career stress among academic staff of tertiary institutions in Cross River state, Nigeria. *Journal of educational and social research*. 3(2), 15- 21.

Usoro, A.A. & Etuk, G.R. (2016). Workload related stress and job effectiveness of university lecturers in Cross River and Akwa Ibom states, Nigeria. *Asian journal of social sciences and management studies*. 3(1), 34-41.

Welford, A. T. (1973). Stress and performance. *Ergonomics*, 16(5), 567-580.

Winefield, A.H. & Jarrett, R.G. (2001). Occupational stress in university staff. *International journal of stress management*, 8(4), 285-298.