



---

## TEACHER VALUE BEHAVIOUR AND STRESS – A CRITICAL STUDY

**Dr. N.V.S.Suryanarayana**

Teaching Associate  
Department of Education  
Andhra University Campus  
Vizianagaram

The quality of human life basing on values is probably possible only through the teacher, the learner and the teaching learning process. The teacher is endeavour of inculcating the values through his effective professional efficacy. Where Stress is usually thought of in negative terms, it is thought to be caused by something bad. But there is also a positive and pleasant side of stress caused by good things, for example an employee is offered a job promotion at another place. There has been high amount of research, which could answer that what is Teacher Value Behavior? What is teacher Stress? And how they are influencing on the learner and teaching-learning process? In what way they are related?<sup>1</sup>

Lot of research efforts have been focused on Teacher Value Behaviour but substantial research has not been taken up on Teacher Stress. The Education Commission (1964-66) observed, 'the weakening of social and moral values in the younger generation is creating many serious social and ethical conflicts. It has become necessary and urgent to adopt active measures to give a proper value orientation to education. The National Policy on Education (1986), which clearly recommended 'readjustment in the curriculum in order to make education a forceful tool for the cultivation of social and moral values'. The Delor's Commission (1996), which asserted 'it is the teacher whose role and help immensely in the inculcation of value'. But no significant efforts are taken to found the relationship between Teacher Value Behaviour and Teacher Stress.

Daniel Behets, Liven Vergauwen (2004) studied 'Value Orientations of Elementary and Secondary Physical Education Teachers in Flanders'. The purpose of this research was to examine and compare physical educators' value profiles. The study concludes that the teachers at the elementary level placed a high priority on the disciplinary mastery and the self-actualization orientations; those at the secondary level scored high on the social responsibility and disciplinary mastery orientations. Melinda A.Solmon and Madge H. Ashy (1995) Studied 'Value Orientations of Pre-service Teachers'. In this study Curriculum theorists have acknowledged the critical role that beliefs and values play in the decisions that teachers make, but very little known about how teachers' value profiles develop. While the study of Ruth Wajnryb (1999) made on 'A Developmental Model of Teacher Development' concludes that how inexperienced and experienced teachers think and act and drew a series of policy.

In respect of Teacher Stress, Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1977) notes that maintaining classroom discipline has not been identified as the most important source



of teacher stress in the studies reviewed by them. Lowther, Stark and Chapman (1984) in found in his study that strong sense of being locked into the current job – and a negative view of their prospects for advancement, vertically as well as horizontally as they were denied the opportunity for promotion even when their performance was outstanding. Akihito Shimazu, Yusuke Okada, Mitsumi Sakamoto and Masae Miura (2003) investigation on “Effects of Stress Management Program for Teachers in Japan: A Pilot Study” is concluded that stress management program conducted in this study contributed to increasing social support from colleagues.

**Problem:**

The problem posed in this study is to establish the relationship between Teacher Value Behaviour and Teacher Stress among the Degree College Lecturers in Vizianagaram District.

**Objectives of the Study:**

- (1) To study the relationship between Teacher Value Behaviour and Teacher Stress of Degree College Teachers.
- (2) To find out the significance of relationship between Dimensions of – Teacher Value Behaviour; and Teacher Stress of Degree College Teachers.
- (3) To find out the significance of difference between the demographic and professional variables in respect of Teacher Value Behaviour, Teacher Stress of Degree College Teachers.
- (4) To find out significant difference between High and Low Teacher Value Behaviour in relation to Teacher Stress; High and Low Teacher Stress in relation to Teacher Value Behaviour.

**Hypotheses:**

- (1) There is no significance of relationship between Teacher Value Behaviour and Teacher Stress.
- (2) There is no significance of relationship between the Dimensions of Teacher Value Behaviour; and Teacher Stress.
- (3) Teachers considered under Sex, Locality, Qualification, Age, Marital Status, Experience, and Type of Management do not differ significantly in their Teacher Value Behaviour and Teacher Stress.
- (4) Teachers of Low and High categories do not differ significantly in their Teacher Value Behaviour in relation to Teacher Stress; and Teachers Stress in relation to Teacher Value Behaviour.

**Procedure adopted:**

In order to test the hypotheses, the investigator is planned and executed in



four phases. In the first phase development and standardization of Teacher Value Behaviour and Teacher Stress self-rating scales. In the second phase measurement of Teachers' opinion is collected with the help of above two self-rating scales. In the third phase using appropriate statistical procedure is adopted to find out the significance of relationship between Teacher Value Behaviour and Teacher Stress. In the Fourth and last phase using appropriate statistical procedures to find out the significance of difference between the demographic variables in their Teacher Value Behaviour and Teacher Stress.

#### **Administration of the Tools:**

After developing and standardizing these two tools following the predictive validity as suggested by John, W. Best and James V. Kahn, the final and fresh scales are prepared for administration with specific instructions. Each statement in both the tools is followed with the five alternatives as suggested by Likert's methods of summated rating technique. This technique is used because it is most forward technique. Those five alternatives are – Strongly agree (SA), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (DA) and Strongly Disagree (SDA). A clear instruction was given to the respondents to express their opinion by putting a tick mark against the response category to which they are agree with. Each scale is stated with the personal data sheet. These two scales are administered to 118 Teachers of Degree Colleges in Vizianagaram District.

#### **Collection of Data:**

For collection of data, the investigator personally visited each school and administered these scales to the teachers. They advised to put their name, sex, qualification, designation, Age, experience and address of the school etc., as mentioned in the demographic data provided to the tools. Teachers are further requested not to leave any item of the tool. Most of the teachers have responded on the spot and return the tools to the investigator. Thus these two tools collected are scores according to the scoring procedure.

#### **Scoring:**

The responses scored according to the key. For all the positive items scores from 5 to 1 for five responses viz., Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (DA) and Strongly Disagree (SDA) respectively are given. For all negative items scores 1 to 5 are given separately for SA, A, N, DA and SDA. Basing on the above scoring procedure both the tools were scored and computed as required and stated in the analysis of data. Thus the total score of Teacher Value Behaviour tool will be 30 to 150 and Teacher Stress Score is 40 – 200.

#### **Sample:**

The sample selected for the present investigation is 38 Degree College Teachers in Vizianagaram District. Random sampling technique is followed to draw



the sample for the present study. To measure the Teacher Value Behaviour and Teacher Stress of the selected sample of Teachers, the collected data was categorized as Sex (Male= 79; Female = 39), Locality (Rural = 46; Urban = 72), Qualification (Post-graduates = 86; PG with M.Phil/Ph.D. = 32); Age (Below 40 years = 61; Above 40 years = 57), Marital Status (Married – 89; Unmarried – 29), Experience (Below 15 years = 49; Above 15 years = 69), Type of management (Govt./Aided Colleges = 44; Private Unaided Colleges = 74). Thus it is found to be a satisfactory sample and the sample is believed to be an adequate to test the hypotheses. Thus the total sample of 38 Degree College Teachers is 118.

#### **Delimitation of the Study:**

This study is delimited to the Teachers working in Degree Colleges in Vizianagaram District only. To measure the opinion of teachers in their Teacher Value Behaviour and Teacher Stress, self-rating Scale is used. Of many dimensions of Teacher Value Behaviour – Work Centered, Learner Centered, Professional Centered, Adjustment Centered and Emotional Centered are taken into account. Similarly, of many dimensions of Teacher Stress – Intensity of work, Students' Behaviour, Professional Growth, and Extrinsic Annoyers are considered in this study.

#### **Statistical Procedure adopted:**

After presenting the methodological aspects, the statistical procedure was used to establish the relationship between the two variables, i.e., Teacher Value Behaviour and Teacher Stress 'r' values are computed. To measure the significant differences between these two variables in relation to the demographic variables the means, standard deviations and Critical Ratio values are computed.

#### **Analysis of Data:**

The following statistics were calculated for arriving at conclusions like coefficient correlation to find the relationship between Teacher Value Behaviour and Teacher Stress and also obtained the Critical Ratio values variables wise.

**Table 1**  
**Table showing significance of 'r' between**  
**Teacher Value Behaviour and Teacher Stress**

Variable category	N	df	'r'	Probability
Teacher Value Behaviour	118	116	0.69	Significant at 0.01 Level
Teacher Stress				

The value of 'r' is significant and hence, the hypothesis is rejected. Hence, the null hypothesis that 'there is no significance of relationship between Teacher Value Behaviour and Teachers' of Degree Colleges is rejected.



**Table showing the inter-correlation matrix of various dimensions of Teacher Value Behaviour of Dr.VSR, Pakalapati (1994)**

	Work centered	Learner centered	Professional centered	Adjustment Centered	Emotional centered
Work centered	1.00	0.57	0.29	0.47	0.63
Learner centered		1.00	0.63	0.56	0.42
Professional centered			1.00	0.58	0.69
Adjustment Centered				1.00	0.41
Emotional Centered					1.00

From the above table it can be concluded that the obtained 'r' values are significant at 0.01 levels respectively. The dimensions viz., Work centered, Learner centered, Professional Centered, Adjustment Centered and Emotional Centered of Teacher Value Behaviour are correlated and statistically significant. Hence, the null hypothesis that 'no significance of relationship between the dimensions of Teacher Value Behaviour' of Degree Colleges is rejected.

**Table 3  
 Table showing the inter-correlation Matrix of various Dimensions of Teacher Stress of Uday's Scale (1996)**

	Intensity of work	Students' Behaviour	Professional growth	Extrinsic Annoyers
Intensity of work	1.00	0.46	0.36	0.58
Students' Behaviour		1.00	0.62	0.45
Professional growth			1.00	0.54
Extrinsic Annoyers				1.00

From the above table it is concluded that the obtained 'r' values are significant at 0.01 levels respectively. The dimensions viz., Intensity of work, Students' Behaviour, Professional Growth and Extrinsic Annoyers of Teacher Stress are correlated and statistically corroborated. Hence, the null hypothesis that, 'no significance of relationship between the dimensions of Teacher Stress' of Degree Colleges is rejected.



**Table 4**  
**Table showing the significance of difference of Mean Between the various variables of Degree College Teachers in their Value Behaviour**

Variable category	Mean	S.D	N	C.R
Male	136.32	11.3	79	1.13@
Female	138.89	11.78	39	
Rural area	132.45	11.89	46	2.36*
Urban area	137.47	10.35	72	
Post-graduates	130.13	11.63	86	2.02*
PG with M.Phil/Ph.D.	134.81	11.38	32	
Below 40 years Experience	136.28	10.45	61	2.12*
Above 40 years Experience	132.16	10.63	57	
Married	128.18	10.82	89	1.66@
Unmarried	132.32	11.96	29	
Below 15 years Age	135.76	11.26	49	2.6*
Above 15 years Age	130.42	10.65	69	
Govt./Aided	130.06	11.26	44	2.32*
Private Unaided	134.92	10.54	74	

\*\*Significant at 0.01 level  
 \*Significant at 0.05 level  
 @Not Significant at any level

From the above table it can be concluded that the Critical Ratio values in respect of Locality, Qualification, Age, Experience and Type of Management of Degree College Teachers are more than 1.96 and 2.58 and significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels respectively. Hence, the null hypotheses in respect of the above variables are rejected. Further, it is also concluded that though there is significance of difference between the variables viz., Sex and Marital status, statistically they are not corroborated and the null hypotheses are retained.

**Table 5**  
**Table showing the significance of difference of Mean Between the various variables of Degree College Teachers in their Stress**

Variable category	Mean	S.D	N	C.R
Male	80.69	13.48	79	2.35*
Female	87.98	16.85	39	
Rural area	74.67	18.42	46	2.03*
Urban area	69.31	13.29	72	
Post-graduates	88.74	16.46	86	2.45*
PG with M.Phil / Ph.D.	97.69	18.11	32	
Below 40 years Experience	82.76	16.43	61	2.29*
Above 40 years Experience	89.69	16.45	57	
Married	78.91	17.88	89	2.18*
Unmarried	87.86	19.63	29	
Below 15 years Age	85.65	16.82	49	2.02*
Above 15 years Age	79.21	17.34	69	
Govt./Aided	86.14	17.23	44	2.12*
Private Unaided	79.33	16.09	74	

\*Significant at 0.05 level



The above table disclosed that the obtained Critical Ratio values of all variables in respect of Stress of Degree College Teachers are more than 1.96 but less than 2.58, which is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the null hypotheses that the ‘there is no significance of difference between the variables – Sex, Locality, Qualification, Age, Marital Status, Experience and Type of Management of College Teachers in their Stress’ is rejected.

**Table 6**  
**Table showing the Mean values of the Dimensions**  
**in respect of Value Behaviour and Stress (N = 118)**

VALUE BEHAVIOUR			STRESS		
Dimension	Mean	S.D	Dimension	Mean	S.D
Work centered	22.5	4.74	Intensity of Work	20.21	3.72
Leamer centered	21.45	4.36	Student's Behaviour	24.65	4.63
Professional centered	23.35	4.98	Professional Growth	22.33	4.11
Adjustment centered	22.37	4.48	Extrinsic Annoyers	33.28	8.63
Emotional centered	24.63	4.39	--	--	--

From the above table it is observed that the ‘Emotional centered’ aspect is possessed highest mean score; the least mean score is ‘Learned centered’ aspect of Value Behaviour. Similarly, in respect of Stress – the mean value of ‘Extrinsic Annoyers’ aspect is high, while the mean value of ‘Intensity of Work’ is stands at last.

**Table 7**  
**Table showing the significance of difference of ‘t’ between**  
**High and Low Teacher Value Behaviour in relation to**  
**Teacher Stress and Vice-versa**

Variable category	Mean	S.D	N	C.R
High Value Behaviour	96.92	14.48	74	8.0
Low Value Behaviour	72.58	16.85	44	
High Stress	89.26	16.32	83	10.21
Low Stress	52.18	18.75	35	

From the above table it can be concluded that there is significance of difference between high and low Value Behaviour in relation to Stress. Since the obtained value of C.R. 8.0 is more than 1.96 and 2.58, which is significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. Similarly, there is significance of difference between high and low Stress in relation to Value Behaviour. The significance of difference between High and Low Stress is very high. The obtained value of C.R. 10.21 is more than 1.96 and 2.58, which is significant at 0.05 and 0.1 levels respectively. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.





### Conclusions:

- 1) There is significance of relationship between Teacher Value Behaviour Stress among the Degree College Teachers.
- 2) There is significance of relationship between the dimensions of Teacher Value Behaviour.
- 3) There is significance of relationship between the dimensions of Teacher Value Behaviour.
- 4) In respect of Teacher Value Behaviour, there is significance of difference between the variables – Locality, Qualification, Age, Experience and Type of Institution. Whereas the Teachers in respect of Sex and Marital Status categories do not differ significantly.
- 5) In respect of Teacher Stress, there is significance of difference between all the variables – Sex, Locality, Experience, Age, Marital Status, Experience and Type of Institution.
- 6) In respect of Teacher Value Behaviour – ‘Emotional Centered’ aspect is the highest in the merit order followed by ‘Professional Centered’, ‘Work Centered’, ‘Adjustment Centered’ and ‘Learned Centered’ aspects respectively. While in the case of Teachers Stress – ‘Extrinsic Annoyers’ aspect is in the highest in the merit order followed by ‘Students’ Behaviour’, ‘Professional Growth’ and ‘Intensity of Work’.
- 7) There is significance of difference between the High and Low Value Behaviour in relation to Stress and High and Low Stress in relation to Value Behaviour.

The result of the study disclosed that the Teacher Value Behaviour aspect is influencing the variables Locality, Qualification, Age, Experience and type of institution, whereas the Stress aspect influencing all the variables Sex, Locality, Age, Experience, Marital Status, Experience and Type of Institution. The high Teacher Value Behaviour in relation to Teacher Stress and high Teacher Stress in relation to Teacher Value behavior are statistically corroborated. In view of the above study, it is needed more attention to pursue the causes of disparity among the Degree College Teachers so as to enhance the quality in teaching-learning process.

### References:

1. Australian Journal of Education (ed.) ‘Self-reported work and family stress of female primary teachers’, e-journal article, April, 2003.
2. Barr, A.S. ‘Teaching Competencies’, Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Revised Edition, 1950, 1446-54.
3. Daniel Behets, Lieven Vergauwen, Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, USA, June, 2004.





4. Delor's Commission Report (1986), Govt. of India, New Delhi
5. Dr.D.S.Kothari (1964-66), Education Commission Report, New Delhi
6. Garrette, H.E., 'Statistics in Psychology and Education', New York, David Mc.Kay Co., Inc., 1966.
7. Guilford J.P., 'Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education', Mac.Graw Hill Publishing Co., Inc., Tokyo, 1978.
8. Jenkins, C.D., 'Psychological modifiers of responses to Stress', Journal of Human Stress, Dec., 1979, 3.15.
9. Keith F.Punch & Elizabeth Tuetteman, 'Reducing Teacher Stress : The Effects of supports in the Work Environment', Nov. 1996, Research Article, B-net, E-Journal.
10. Kyriacou, C. and Sutcliffe, J. 'Teacher Stress – Prevalence, Sources and Symptoms', British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1978, 48, Pp.158-167.
11. \_\_\_\_\_ (1979), 'Teacher Stress and Satisfaction', Dept. of Education, Cambridge University, UK, Published: 'Educational Research', Vol.21, Issue 2, Feb.1979, Pp.89-96.
12. Melinda A.Solmon and Madge H. Ashy (1995) Studied 'Value Orientations of Pre-service Teachers' National Policy on Education Commission, Govt. of India, 1986.
13. Ruth Wajnryb, Nexus: A Journal for Teachers in Development, China, November, 1999.
- 14 Sixth Survey of Education, NCERT, New Delhi, 2006.