

Prevalence of Job stress and its Associated Factors among Universiti Putra Malaysia Staff

Okonkwo Mukosolu,¹ Faisal Ibrahim*,¹ Lekhraj Rampal,¹ Normala Ibrahim²

¹Department of Community Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences,
Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia

²Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences,
Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Stress in the work place is a global major risk factor to worker's health, which triggers the workers to be poorly motivated and less productive. **Objectives:** The objective of the study was to determine the prevalence of job stress and its associated factors among Universiti Putra Malaysia staff. **Methods:** This is a cross sectional study involving 511 academic and non-academic staff of Universiti Putra Malaysia in Serdang. Probability proportionate to size was used for calculating the required sample size. **Results:** The overall prevalence of stress was 21.7% (21.0% among male and 23.0% among female). The variables found to be significantly associated with stress were: Job demand, coworker support, depression, anxiety, focus and venting of emotion and self-blame ($p < 0.05$). The findings revealed that UPM staffs are exposed to a range of specific stressors such as work stressor: job demand, lack of social support such as co-worker support and supervisor support, psychological stressors such as depression and anxiety, coping such as focus and venting of emotion and self-blame. Work stressor such as job demand was the main predictor of stress (p value = 0.001). **Conclusion:** The overall prevalence of job stress was 21.7%. The predictors job stress were job demand, lack of support from co-worker and supervisor, depression, anxiety and use of avoidance focused coping.

Keywords: Job stress, Prevalence of stress, Stress associated factors, University staff

INTRODUCTION

Stress is a condition or feeling experienced when a person perceives that demands exceed the personal and social resources the individual is able to mobilize.¹ It is an outcome from inconsistencies between demands and pressures on the person, on one hand then their knowledge and abilities on the other, which challenges their ability to cope. This includes not only the situation where the pressure of the work exceeds the person's ability to cope but where the person's knowledge and abilities are not sufficiently utilized and that is a problem for them.² It affects different people in different ways; such as causing dysfunctional behavior and contributes to poor physical and mental health. In extreme cases chronic stress can lead to psychological problems, heart diseases, disorders in digestive system, increased blood pressure and psychiatric disorders.² It occurs in a wide range of work circumstances, but it is often worsened, when the employee feels they have little support from supervisors and colleagues, having little or no control over work and how they can cope with its demands and pressures.²

Stress is a worldwide serious risk factor to the worker's physical and mental condition, as well as to the well-being of the organization. Stress if not managed, may lead to loss of interest among the workers, unfruitful and valueless outputs.² WHO estimates that there are 160 million work related illnesses including back pain 16%, hearing loss 10% and depression which accounts for one death in every ten and half minutes.³ Globally, stress related to the work environment and conditions have become a growing concern for both employees and employers.⁴ Global organization for stress statistics, shows that stress continues to be on the rise among adults in the workplace.⁵ It has been acknowledged that the education sector is one of the work settings dominated by stress. Researches from across the globe have indicated that prevalence of stress among university personnel has been escalated up to 2340 cases per 100 000 people, where lack of support, anxiety and depression were the most observed prevalence.⁶ Most of these personnel see their work as stressful or extremely stressful.^{6,7} In Malaysia, public academics are also faced with increased stress due to the rapid development in the higher education sector.⁸ Study done among Malaysia education officials revealed that lack of clear-cut policies and lack of good working procedures played a significant role in initiating stress.⁹ A study on job stress among 300 public university academicians from Klang Valley in Malaysia, reported that job stress was one of the significant factors that reduces job satisfaction among staff.¹⁰

*Corresponding author: Assoc. Prof. Dato Dr. Faisal Ibrahim
faisalupm@upm.edu.my

The number of higher institutions in Malaysia has increased over the years, thereby causing managements to face competitive pressures from each other due to the growing demands and with subsequent increase of staff workloads, thus affecting their psychological wellbeing.¹¹ Academic and non-academic personnel have expressed pressure in building international reputation, funding, and in adhering to key performance indicators to bring Malaysian education to international standard, with a vision of building Malaysia towards a Centre of educational excellence by 2020.^{11, 12} In a bid to achieve these goals, the university academic staff need to work harder to bring adequate output such as production of papers for publication in high impact journals, application of research grants, supervision of students, conducting of qualitative and quantitative researches. Likewise non-academic staff are forced to work harder to provide high quality administrative service for their clients, which may incur an adverse effect on their health and wellbeing. Prevalence of stress was found to be 22.2% in a study done among health care workers of a Higher Learning Institution in Kelantan.¹³ Equally, a prevalence of 33.3% was found in a study among laboratory technicians in Universiti Sains Malaysia.¹⁴

Work related Health problems are usually generated by occupational stress and regarded as one of ten leading health problems.¹ The UK's Health and Safety Executive has identified six categories of work related stress, namely demands, control, relationships, change, role and support.¹⁵ The objective of this study is to determine the prevalence of job stress and factors associated among UPM staff in Serdang campus. Work related stress occurs when there is a mismatch between the demands of the job and the individual capabilities.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This is an analytical cross sectional study, carried out at Universiti Putra Malaysia, Serdang campus. The research was conducted in UPM main campus, Serdang. UPM has two campuses, the main campus, located at Serdang (1108.103 hectares) and another branch at Bintulu (714.717 hectares). The university was established in 1931 and consists of 16 faculties and 9 institutes. UPM is a research intensive public university. Probability proportionate to size (PPS) sampling was used to select participants from a total of 4067 staff of 16 faculties and 9 institutes. Sampling with probability proportionate to size was used for the selection of staff. This is a combination of simple random, cluster and systematic random sampling. The first step was calculating the sample size. The desired cluster size was obtained by getting the mean number of staffs in the faculties and institutes with less than 1000 staffs. The next step was computing the number of clusters (Faculties and Institutes) needed to achieve the calculated sample size which was obtained by dividing the sample size by cluster size to calculate the required 565 sample size based on 95% CI with 0.05 level of significance. Hence number of clusters obtained was 6. A starting point within the sampling interval was identified using table of random numbers. In the final step, the sampling interval was added to the starting point. The process was repeated until all the five faculties and one institute was identified and proportionate allocation of the number of staff to participate in the study from each faculty and institute was done. All Malaysian staff who are employed permanently or on contract basis were selected, staff working in Serdang campus and staff present at time of study were the inclusion criteria, while staff on sabbatical, maternity, study, and sick leave throughout the period of the study and non- Malaysian citizens were excluded from the study.

Data Collection

The data was collected between July to October 2013.

Study Instrument

English and Malay version of self-administered questionnaire was pretested and validated for content and face validity and distributed to the respondents. The questionnaire was pretested among 25 university staff from the Faculty of Engineering while the reliability of the questionnaire was tested using the internal consistency approach by checking for the Cronbach alpha of the scale. The questionnaires consisted of seven sections. Section A consisted of eight socio-demographic items including gender, age, ethnicity, religion, marital status, highest educational level, occupation and monthly family income. Section B consisted of 18 items adapted from the Job Content Questionnaire.¹⁶ Role ambiguity/clarity adapted from the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire for role ambiguity.^{17, 18} was also included in this section, which were all in Likert scale. Section C consisted of 12 items measuring the life events of the respondents in the last six months. The response to the scale was expressed as either yes or no. The life events measured self-illness or injury, relative's illness/injury, death of parent/child/spouse, death of close family, marital separation, broken relationship, problem with close friend / neighbour /relative, unemployment, loss of job, financial crisis, police/court problems, and loss of valued property.¹⁹ Section D focused on social support received from the work place, including eight items adapted from the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire¹⁸, and measured in four

likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Section E examined the psychosocial characteristics of the respondents, which consisted of twenty-one questions on depression, anxiety and stress (DASS21).^{19,20} Section F measured 18 items on personality of the respondents, adapted from the Temperament and Personality Questionnaire.²¹ Two important variables were measured in this section, namely anxious worrying and effectiveness. Section G of the questionnaire assessed the coping skills of the respondents, which comprised of twenty eight items. The questionnaire was adapted from Brief Cope questionnaire.²²

Ethical approval

Ethical approval was obtained from Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM) Medical Research Ethics Committee. Prior to conducting this research, written approvals were obtained from the Deans and Directors of the five Faculties and one Institute respectively. Verbal and written informed consent was acquired from each respondent. The confidentiality of the respondent's information was ensured.

Data analysis

All data were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. Transformation and coding of the data was done. The normality tests showed that the data have normal distribution. Categorical variables were tested for associations using the Pearson's chi square for association, and Fisher's exact tests, which were presented as frequencies and percentages. Continuous variables were presented as means with their 95% confidence interval. Multivariate analysis was performed using multiple logistic regression and the result was expressed as odds ratio with 95% confidence interval. The level of significance was set at 5%.

RESULTS

Response rate

Table 1 shows that out of 564 respondents selected, 511 participated and completed the questionnaire giving overall response rate of 90.4%.

Table 1: Response rates according to Faculties and Institute

Faculties and Institute	N	%
Institute of Advanced Technology	32	68.3
Faculty of Design and Architecture	46	72.5
Faculty of Agriculture	60	78.7
Faculty of Engineering	124	90.7
Faculty of Medicine and Health Science	177	98.5
Faculty of Educational Studies	72	88.5
Total	511	

Overall response rate = $\frac{\text{Number of completed questionnaire} \times 100}{\text{Number of eligible staff}}$

= $511/565 \times 100 = 90.4\%$

Majority of the respondents (70.3%) were female while (29.7%) were male. The overall mean age of the respondents was 37.91(95% CI 33.39-34.64) years. As shown in Table 2, majority of the respondents were Malays (91.0%), Muslims (91.0%), and married (84.5%), Academic staff (23.1%). Likewise majority (40.7%) had master and those who earn RM >8000 which is (53.8%).

Prevalence of stress

The overall prevalence of stress was 21.7%. Out of the 511 respondents, 111(21.7%) had stress where (78.3%) of the staff had no stress, (6.7%) had mild stress, (8.6%) had moderate stress, (5.9%) staff had severe stress, and (0.6%) staff had extreme severe stress.

Table 2: Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents' (n = 511)

Socio demographic Profile		n	%
Gender	Male	152	29.7
	Female	359	70.3
Age (years)	20-29	79	15.5
	30-39	251	49.1
	40-49	145	28.4
	≥50	36	7.0
Ethnicity	Malay	465	91.0
	Chinese	29	5.7
	India	17	3.3
Religion	Islam	465	91.0
	Christianit	12	2.3
	Buddhism	20	3.9
	Hinduism	14	2.8
Marital Status	Single	70	13.7
	Married	432	84.5
	Widowed	9	1.8
Highest Education Level	SPM/STMP	57	
	Diploma/Bachelor	159	11.2
	Master	208	31.1
	PhD	87	40.7
			17.0
Occupation	Academic	294	57.5
	Non-Academic	217	42.5
Monthly Family Income (RM)	<2000	55	10.8
	2000 - 3999	87	17.0
	4000 – 5999	73	14.3
	6000 – 7999	21	4.1
	≥8000	275	53.8

Factors associated with stress

Table 3 shows that the prevalence of stress was higher among the females (23.0%) than in males (21.2). Those that are 40-49 (23.4%) had the highest prevalence of stress also among ethnicity; Indians had the highest prevalence of stress (29.4%). Likewise in religion Buddhism (40.0%) had the highest prevalence. Staff that are single (24.3%) were more stressed compared to those that were married (21.3%) and widowed (22.2) and academic staff (23.1) had a higher prevalence of stress than non-academic staff (19.8). The prevalence of stress was higher among those that earn RM6000-7999. Meanwhile there was no significant association between stress and socio-demographic characteristics: such as gender, age, ethnicity, religion, marital status, highest educational level, occupation and monthly family income. The prevalence of stress was higher among those with, job decision authority (22.4%) and those with job decision authority had a significantly higher prevalence of stress compared to those with no job decision authority. For job demand, the prevalence of stress among those with job demand was (24.9%) and those with job demand had a significantly higher prevalence of stress compared to those with no job demand. Among those with role ambiguity, those that understand their role to a small extent (19.3%) had significant association with stress compared to those

that understand their role to a large extent. Likewise among those that had one or more life event occurrence, (26.9%) had stress compared to those with no life event occurrence, which had a significant association with stress. For social support, those that were psychologically exposed, (29.9%) were stressed compared to those that were not psychologically exposed, both co-worker and supervisor support had a statistically significant association with stress. Prevalence of stress was higher among those with high score on anxious worrying (38.5%) than those with low score (21.3%) unfortunately it was significant. Meanwhile prevalence of stress was higher among those with low score (33.3%) on effectiveness and those with low score had a significant association with stress than those with high score (15.7%). Among those with anxiety, (63.1%) had stress and those with anxiety had a significant association with stress than those with no anxiety and those with depression had a significant association with stress too. Coping skills shows that only use of instrumental support was significant with for problem focused coping while among emotion focused coping, focus and venting of emotion, behavioral disengagement and positive reinterpretation had a significant association with stress. Among avoidant coping, denial, self-distraction was significant and self-blame were significant with a weak effect on stress.

Table 3: Association between respondents' socio-demographic characteristics and stress (n=511)

Variables P-value	With stress		Without stress		χ^2	df
	Number	%	Number	%		
Overall	111	21.7	400	78.3		
Gender					0.216	10.642
Male	35	21.2	283	78.8		
female	76	23.0	117	77.0		
Age					0.414	30.934
20 - 29	16	20.3	63	79.7		
30 -39	53	21.1	198	78.9		
40 - 49	34	23.4	111	76.6		
>=50	8	22.2	28	77.8		
Ethnicity					1.292	20.524
Malay	98	21.1	367	78.9		
Chinese	8	27.6	21	72.4		
India	5	29.4	12	70.6		
Religion					4.225	30.262
Islam	98	21.1	367	78.9		
Christianity	2	16.7	10	83.3		
Buddhism	8	40.0	12	60.0		
Hinduism	3	21.4	11	78.6		
Marital status					0.318	20.853
Single	17	24.3	53	75.7		
Married	92	21.3	340	78.7		
Widowed	2	22.2	7	77.8		
Highest education level					0.487	30.922
SPM/STMP	11	19.3	46	80.7		
Diploma/Bachelor	34	21.4	125	78.6		
Master	48	23.1	160	76.9		
PhD	18	20.7	69	79.3		
Occupation					0.806	10.369
Academic	68	23.1	226	76.9		
Non academic	43	19.8	174	80.2		
Monthly family income (Rm)<2000	11	20.0	44	80.0	7.153	40.128
2000-3999	13	14.9	74	85.1		
4000-5999	20	27.4	53	72.6		
6000-7999	8	38.1	13	61.9		
>8000	59	21.5	216	78.5		

Note: χ^2 =chi square, df=degree of freedom,*Significant at p value < 0.05

Table 4: Association between respondents' job related factors, live event, social support, personality factors, psychological factors and coping Characteristics with stress (n=511)

Variables	With stress Number	%	Without stress Number	%	χ^2	df	p-value
Job decision latitude							
Job decision authority	70	22.4	243	77.6	0.196	1	0.658
No job decision authority	41	20.7	157	79.3			
Job demand							
Job demand	60	24.9	181	75.1	2.703	1	0.002*
No Job demand	51	18.9	219	81.1			
Role Ambiguity							
To a small extent	34	19.3	85	80.7	9.6873	1	0.003*
To a large extent	77	44.5	315	55.5			
Life event							
None	57	26.9	155	73.1	0.5168	1	0.017*
>=1	54	18.1	245	81.3			
Co- worker support							
Psychological work exposure	60	29.9	141	70.1	12.875	1	<0.001*
No psychological work exposure	51	16.5	259	83.5			
Supervisor support							
Psychological work exposure	39	33.1	79	66.9	11.580	1	<0.001*
No psychological work exposure	72	18.3	321	81.7			
Anxious worrying							
Low score	106	21.3	392	78.7	2.1980	1	0.168
High score	5	38.5	8	61.5			
Effectiveness							
Low score	58	33.3	116	66.7	20.920	1	<0.001*
High score	53	15.7	284	84.3			
Anxiety							
No anxiety	70	63.1	81	20.2	2.1980	1	<0.001*
Anxiety	41	36.9	319	79.8			
Depression							
No depression	67	44.4	84	55.6	20.920	1	<0.001*
Depression	44	12.2	316	21.0			

Table 5: Association between respondents' coping skills and stress (n=511)

Coping skills	With Stress Number	%	Without stress Number	%	χ^2	df	p-value
Problem focused							
Active coping							
Have been doing this	94	23.1	236	76.9	0.418	1	0.518
Have not been doing this	17	20.2	164	79.8			
Use of instrumental support							
Have been doing this	30	18.8	130	81.2	1.210	1	<0.001*
Have not been doing this	81	23.1	270	76.9			
Planning							
Have been doing this	82	20.6	317	79.4	1.467	1	0.226
Have not been doing this	29	25.9	83	74.1			
Emotion focused							
Focus and venting of emotion							
Have been doing this	39	35.8	70	64.2	9.332	1	<0.001*
Have not been doing this	72	17.9	330	82.1			
Behavioral disengagement							
Have been doing this	25	44.6	31	55.4	9.432	1	<0.001*
Have not been doing this	86	18.9	369	81.1			
Emotion support							
Have been doing this	77	21.8	276	78.2	0.016	1	0.941
Have not been doing this	34	21.5	124	78.5			
Positive reinterpretation							
Have been doing this	94	23.2	311	76.8	2.542	1	0.035*
Have not been doing this	17	16.0	89	84.0			
Humor							
Have been doing this	33	26.7	63	73.3	1.534	1	0.216
Have not been doing this	88	20.7	337	79.3			
Acceptance							
Have been doing this	70	19.3	292	80.7	0.601	1	0.741
Have not been doing this	41	27.5	108	72.5			
Avoidant coping							
Self-distraction							
Have been doing this	91	23.9	290	76.1	4.118	1	0.042*
Have not been doing this	20	15.4	110	84.6			
Denial							
Have been doing this	21	34.4	60	65.6	6.575	1	0.010*
Have not been doing this	90	20.0	360	80.0			
Substance use							
Have been doing this	1	50.0	1	50.0	0.944	1	0.331
Have not been doing this	110	21.6	399	78.4			
Self-blame							
Have been doing this	69	17.8	318	82.2	5.000	1	<0.001*
Have not been doing this	42	33.9	82	66.1			

Note: χ^2 =chi square, df = degree of freedom,*Significant at p value < 0.05

Logistic regression

A multivariate regression was carried out to determine the predictors of stress, while controlling for cofounders, a Univariate Analysis using simple logistic regression was carried out. Out of 21 variables 16 were selected as been the most important variable to be entered in the logistic model because they showed statistical significance. All variables that had ($p < 0.25$), which was recommended by Hosmer-Lemshow.²³ Which was found that the uses of $p < 0.05$ sometimes are unsuccessful in recognizing some important variables. Table 6 shows the final logistic regression model. The variables that were retained in the final model were job demand, coworker support, depression, anxiety, focus and venting, and self-blame. Mostly staff are 2 times likely to have stress due to job demand (AOR= 2.410, 95%CI 1.417- 4.098). The odds of developing stress is 1.9 times higher in those that do not get support from there coworker than those that do get support from there coworker (OR = 1.973, 95% CI = 1.201, 3.243, $p < 0.007$). Those who were depressed are 2.6 times more likely to develop stress than those with no depression (OR = 2.555, 95% CI = 1.398, 4.672, $p < 0.002$). Those that had anxiety are 2.6 times more likely to develop stress than those with no anxiety (OR = 2.578, 95% CI = 1.409, 4.718, $p < 0.002$). Those that cope using focus and venting emotion which is emotion coping and have been doing it a lot are 3.6 times likely to develop stress compared to those that have not been doing it at all (OR = 3.685, 95% CI = 2.040, 5.659, $p < 0.027$). Those that cope using self-blame which is avoidant coping are 2.9 times more likely to develop stress compared to those that do not do this at all (OR = 2.997, 95% CI = 0.948, 4.381, $p < 0.03$). Goodness of fit was assed using the Hosmer-Lemshow test which shows that at p-value is 0.723 which is greater than 0.05, so therefore the model is fit, also the classification table, the overall percentage was 81.8% which shows a good model and area under roc curve which was 0.824(95%CI: 0.782, 0.866). The model can accurately discriminate 0.824% of the cases.

Table 6: Multiple logistic regression final model showing adjusted odd ratio of predictors of stress

Factors	B coefficient	Standard error	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P = value
Job demand			1		
No demand					
job demand	0.880	0.271	2.410	1.417 4.098	< 0.001*
Life event			1		
No life event					
life event	0.420	0.250	1.522	0.932 2.486	0.093
Co-worker support			1		
No Psychological work					
Exposure					
psychological	0.680	0.253	1.973	1.201 3.243	0.007*
work exposure					
Supervisor support			1		
No Psychological work					
exposure					
Psychological work	0.682	0.255	1.977	1.205 3.248	0.007*
exposure					
Depression			1		
No depression					
Depression	0.938	0.308	2.555	1.398 4.672	0.002*
Anxiety			1		
No anxiety					
Anxiety	0.947	0.308	2.578	1.409 4.718	0.002*
Focus and venting emotion			1		
Have not been doing this	0.789	0.382	3.685	2.040 5.659	0.027*
Have been doing this					
Self-blame			1		
Have not been doing this					
Have been doing this	0.689	0.379	2.997	0.948 4.381	0.003*

Significance at p value < 0.05 Hosmer-Lemshow test, p -value = 0.723; overall percentage = 81.8%, Area under Roc curve = 824(95%CI: 0.782-0.866).

DISCUSSION

The overall prevalence of stress from this study was 21.7% where 6.5% reported mild stress, 8.6% reported moderate stress, 5.9% reported severe and 0.7% reported having extreme severe stress. This is similar with a study done among dental workers in Kelantan where the reported prevalence was 22.2%, 1.9% experienced severe stress while 20.4% experienced mild to moderate stress.¹³ The difference is probably due to the respondents and setting of where the studies were carried out. There was no significant association between stress and socio-demographic factors. Meanwhile female had a higher prevalence of stress than men. This is in accordance with the hypothesis of differential vulnerability which states that, women would be more responsive than men to work stressors.¹³ Similar findings of females reporting more stress than males was reported in Universiti Malaysia Pahang.²⁴ Prevalence of stress was higher among the academic compared to non-academic staff. Most of the academic staff reported not having enough time to get their work done and not having control of decision at work could lead to depression and anxiety. This is supported by Karasek's Demand-Control Theory, which states that, the most adverse reactions of psychological strain (anxiety, depression, fatigue and physical illness) occur when the psychological demands of the job are high and the worker's decision latitude in the task is low.²⁵

Furthermore there was a significant association between role ambiguity and stress. 19.3% who understand their role to a small extent reported lack of unclear objective in their work which could indicate that role ambiguity will be a risk factor for stress.²⁶ A similar finding on role ambiguity being a risk factor for stress was reported in Pakistan, indicating that higher ambiguity may also arise due to lack of clarity regarding how to juggle different roles at work.²⁷ This study found that job demand was the main predictor of stress, which indicates that staff had stress due to high demand in their job such as learning new things, working hard and not being free from conflicting demands of others. The finding is supported by study done among university staff in Malaysia and Tanzania which found association between stress and job demand ($p < 0.003$)¹³ and ($p < 0.005$) respectively.²⁸ Likewise in Australian universities, academic staff has been subjected to additional job demand to attract external funding through research grants or research consultancies. A research done in London by health and safety executive in higher education, found significant strong effects for job demands which was due to too many students, not enough staff and no time to think.²⁹ The study showed no significant association between stress and decision latitude. Similar finding was revealed in a study done in Canada among university staff.³⁰ This study indicated that 29.9% and 331.1% reported been psychologically exposed due to lack of coworker and supervisor support which had a significant association with stress.

In a study done among academicians in East Malaysia public University, showed that coworker support acts as a moderating effect in relationship with work stress. The study also revealed that coworker social support moderated the effect of role ambiguity in their job.³¹ Likewise studies done in US among government workers showed coworker support, significantly predicted work stress.^{32,28} Likewise job demand and lack of support from coworker as having risk of developing stress was reported from studies done in government agencies in US, and Universities College Union (UCU), London.^{32,29} There was a significant association between personality and stress which shows that personality is a moderating factor for role stress.⁵ This study indicated that depression and anxiety had a significant association with stress, which might be due too much worrying, workload and job demand. A similar finding was reported in Australia among 1,188 employed professionals which showed significant association of job strain with depression (OR = 3.49, 95%CI=1.90 to 6.41) and anxiety (OR = 3.29, 95%CI=1.71 to 6.33).³³ Likewise, National Health Worksite Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality in US, found that 80% of the workers had depression and anxiety and this caused them serious difficulties at work which had negative effect on productivity.³⁴

Also Melchior in his study reported that work stress predicted the first onset of depression and anxiety among individuals with no prior history of these disorders.³⁵ This study found that staff cope with stress, using emotion focused such as focus and venting of emotion which is the tendency to focus on whatever distress or upset they are experiencing and to ventilate those feelings and avoidant coping such as self-blame which they had significant association with stress. Research done in Brunei among Trainee teachers shows most of them use emotion and avoidance coping to cope with stressful situation.³⁶ Avoidant coping has also been associated with increased psychological distress in the general population and university samples.³⁷ Found in their university study that participants experienced greater depressive symptoms when they engaged in an avoidant coping style such as wishful thinking³⁸ study also revealed strong positive associations between avoidant coping and psychological distress. Participants were shown to have increased symptoms of anxiety and depression when they engaged in avoidant coping. The positive association between avoidant coping, emotion focused coping and stress, anxiety and depression may occur because avoidant coping and emotion coping fails to remove stressors.³⁹ As stressors are allowed to fester and grow, they can become more stressful, resulting in an individual experiencing increased anxiety and depression. The coping strategies that focus on negative emotions and thoughts appear to increase psychological distress (e.g. venting of emotions). On the other hand, avoidant strategies have been generally found to increase emotional exhaustion and decrease work achievement.⁴⁰

In contrast, emotion-focused strategies as well as escape-oriented or avoidant actions are generally associated with poor mental health and unwell-being.⁴¹ To realize how serious stress can affect us, the 10th Conference on Occupational Stress and Health in Los Angeles, California, May 2013, revealed that, stress, if not handled can lead to heart attack and even death.⁴² Immediate measures should be applied to help staff cope well with stress. Six factors were found to be predictors of stress in this study, namely; job demand, co-worker and supervisor support, anxiety, depression, focus and venting of emotion and self-blame. The university authorities should implement stress management programmes such as; providing opportunity for interaction among staff, support groups to improve social support among coworker and supervisors, individual focused intervention should applied, which aims to increase individual psychological resources and responses such as coping, depression and anxiety. Organization focused intervention which aims to improve stressful work factors and environment such as job demand and role ambiguity.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, prevalence of stress was 21.7%, which was higher among females compared to males. Stress predictors were job demand, coworker support, depression, anxiety, focus and venting emotion, and self-blame. These six predictors need to be addressed to mitigate the prevalence of stress among the staff. Coworker and supervisor support need to be encouraged. Practicing exercise, rescheduling of school activities and stress management programs should be put in place.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmad U, Zulfiqar A, Ishfaq A, Zeeshan A. Work Stress Experienced by the Teaching Staff of University of the Punjab, Pakistan: Antecedents and consequence *Int J Bus Soc Sci* 2011; 2(8): 202.
2. Ahsan N, Abdullah Z, Fie GYD, Alam SS. A Study of Job Stress on Job Satisfaction Among University Staff in Malaysia: Empirical Study. *Eur J Soc Sci* 2009; 8(1):121-131.
3. American Institute of Stress. People are disturbed not by a thing, but by their Perception of a thing 2013. Retrieved January 31, 2013, from <http://www.stress.org/daily-life/>.
4. American psychological association. Work, Stress and Health Protecting and Protecting And Promoting Total Worker Health 2013. Retrieved June 2013, from <http://www.apa.org.wsh>.
5. Aziah BD, Rusli BN, Winn T, Naing L and Tengku MA. Prevalence and risk factors of job strain among laboratory technicians in Hospital. *Singapore Med J* 2004; 45(4): 170-175.
6. Crockett, LJ, Iturbide MI, Torres Stone RA, McGinley M, Raffaelli M, Carlo G. Acculturative stress, social support, and coping: Relations to psychological adjustment among Mexican American college students. *Cultur Divers Ethnic Minor Psychol* 2007; 13(4): 347-355.
7. Ismail A, Mohamed AH, Sulaiman ZA, Ismail Z, Mahmood WNW. Relationship Between Work Stress, Coworker's Social Support, Work Stress and Work Interference With Family Conflict: An Empirical Study in Malaysia. *International Business Management, Medwell Journal* 2010; 4(2):76-83.
8. Biron JP, Brun H, Ivers H. Extent and sources of occupational stress in university staff. *Journal of Prevention, Assessment and Rehabilitation* 2008; 30(4): 511-522.
9. Black Dog Institute. Temperament & Personality (T&P) Questionnaire Information. Retrieved 22, February 2013 from <http://www.blackdoginstitute.org.au/docs/TemperamentandPersonalityQuestionnaire>.
10. Blaud R, Kenyon A, Lekhi R. Stress at work: A report prepared for the Work Foundations' principal partners. London. The Work Foundation 2006. Retrieved July 2013, from http://www.theworkfoundation.com/downloadpublication/report/69_69_stress_at_work.pdf
11. Brugha TS, Bebbington P, Tennant C, Hurry J. The List of Threatening Experiences: a subset of 12 life event categories with considerable long- term contextual threat. *Psychol Med* 1985; 15(1):189-194.

12. Carver CS. You want to measure coping but your protocol's too long. Consider the Brief Cope. *Int J Behav Med* 1997; 4:92-100.
13. Court S, Kinman, G. Tackling stress in higher education. London:UCU.2009. Retrieved July 11, 2013 from, http://www.ucu.org.uk/media/pdf/d/0/ucu_hestress_dec08.pdf
14. DeLongis A, Holtzman S. Coping in Context: The Role of Stress, Social Support, and Personality in Coping. *J Pers* 2005; 73(6): 1633-1656.
15. Fauziah N, Quek KF, Agus SMB. Validity-Reliability Study of the Malay Version of Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ) in Assessing Psychosocial Status in Relation to Nature of Work among Workers. *J Occu Safety Health* 2005; 2(1):10-18
16. Health and Safety Executive. Investigation of the links between Psychological ill health, stress and safety 2006.
17. Health and Safety Executive. Stress and Psychological Disorders in Great Britain 2013. Retrieved from July 8 2013, from <http://www.hse.gov.uk/statistics/causdis/stress/stress.pdf>
18. Holahan CJ, Holahan CK, Moos RH, Brennan PL, Schutte, K. K. Stress Generation, Avoidance Coping, and Depressive Symptoms: A 10-Year Model. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 2005; 73(4): 658-666.
19. Hosmeh DW, Lemeshow S. Applied logistic regression (second edition). A Wiley- interscience publication, John Wiley and sons Inc.2000.
20. Joan B. World Health Organization .WHO healthy workplace framework and model 2010 February. Retrieved February 2013 from http://www.who.int/occupational_health/healthy_workplace_framework.pdf
21. Karasek R, Brisson C, Kawakami N, Houtman I, Bongers P, Amick B. The JobContent Questionnaire (JCQ): An instrument for internationally comparative assessments of psychosocial job characteristics. *J Occup Health Psychol* 1998; 3(3): 22-355.
22. Katherine T, McCalister, Christyn L, Dolbier, Judith A, Webster, Mark W., Mallon, Mary A. Steinhartd. Hardiness and Support at Work as Predictors of Work Stress and Job Satisfaction, *Am J Health Promot* 2006; 20(3): 183-191.
23. Kitila M. Prevalence of and Factors Associated with Work Stress in Academia in Tanzania. *J High Educ* 2014; 3(1):1
24. Kristensen T, Hannerz H, Hogh A, Borg V. The Copenhagen psychosocial Questionnaire: A tool for the assessment and improvement of the psychosocial work environment. *Journal of Work, Environment and Health* 2005; 6 (31): 438-449
25. Lovibond SH, Lovibond PF. Manual for the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales. Sydney: Psychology Foundation.1995.
26. Melchior M,Caspi A, Milne BJ, Danese A, Poulton R, Moffitt T.E. Work stress precipitates depression and anxiety in young, working women and men. *Psychol Med* 2007; 37(8): 1119-1129.
27. Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE). Education Malaysia: Ministry of Higher Education MOHE). Retrieved January 2, 2014 from <http://www.mohe.gov.my/educationmsia/index.php?article=mohe>
28. Moen BEG, Wieslander JV, Bakke D Norbäck. Subjective health Complaints and psychosocial environment among university personnel. *Journal of Occupational Medicine* 2013; 63 (1): 38-44.
29. Kamel MI. Occupational stress in academic life: A study on Academics of Malaysian Public Universities. PhD Thesis. The University of Waikato.2009.
30. Myrtle RC GlogowE, Glogow, CD . Stress among Malaysian education officials: causes and coping methods 2010. Retrieved June 2013 <http://portal.min.org.my/resources/MMR/8812/881207.Htm>

31. Ng CG, Amer Siddiq AN, Aida SA, Koh OH, Nor ZZ (2009). The Reliability of Malay Version of List of Threatening Experiences Questionnaire: A Study on a Group of Medical Students in Malaysia. *Malay J Psychiatry* 2009;18(2): 0 – 0.
32. Penland, E, Masten W , Zelhart, P , Fournet G, Callahan T . Possible selves, depression, and coping skills in university students. *Journal of Personality and Individual Difference* 2000; 29: 963-969.
33. Ramli M, Ariff MF, Zaini, Z. Translation, validation and psychometric properties of Bahasa Malaysia version of the Depression Anxiety and Stress Scales (DASS). *ASEAN J Psychiatry* 2007; 8(2):82-89.
34. Robbins, SP, Judge, T A, & Sanghi, S. *Organizational Behavior*, Mumbai, IN: Dorling Kindersley 2009.
35. Rusli, BN, Edimansyah BA, Naing L. Prevalence and associated factors of stress in dental healthcare workers of a higher institution of learning in Kelantan. *Archives of Orofacial Sciences* 2006; 1: 51-56..
36. Schaufeli WB, Job stress coping with. *International Encyclopedia of the social and behavior sciences* 7984–7987.
37. Singh JKN, Schapper J, Mayson S. The impact of economic policy on reshaping higher education in Malaysia: In M. Devlin, J. Nagy and A. Lichtenberg (Eds.). *Research and Development in Higher Education: Reshaping Higher Education* 2010; 33:585–595.
38. Stavroula L, Griffiths A, Cox T. Protecting workers health series No3. Work organization and stress. Systematic problem approaches for employers managers and trade union representatives 2003: ISBN : 92 4 159047 5.
39. Tenibiaje DJ. Work Related Stress. *European Journal of Business and Social sciences* 2013; 1(10): 73-80.
40. Othman C, Triantoro S, Nubli M, Wahab A. Gender, Academic Rank, Employment Status, University Type and Job Stress among University Academic Staffs in Pahang, Malaysia and Jogjakarta, Indonesia Context. *Int J Technol Manage* 2012;1(18):57-70.
41. Wijndaele K, Matton L, Duvigneaud, N, Lefevre J, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Duquet, W. Association between leisure time physical activity and stress, social support and coping: A cluster-analytical approach. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 2007; 8(4), 425-440.
42. Winefield AH, Jarrett R. Occupational stress in university staff. *Int J Stress Manag* 2001; 8(4): 285–298.