The Effect of Occupational Stress on Performance of Academic Faculty Members in U.A.E. Universities

Rasha Abu Samrah

Colleges of Higher Technology, Sharjah, U.A.E.

The British University in Dubai, Dubai, U.A.E.

The purpose of this study is to determine the effective relation between stress and organizational performance, specifically the outcome of performance due to stress on academic staff members within the United Arab Emirates (U.A.E.). Three potential sources of organizational related stress have been identified, namely, personal perception, work environmental climate, and personality traits. Fifty questionnaires were prepared based on extensive literature review of these topics, and sent to various universities within the U.A.E., mainly Dubai and Sharjah. It must be noted that due to its lengthy size, most were self-administered, and the rest were distributed and collected normally. The study investigates the support of three hypotheses developed. Various tests were conducted through the commonly used SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software to analyze and interpret the results. These tests were both descriptive and inferential, mainly covering reliability, correlation, regression, and some descriptive stats. The findings indicate that the level of organizational performance is affected negatively by the level of perceived stress. The organizational climate plays a great role in motivating people and increasing their level of satisfaction. It was also revealed that trust, cooperation, and prestigious climate are increasing the level of satisfaction. The research performance decreases the level of satisfaction due to the fact that the researcher is forced to do it without enough financial support. The research provides useful recommendations to the deans of faculties to increase the level of academic performance and enhance staff satisfaction. Results and implications, both theoretical and practical, are explored and discussed towards the end of the research paper, and finally recommendations based on the analysis of the tests and arguments of the researchers are given to spark interest for further research in this field.

Keywords: work climate, occupational stress, academic performance

Introduction

Background

Not too long ago, in 2008, the world has fallen victim to a financial recession that seemed to have no certain end. The effects of this economic black hole were not immediate in the U.A.E., but when it hit after a couple of months, its intensity spreaded across all operational industries, specially the service sector, which is relied on heavily in the U.A.E. (Al-Ali, 2008). Universities, service sectors, have had its share of the crisis, and

Rasha Abu Samrah, lecturer, Business Department, Colleges of Higher Technology, Sharjah, U.A.E.; Ph.D. student, The British University in Dubai, Dubai, U.A.E.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Rasha Abu Samrah, 805 Reem Plaza Tower, Kournich Buhaira, Sharjah, U.A.E.

are still going through some after effects. Indeed, academics have had witnessed fall in salaries, and higher workloads, and are pressed harderly to “publish or perish” before the crisis (Fisher, 1994). It is factors like this economic downfall that seems to generate stress among academics. Other potential sources factors include, but are not limited to personal perception and personality traits. These factors influence performance levels within a university considerably (Safaria, 2013). The effects of stress on performance in the workforce in general have been extensively studied, as evident in literature, and its impact has proven undeniable. However, Gillespie, Walsh, Winefield, Dua, and Stough (2001) asserted that stress among academics within universities is less well understood and documented. Bowen and Schuster (1985) reported that during their study of stress in universities, many of the academics they interviewed were actually angry and hesitant. They felt dispensable, devalued, and abandoned which affected their performance ethically and socially. Armour, CaVarella, Fuhrmann, and Wergin (1987) investigated how the quality of teaching and researching of academics has not only dropped down low as a result of stress, but in fact, it was contagious to their colleagues and students. Seldin (1987) stated that the levels of stress would only continue to rise among academics for better or worse; for another aspect to take into consideration is what is known as beneficial stressors. Unlike hindering stressors, these tend to push academic staff to act out of challenge and opportunity to potential gain, and therefore perform better than usual. This is mainly because beneficial stressors produce less strain and are somewhat a retains motivational dynamic model (Podsakoff, J. A. LePine, & M. A. LePine, 2007).

Problem Statement

It has been brought to the researcher’s attention that performance of academics within universities in U.A.E. has been declining. One major contributor to this issue is the manifestation of the pressure of stress. This includes constant worrying, inability to concentrate, poor judgments, depression, isolation of oneself, and feeling of hopelessness. The effects on performance are plainly obvious when one observes the ethical, social, and quality of teaching and research of both the academics and the students. Most universities’ policies of dealing with such performance outcomes are false marketing schema, and/or downsizing, which only results in more stress.

The research problem statement may be as follows:

“What are the factors that affect the academic staff member’s performance? To what extent does this performance change according to the change in organizational climate and perceived levels of occupational stress ?”

Aims and Objectives of the Research

This research aims to study three factors that contribute to creating and developing stress among academics in universities in the U.A.E., before it manifests itself as signs of declining performance levels, and suggesting a method through which to deal with them appropriately. The steps following this process in order are: (1) to model stress sources that are common within academics in universities, (2) to study their relations to performance, and (3) to recommend methods that could be used to manage stress.

The Rational and Importance of the Study

This research is one of the very few that acknowledge and appreciate the impact of stress on academic staff’s performance within universities in the U.A.E., and study the significance of their relationship. University heads and academics would be able to use this research to define the common and important stressors, and use the model recommended in order to reduce them. This would improve performance measures, reduce turnover, and increase academics satisfaction and motivation levels.

Literature Review & Conceptual Framework

Academic Stress in Universities

Stress is no stranger to anyone, and for an academic personnel to be stressed, or burnt out, is a natural response to many challenges in life whether its family relations, finances, health, natural disaster, or otherwise. However, studies show that work is, for most people, the most significant form of stress in their life (Carr, Kelley, Keaton, & Albrecht, 2011), and as the largest source of stress, it is not a surprise that it also is the drain of it. Most university academics tend to take out what they see as the cause of their pressure back to where it came from; this translates from greater workloads, lower salaries, and longer hours to reduced performance in the universities. There is no conclusive evidence that this statement is true, but to a large extent, literature reviews implicitly show that stressed out employees, in general, tend to act out unethically in their work place more than they do back with their personal lives. This is made much worse when these academic staff are forced to hide their anxiety for fear that they might lose their job, since it just adds more strain feelings, which leads to many other things among lowered performance like declined quality in lecturing. Here, it must be noted that a completely stress-free work environment is impossible to achieve in universities, let alone any work place, but can be controlled through various management models. These models acknowledge that stress is a double edged; where it functions properly, it could, in fact, be the very reason employees achieve. Going beyond a certain level causes damage to productivity, performance, and efficiency (Hede, 2009). Lecture halls become boring, pressure to publish becomes extreme, and the office environment becomes hostile.

Before delving anymore deeper into the topic and relating it to this research, it is essential to define stress and state its two main types. Stress is a dynamic condition in which an individual is confronted with an opportunity, demand, or resource related to what the individual desires and for which the outcome is perceived to be both uncertain and important (Cooper, Dewe, & Driscoll, 2002). There are two main types of stress: acute and chronic. Acute stress is short lived and is often the result of unexpected stressors, for example, the inability to find one's car keys. Chronic stress, is a state of ongoing physiological agitation from an unresolved problem or situation (Carr et al., 2011). This research paper pays more attention to chronic stress, since their prolonged effect on an academic personnel in a university is what causes the declining performance. Although stress is often discussed in a negative context, it is not necessarily bad in and of itself; it also has a positive value; it is an opportunity when it offers potential gain. Beneficial or challenge stressors are not disputed among scholars, however, what they are, or what contributes to them, has been a subject of conflict. Many professionals see the pressures of heavy workloads like more credit hours, training, and development deadlines, as positive challenges that enhance the quality of their work and the satisfaction they get from their job, while others consider motivational factors, whether intrinsic or extrinsic, the right positive stressors (Ablanedo-Rosas, Blevins, Gao, Teng, & White, 2011). Most typically, stress is associated with demands and resources. Demands are responsibilities, pressures, obligations, and uncertainties an academic faces in the university, like for example exam timetables, publishing deadlines, differences with students, etc. Resources, are things that lie within an academic's control span, a perception that he/she is capable to resolve the demands. This is known as the demands-resource or demands-control model, and is very commonly used to research stress (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Under the demand-resource model, it is important to note that having resources to cope with stress is just as important as offsetting it as demands are increasing it (Jonge & Dormann, 2006). Research suggests that some sources of stress are usually unique to a university or a region, however, among literature

review, common sources to academic stress are personal perception (Gillespie et al., 2001), environmental climate or physical conditions (Ablanedo-Rosas et al., 2011), and personality traits (Parikh, Amjad, Saliba, Kazmi, Khan, Lahoti, ... Qazilbash, 2009). The following sections will talk about each factor in extensive details; what are they, how may they be potential sources of stress, and finally how do they affect academic performance. After each segment allocated to understand these factors, a hypothesis will be generated. These hypotheses will be used to produce a conceptual model for factors of the independent and the dependent variables.

Environmental/Work Climate

There is no shortage of factors within a university that can cause stress to academics. Pressures to avoid errors or complete reports in a limited time, overloaded credit hours, demanding superiors, and unpleasant co-workers are some examples to name a few. These difficulties seem to grow fiercely every day, it is therefore, no surprise that conflicts amongst them emerge. There also exists ambiguity of academic job expectations due to procedures being implemented in the U.A.E. as part of a process for education development. These processes are being managed less than properly, and are leading to mass confusion and misunderstandings. Some of them include opening of new subjects, disputes over scope of subjects, constant changing of curriculums, and the concealed, yet obvious, undertaking to change subject materials (which includes books) every semester, which is purely intended for business gain. These points mentioned are just a cup of water in the sea, so to clarify and elucidate this factor, this research has categorized the work climate into three main aspects, upon which the research question items were designed. They are task demands, role demands, and interpersonal demands. Task demands are related to one's job, they include the design of the job, the working conditions, and the physical layout of the work (Hidi & Anderson, 1986). Role demands are related to pressures placed on one as a function of the particular role he plays in the university. These include role conflicts, role overload, and role ambiguity (Judge & Colquitt, 2004). Finally, interpersonal demands are pressures created by other academics in the university; they include social support, colleague relationships, and supervisors' attitudes and behaviors (Lee-Baggley, Preece, & DeLongis, 2005).

Personality Traits

Although it may seem helpful to try to determine how much stress people can withstand, this is highly dependent on individuals themselves, their personalities are the key to describing that. Personality is best described as the sum of total ways in which one reacts to and interacts with others, that includes their behavior and characteristics. Friedman and Rosenman (1974) identified extreme individual personality type, labeling them type A and type B, type A is being the competitive, aggressive personality; while type B is a more relaxed one (Parikh et al., 2009). Of course there are other personality tests that classify people into groups of their characteristics and are expected to behave accordingly when met with stress. These tests include the Myers-Briggs Type indicator (R. Kennedy & D. Kennedy, 2004) and the Big Five Model (Bartley & Roesch, 2011). Traits from each model are taken into consideration in this research. Other personality characteristics that react differently to stress that are commonly observed in universities in U.A.E and so which included in this study are Machiavellianism, self-monitoring, narcissism, and self-evaluators.

Personal Perception

Some academics thrive on stressful situations, while others get overwhelmed by them. The difference the researchers referring to here is not the stressors themselves, but rather, how one might perceive them. It is a

known fact that employees react to their projection of reality rather to reality itself. Perception, therefore, will moderate the relationship between a potential stress condition and an academic's reaction to it. For example, pressures to publish may cause one academic the view of work overload, while another would see it as an opportunity he was eagerly waiting for. This perception factor is not only a "1 or 0" reality, it also happens to weigh the density of a stressor; to what level that a situation is stressful is a matter of subjectivity. This means that stress potential does not really lie in objective conditions, rather, it lies in an academic's interpretation of those conditions. Given this subjective nature of stress, an understanding of its connection to academic performance may potentially have important implications for effective stress management (Gillespie et al., 2001).

Conceptual Framework

Now that the research paper has identified the dependent and the independent variables, it is important to demonstrate the hypotheses in an illustration to give the reader an unambiguous and clear idea as to how the research is designed, and so how it will progress. Figure 1 below depicts the relation among the three independent variables Environment/Work Climate, Personality Traits, and Personal Perception, with the dependent variable, Academic Performance.

Figure 1. Research conceptual model.

Research Methodology

The sample size was 112 questionnaires. The data were collected from USA, Netherlands, Egypt, and U.A.E. The questionnaire was collected using self-administered method from inside the U.A.E. and electronically from the other countries. The team of researchers discussed the questions and modified and deleted some questions according to their own judgment. Then the questionnaire was validated by taking the opinion of three experts from the field of human resources management and at the same time academic staff. Pilot survey was done on a sample of 10 respondents. Cronbach's Alpha value for the pilot sample was 0.82.

The number of questions of the pilot survey was 191. The researchers reviewed again the questionnaire before conducting the factor analysis on 168 questions. Cronbach's Alpha value for those questions was 0.857. The sample of this research consists of almost 46% between the 34-44 years old. Almost 36% were married with one or two children. Almost 56% were associate professors and senior lecturers, 65% were non-citizens, and 47% were masters' degree holders; 30% were specialized in business and 30% were specialized in engineering; 40% have a contract length of one year, 20% have a contract length of three years, and 25% have a contract length of five years; 67% were full timers, 28 were part timers, and 5% were visitors. Regarding the job tenure, 23% worked for five to seven years in the field of academic teaching, 23% have worked in the field for 11 years or more. Some questions were deleted based on the factor analysis results. The items that measure the occupational stress were loaded on two factors as shown in following Table 1:

Table 1

Factor Analysis for Occupational Stress

Items	F1	F2
To what extent do you feel stress towards having insufficient reward for institutional/departmental services?	0.671	
To what extent do you feel stress towards receiving insufficient recognition for teaching performance?	0.606	
To what extent do you feel stress towards resolving differences with your chair?	0.547	
To what extent do you feel stress towards receiving insufficient institutional recognition for research?	0.641	
To what extent do you feel stress towards lacking personal impact on departmental/institutional decisions?	0.559	
To what extent do you feel stress towards lacking congruency in institutional, departmental, and personal growth?	0.648	
To what extent do you feel stress toward believing that the progress in your career is not what it should or could be?	0.640	
To what extent do you feel stress towards being unclear as to the scope and responsibilities of your job?	0.623	
To what extent do you feel stress towards assignments and duties that take you away from your office?		0.615
To what extent do you feel stress towards pressures of competing with your colleagues?		0.701
To what extent do you feel stress towards writing letters and memos and responding to other paper work?		0.642
To what extent do you feel stress towards resolving differences with students?		0.599
To what extent do you feel stress towards dealing with program changes?		0.509
To what extent do you feel stress towards not having clear criteria for evaluating service activities?		0.546
To what extent do you feel stress towards your teaching load?		0.625
To what extent do you feel stress towards evaluating students' performance?		0.573
To what extent do you feel stress towards evaluation of your teaching performance?		0.708
To what extent do you feel stress towards teaching and advising weak students sufficiently?		0.741
To what extent do you feel stress toward dealing with cultural differences?		0.651

Career promotion stress is the name of the factor of the first group. The name of the second factor is functioning stress. The researchers assume that the academic staff feels two types of stress. The first one is related to the career promotion they want to achieve. The second type of occupational stress is related to the functioning of the academic job duties. Factor analysis test was done for the motivational climate factors as shown in Table 1.

According to Table 2, the researchers classified the motivational climate in the academic life to three factors. The researchers labeled those three factors as follows: the first group of items belongs to cooperation climate factor, the second group of items belongs to the trust climate factor, and the third group of items belongs to the prestigious climate factor. The researchers assume that the academic staff member will be motivated by the cooperation climate, trust climate, and prestigious climate.

Table 2

Factor Analysis for Academic Climate

Items	F1	F2	F3
The extent to which your coworkers assume your responsibilities when you are absent is...	0.524		
The extent to which your coworkers listen to your work-related problems is...	0.657		
The extent to which your coworkers care about you is...	0.754		
The extent to which your coworkers are enjoyable to work with is...	0.836		
The extent to which your coworkers appreciate you is...	0.699		
The extent to which your coworkers take your concerns seriously is...	0.685		
The extent to which you are motivated by your personal growth (i.e. skills acquired through training and development) is...	0.576		
The extent to which you are motivated by the amount of praise you receive for your outstanding efforts is...	0.584		
The extent to which you are motivated by participating in decision making is...	0.764		
The extent to which you are motivated by the opportunity to voice your opinion is...	0.857		
The extent to which your coworkers are mean to you is...		-0.550	
The extent to which you are motivated by recognition at work is...		0.734	
The extent to which you are motivated by your advancement on the current job (i.e. promotion) is...		0.602	
The extent to which you are motivated by your cordial relationship with your supervisor is...		0.650	
The extent to which you are motivated by your job security is...		0.729	
The extent to which you feel satisfied with the interactional justice in your department is...		0.747	
The extent to which you feel satisfied with the procedural justice in your department is...		0.555	
The extent to which you feel satisfied with the supervisory ratings of your performance is...		0.582	
The extent to which you feel satisfied with the supervisory dealings with all academic staff members equally is...		0.667	
The extent to which you feel satisfied with the dean dealings with all academic staff members equally is...		0.719	
The extent to which you are satisfied with the justice in distribution of work benefits is...		0.555	
The extent to which you are motivated by your achievements on the current job is...			0.618
The extent to which you are motivated by the work itself...			0.795
The extent to which you are motivated by the working conditions is...			0.673
The extent to which you are motivated by the contribution of your work in having a better life is...			0.711
The extent to which you are motivated by your salary is...			0.742
The extent to which you are motivated by your improvement in your status is...			0.505
The extent to which you are motivated by the degree of freedom given to you to work independently and creatively is...			0.507
The extent to which you are motivated by the general working conditions of the college is...			0.647

Histograms with natural distribution curve were indicating the normality of the data. One sample kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality is conducted on the above factors. The results showed the normal distribution of test (Table 3).

Table 3

Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Normality of Stress and Climate Factors

	Perception of career promotion stress	Perception of functional stress	Cooperative climate motivation	Trust climate motivation	Prestigious climate motivation	Global stress	Global climate motivation
K-S Z	1.157	1.006	1.079	1.148	1.405	0.859	1.310
Sig	0.137	0.264	0.195	0.143	0.039	0.451	0.065

Factor analysis is conducted for stress indicators. The factors loadings are shown in Table 4 on two factors.

Table 4

Factor Analysis for Stress Indicators

Items	F1	F2
How often you could be experiencing some emotions and not be conscious of it until sometime later?	0.582	
How often do you break or spill things because of carelessness, not paying attention, or thinking of something else?	0.760	
How often do you find it difficult to stay focused on what is happening in the present?	0.615	
How often do you tend not to notice your feelings of physical tension or discomfort until they really grab your attention?	0.586	
How often do you feel that you are "running on automatic" without much awareness of what you are doing?	0.509	
How often do you find yourself snacking without paying attention how much you are eating?	0.607	
How often do you have trouble falling asleep?	0.635	
How often do you take pills to get to sleep?	0.636	
How often do you have to work late?	-0.522	
How often do you go to work even when you feel sick?	-0.619	
How often do you have to bring your work home?	0.518	
How often do you have negative thinking about your job?	0.544	
How often do you you feel that you are harder or less sympathetic with people than perhaps they deserve?	0.687	
How often do you feel that you are misunderstood or unappreciated by your coworkers?	0.684	
How often do you feel that you are with no one to talk to?	0.535	
How often do you feel that you are achieving less that you should?		0.546
How often do you feel that you are happy when you think about your job?		0.575
How often do you have nightmares or repeated bad dreams?		0.679
How often do you wake up in the middle of the night for no apparent reason?		0.755
How often do you stutter or get your tongue tied when you talk to other people?		0.676
How often do you arrive at work late?		0.642

The first group of items is loaded on the factor of emotional indicators of stress. The second group of indicators is loaded on the factor that is called mental indicators of stress.

Factor analysis test was done for the personal interaction with stress. The factor loading matrix is shown below (Table 5):

Table 5

Factor Analysis for Coping Styles

Items	F1	F2
How often do you deal with stressful situations by making a plan of action?	0.603	
How often do you deal with stressful situations by forcing yourself to wait for the right time to do something?	0.598	
How often do you deal with stressful situations by putting your trust in god?	0.513	
How often do you deal with stressful situations by refusing to believe that it has happened?	-0.568	
How often do you deal with stressful situations by daydreaming about things other than this situation?	-0.537	
How often do you handle your stress by time management solutions?	0.656	
How often do you handle your stress by religious solutions?	0.642	
How often do you handle your stress by entertainment solutions?		0.608
How often do you deal with stressful situations by learning to live with it?		-0.663
How often do you deal with stressful situations by letting your feelings out?		-0.528
How often do you handle your stress by sports solution?		0.756

The first group of items is forming the first factor which is called mental coping style. The second group of items is forming the second factor which is called the physical coping style.

Factor analysis test for the desire to perform is conducted and the items loadings are shown in Table 6 below:

Table 6

Factor Analysis for Academic Performance

Items	F1	F2	F3
How many national conferences did you attend in the last year?	0.587		
How many international conferences did you attend in the last year?	0.793		
How many conference papers do you publish in conference proceedings in the last three years?	0.646		
How many research papers did you publish in local journals in the last three years?	0.823		
How many Research papers did you publish in international journals in the last three years?	0.603		
How many books did you author in the last three years?	0.510		
How many books did you coauthor in the last three years?	0.575		
How many edited books did you contribute by writing chapters in it in the last three years?	0.659		
How many book of readings did you contribute some chapters in it in the last three years?	0.594		
How many articles did you publish in newspapers or magazines in the last three years?	0.600		
How many sponsored national researches did you participate in during the last three years?	0.701		
How many sponsored international researches did you participate in during the last three years?	0.789		
How often do you enter your class at the right time? Not later than supposed.		0.668	
How often do your leave your class at the right time? not earlier than supposed.		0.645	
How often do you give the notes to your students on time?		0.702	
How often do you mark all the assignments given to students?		0.764	
How often do you return all continuous assessment marked scripts to students?		0.721	
How often do you feel that you have too much work and too little time to do it?		0.507	
How often do you read and correct your students' projects?		0.759	
In general, to what extent do you feel that you are satisfied with your job?			0.655
How often do you feel enthusiastic about your work?			0.539
How often do you think about quitting?			-0.629
How often do you feel that you have to start searching for another job?			-0.695
I will leave this job as soon as I find another job.			-0.663

The first group of items is loaded on the factor that indicates the research performance. The second group of items is loaded on the factor that measures the teaching performance. The third group of items is loaded on the factor that measures the level of satisfaction with the academic job.

Normality test K-S is conducted on the last factors. The results of normality test are shown in Table 7 below:

Table 7

Normality Test K-S for Coping, Stress Indicators, Performance, and Satisfaction

	Emotional stress indicators	Mental stress indicators	Mental coping style	Physical coping style	Research performance	Teaching performance	Job satisfaction
K-S Z	1.094	1.772	1.624	1.703	1.342	1.062	1.016
Sig.	0.183	0.004	0.010	0.006	0.054	0.209	0.254

Note. From Table 7, the author concludes that the test distribution is normal.

Data Analysis and Discussion

The following part deals with the analysis of the research hypotheses and the interpretation of hypotheses testing results.

H1: There is significant negative relationship between the perception of the academic stress and academic climate motivation.

Table 8

Correlation Matrix Between Academic Climate and Perception of Stress

	Academic climate motivation	Perception of academic stress
Academic climate motivation	1	
Perception of academic stress	-0.252 Sig. (0.007) N. (112)	1

Note. Significance level: 0.01.

The correlation test matrix showed that if the academic staff member is highly motivated by the academic climate, then he or she tends to perceive lower levels of academic stress, and vice-versa (Table 8).

H2: There is significant negative relationship between the perception of academic stress and the cooperative climate motivation.

Table 9

Correlation Matrix Between Cooperative Climate and Perception of Stress

	Cooperative climate motivation	Perception of academic stress
Cooperative climate motivation	1	
Perception of academic stress	-0.293 Sig. (0.002) N. (112)	1

Note. Significance level: 0.01.

The correlation test matrix showed that if the academic staff member is highly motivated by the cooperative climate, then he or she tends to perceive lower levels of academic stress, and vice-versa (Table 9).

H3: There is significant negative relationship between the academic climate motivation and the level of perceived career promotion stress.

Table 10

Correlation Matrix Between Academic Climate and Perception of Career Promotion Stress

	Academic climate motivation	Perception of career promotion stress
Academic climate motivation	1	
Perception of career promotion stress	-0.301 Sig. (0.001) N. (112)	1

Note. Significance level: 0.01.

The correlation test matrix showed that if the academic staff member is highly motivated by the academic climate, then he or she tends to perceive lower levels of career promotion stress, and vice-versa (Table 10).

H4: The level of academic performance is affected by the level of perceived stress and the level of climate motivation.

The hypothesis is tested by the following regression model (Table 11):

Table 11

Regression Model for H4

Variables entered	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate	F	Sig.
Global climate	0.346	0.120	0.103	6.82722	7.330	0.001
Global stress						

Note. Dependent variable is global performance.

The model is significant and the coefficients are as follows (Table 12):

Table 12

Coefficients of Regression Model for H4

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients		Sig.
	B	Std. error	Beta	<i>t</i>	
Constant	47.003	6.404		7.340	0.000
Global stress	-0.170	0.062	-0.255	-2.733	0.007
Global climate	0.099	0.052	0.178	1.910	0.059

The model shows that there is negative impact of the level of perceived stress in general on the level of performance in general. It also reveals that better motivating climate in general leads to higher level of academic performance. The academic staff member's performance is increased by better motivating climate and lower levels of stress.

H5: The level of academic performance is affected by:

- Mental coping with stress
- Level of perceived functioning stress
- Trust motivating climate

The hypothesis is tested by the following regression model (Table 13):

Table 13

Regression Model for H5

Variables entered	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate	F	Sig.
Mental coping with stress						
Level of perceived functioning stress	0.506	0.256	0.235	6.30388	12.291	0.000
Trust motivating climate						

Note. Dependent variable is global performance.

The model is significant and the coefficients are as follows (Table 14):

Table 14

Coefficients of Regression Model for H5

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients		Sig.
	B	Std. error	Beta	t	
Constant	34.848	5.451		6.393	0.000
Functioning stress	-0.319	0.082	-0.327	-3.897	0.000
Trust climate	0.236	0.104	0.200	2.272	0.025
Mental coping style	0.646	0.214	0.265	3.014	0.003

Table 14 shows that the level of academic performance is increased by better trust motivating climate, more mental coping with stress, and less perceived functioning stress.

H6: The level of academic staff members' satisfaction is significantly affected by the following variables:

- Level of mental indications of stress
- Level of perceived functioning stress
- Level of cooperation motivating climate
- Level of research performance

The hypothesis is tested by the following regression model (Table 15):

Table 15

Regression Model for H6

Variables entered	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> square	Adjusted <i>R</i> square	Std. error of the estimate	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Level of mental indications of stress	0.595	0.354	0.330	2.28698	14.688	0.000
Level of perceived functioning stress						
Level of cooperation motivating climate						
Level of research performance						

Note. Dependent variable is global performance.

The model is significant and the coefficients are as follows (Table 16):

Table 16

Coefficients of Regression Model for H6

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	<i>t</i>	Sig.
	<i>B</i>	Std. error	Beta		
Constant	18.947	2.365		8.012	0.000
Level of mental indications of stress	-0.269	0.099	-0.238	-2.706	0.008
Level of perceived functioning stress	0.087	0.030	0.229	2.848	0.005
Level of cooperation motivating climate	0.104	0.038	0.229	2.737	0.007
Level of research performance	-0.126	0.031	-0.339	-4.047	0.000

The model is significant and the hypothesis is accepted. The model shows that higher level of academic job satisfaction is related to lower mental indications of stress, lower level of research performance, higher level of perceived functioning stress, and higher level of cooperation motivating climate. The less mental indications of stress are shown by the worker, the higher level of satisfaction he/she has. The research performance was found to decrease the level of job satisfaction. This is logical because the data revealed that most of the respondents suffer from lacking financial support for their research. They tend to have more research just because they want to be promoted. They tend not to bother themselves by doing research unless they are forced by university policy to do so. The higher level of perceived stress due to the functioning of the academic job, the more satisfied the member is. The conclusion is that functioning stress is a reinforcing stress because it increases the level of job satisfaction. The policy and the atmosphere of dealing with the staff member must increase the cooperative climate to motivate the worker and to increase his/her level of satisfaction.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The conclusion of this research is that there is significant negative relationship between the perception of

the academic stress and academic climate motivation. The dean of the college has to use this result to try to modify the climate of the faculty by providing more cooperation support values and showing prestigious respect and atmosphere, and also by reinforcing trust among staff members. This will enable the dean to control the level of stress. The results also showed that the more cooperative climate the faculty has, the less perceived academic stress staff members will have. The positive academic climate will enable the worker to minimize the level of stress regarding career promotion issues. The more trust, cooperation, and prestigious treatment they have, the less worried they are about their opportunities of career promotion. This also must be enhanced by faculty policies and regulations. It was proved by this research that if the university management wants to increase the level of academic performance, there is a need to increase the motivating climate and decrease the level of perceived occupational stress in general. More trust motivating climate and more mental coping styles will increase the level of performance. Lower perceived functioning stress increases the level of performance. That is why it is recommended to give training courses on building trust motivational climate and how to use mental coping styles of stress, and also how to minimize the level of stress and especially the functional stress. The level of academic staff member's satisfaction will be decreased by having mental indicators of stress. This mental indication is a sign for the dean that the staff's satisfaction level is low. Staff members must be under stress to exert more effort in research which in turn will decrease their level of satisfaction. More cooperation is the key to more satisfaction, higher levels of performance, and less perceived stress in general.

References

- Al-Ali, J. (2008). Emiratisation: Drawing UAE nationals into their surging economy. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 28, 365-379.
- Fisher, S. (1994). *Stress in academic life: The mental assembly line*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Gillespie, A., Walsh, M., Winefield, H., Dua, J., & Stough, C. (2001). Occupational stress in universities: Staff perceptions of the causes, consequences and moderators of stress. *Work & Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health & Organisations*, 15, 53-72.
- Bowen, R., & Schuster, H. (1985). Outlook for the academic profession. *Academe*, 71, 9-15.
- Armour, R. A., Caffarella, R. S., Fuhrmann, B. S., & Wergin, J. F. (1987). *Academic burnout: Faculty responsibility and institutional climate*. California: Jossey-Bass.
- Seldin, P. (1987). *Research findings on causes of academic stress*. California: Jossey-Bass.
- Safaria, T. (2013). Job stress among academic staff: A cross-cultural qualitative study. *International Journal of Public Health Science*, 2, 43-58.
- Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential challenge stressor-hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 438-454.
- Cooper, C., Dewe, P., & Driscoll, M. (2002). *Organizational stress: A review and critique of theory, research, and applications*. California: Sage.
- Ablanedo-Rosas, J., Blevins, R., Gao, H., Teng, W., & White, J. (2011). The impact of occupational stress on academic and administrative staff, and on students: An empirical case analysis. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 33, 553-564.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22, 309-328.
- De Jonge, J., & Dormann, C. (2006). Stressors, resources, and strain at work: A longitudinal test of the triple-match principle. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 1359-1374.
- Hidi, S., & Anderson, V. (1986). Producing written summaries: Task demands, cognitive operations, and implications for instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 56, 473-493.
- Judge, A., & Colquitt, A. (2004). Organizational justice and stress: The mediating role of work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 395-404.

- Lee-Baggley, D., Preece, M., & DeLongis, A. (2005). Coping with interpersonal stress: Role of big five traits. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 1141-1180.
- Kennedy, R., & Kennedy, D. (2004). Using the myers-briggs type indicator in career counseling. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 41, 38-43.
- Bartley, C., & Roesch, C. (2011). Coping with daily stress: The role of conscientiousness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50, 79-83.
- Carr, J., Kelley, B., Keaton, R., & Albrecht, C. (2011). Getting to grips with stress in the workplace. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 19(4), 32-38.
- Hede, K. (2009). Destigmatizing depression. *Science*, 2 October.
- Rosenman, R. H., & Friedman, M. (1974). Neurogenic factors in pathogenesis of coronary heart disease. *Medical Clinics of North America*, 58(2), 269-279.
- Parikh, G. C., Amjad, A. I., Saliba, R. M., Kazmi, S. M. A., Khan, Z. U., Lahoti, A., ...Qazilbash, M. H. (2009). Autologous Hematopoietic stem cell transplantation may reverse renal failure in patients with multiple myeloma. *Biology of Blood and Marrow Transplantation*, 15(7), 812-816.