

1988

A comparative study of stress related factors in the work environment of the student personnel administrator

Bruce D. LaVant
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

LaVant, Bruce D., "A comparative study of stress related factors in the work environment of the student personnel administrator " (1988). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 9212.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/9212>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 8920157

**A comparative study of stress-related factors in the work
environment of the student personnel administrator**

LaVant, Bruce D., Ph.D.

Iowa State University, 1988

U·M·I

**300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106**

**A comparative study of stress related factors in the work
environment of the student personnel administrator**

by

Bruce D. LaVant

**A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Higher Education)**

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

for the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

**Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa**

1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
CHAPTER I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTINGS	1
Introduction	1
The Problem	4
The Purpose	5
Statement of Hypotheses	6
Delimitations	7
Limitations	7
Definitions of Terms	7
Organization of the Study	9
CHAPTER II. THE REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	11
Introduction	11
Definitions and Theories of Stress	11
Models of Stress	16
Educational Stressors	23
The Impact of Stress on Job Performance	32
Leadership, Management and Administrative Styles	35
Stress in the Profession	40
Summary	42

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY	45
Introduction	45
The Social Readjustment Rating Scale and The Stress Survey Questionnaire	45
Sources of Data	47
Phase 1. Sample Identification	47
Phase 2. Distribution and Collection of the Instrument	48
Phase 3. Follow-up	48
Field Testing the Instrument	49
Treatment of Data	49
Statement of Assumption	50
CHAPTER IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATE	51
Introduction	51
Data Analysis	52
Hypothesis I	52
Hypothesis II	53
Hypothesis III	54
Hypothesis IV	54
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	75
Summary	75
Conclusions	77
Recommendations	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY	86
APPENDIX A: LIFE, STRESS, AND WORK	93
APPENDIX B: COVER LETTERS AND INSTRUCTIONS	105
APPENDIX C: FOLLOW-UP	107

LIST OF TABLES

Table I.	Sample distribution by geographic location inventories returned	58
Table II.	One-way analysis of variance summary table for scores on variables job-related stressors by levels of administrator	59
Table III.	Data on job-related stressors for all administrators	59
Table IV.	Multiple range tests on mean scores for degrees of job-related stressors on all administrators	60
Table V.	Partial correlation on variables job-related stress	61
Table VI.	Controlling for data on selected variables	62
Table VII.	Partial correlation on variables for job-related stressors, lack of support, and management style by institution	63
Table VIII.	Controlling for data on variable institution size	64
Table IX.	One-way analysis of variance summary table for scores on management style by level of administrator	65
Table X.	Stress rating scale	66
Table XI.	One-way analysis of variance summary table for scores job-related stressors by ethnic background	67
Table XII.	Data on job-related stressors by ethnic background	67
Table XIII.	Three-way analysis of variance summary table on stress at work by level of administrator, sex, ethnic background, with highest educational degree	68
Table XIV.	One-way analysis of variance summary table for scores on job-related stressors by highest educational degree	69
Table XV.	Multiple range tests for job-related pressures by highest educational degree	70

Table XVI.	One-way analysis of variance summary table for scores on lack of support by age of administrator	71
Table XVII.	Multiple range tests for lack of support by age of administrator	72
Table XVIII.	One-way analysis of variance summary table scores on job-related stressors by marital status and academic attainment	73
Table XIX.	Three-way analysis of variance summary table on stress at work by level of administrator, size of institution, and pressure encountered	74

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am sincerely grateful to all individuals who have contributed in some way to this study and provided me with guidance and assistance throughout my doctoral program.

Special appreciation is given to the following individuals: Dr. Daniel Robinson and Dr. Larry Ebbers, my co-Major Professors, for their continual guidance and assistance throughout my doctoral studies at Iowa State University; Dr. Wilbur Layton and Dr. Richard Warren for their special consultations in the initial development of the project and for also serving on the committee; Dr. Penny Ralston and Dr. George Kizer for serving on the committee; Dr. Thomas Thielen for his assistance with encouraging the National Association of Student Personnel Administration to participate in this project; Dr. George Jackson for his support of this project.

My deepest appreciation is extended to my wife, Felecia, and daughter, Andraea, for their understanding, support and encouragement throughout this time consuming project; to my mother and father for their continual encouragement throughout my educational career.

Lastly, dedication is given to my deceased friend and colleague, Dr. Donald T. Watson, "I am forever grateful for your words of wisdom, advice, and support" throughout my continual pursuit of higher education. "I thank God for the strength to endure."

CHAPTER I.

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTINGS

Introduction

The results from various studies (Carnegie Council, 1980) have indicated that the American public places strong value and high priorities in education; specifically higher education. However, as the cost of tuition at institutions of higher education continue to increase (Mayhew, 1979; Evangelauf, 1985) constant pressures are placed upon college and university administrators to provide adequate curriculum and the atmosphere to promote quality education (Martonana and Kuhns, 1975). This requires college or university administrators to perform their duties at a maximum level in order to provide an acceptable educational environment. In view of the above, there is a need to conduct research that would provide more information to assist college and university student personnel administrators reduce stress on their jobs.

According to Ivancevich and Matteson (1980), stress at work has a significant effect on performance. As in the case of college administrators, potential stressors multiply as organizations grow in size and complexity. There are many explanations for this phenomenon. A partial explanation may be found in the increasing stressful environment and in the average person's poor ability to deal with these stressors in a manner which does not cause significant disruptions to the individual's personal and organizational systems (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980).

Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) stated that stress disorders cost organizations an estimated \$17 to \$25 billion each year in lost performance, absenteeism and health benefit payments. Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) indicated that projections from government, industry, and health groups, estimate the costs of stress to be approximately \$75-90 billion annually. Although this estimate accounts for 10 percent of the United States gross national product, it is still viewed to be a conservative estimate.

Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) outlined five major categories of work related or job-related stressors. The first is "extra-organizational" stressors which are the events and situations outside the person's immediate work life which nonetheless influence the amount of work stressors and performance. These include disruptions such as marital problems, financial difficulties, political uncertainties, and larger quality of life concerns. The remaining stressor sources are four "intra-organizational" categories. Three of these are individual, group, and organizational stressors. These refer to the level or initial source of the stressor. Role overload may be an individual level source of stress. Intragroup conflict may be a stressor at the group level. Several aspects of climate or the manner in which jobs are designed may be an organizational level source of potential stress. Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) maintained that the physical environment in which work takes place may give rise to stressors that may hinder job performance. These researchers indicated that the four aforementioned categories of intraorganizational stressors interact.

Raudsepp (1987) reports that some of the causes of excessive stress for administrators, supervisors and managers are meeting impossible deadlines, making important decisions, personality conflicts with associates, working under time pressures, excessive responsibility, fear of failure, fear of criticism, and excessive ambition.

Among this population of individuals who have the title of administrators on college and university campuses, are Student Personnel Professionals. Brown, Bond, Gerndt, Kroger, Krantz, Lukin, and Prentice (1986) studied stress among student services professionals by applying an interactional approach. They examined relationships among situational variables (time of semester, gender, adequacy of resources), personal variables (gender, priorities, and personal resources for coping), and reported stress and strain among student personnel professionals.

The results revealed that stress varies significantly with time of semester and gender and that other personal and situational variables significantly predict stress levels. It was indicated that their particular approach to studying stress can provide useful environmental information for administrators concerned about staff and also for personnel actively engaged in reducing stress levels through counseling and group work.

With the outcome of this study, it is hoped that the student personnel administrator will develop greater awareness of various sources of stress and will develop theories or new practices that will help him/her to relate to certain stressful situations. This will be a major step in the development of a better quality of life.

The Problem

There are many responsibilities that must be carried out by college administrators. In attempting to assume these responsibilities and carry them out satisfactorily, college administrators often encounter situations that are stressful in origin. The many expectations and demands placed upon college administrators constantly create situations that conflict with their moral beliefs, theories, philosophy, and methods of training (Forney, Wallace, Schutzman, and Wiggers, 1982). Schuler (1981) cited several conditions that generally place higher education administrators in high pressure and undesirable positions as:

1. Having to reduce their budgets, which often leads to the reduction of staff and the elimination of programs.
2. Coping with space limitations.
3. Having to comply with affirmative action laws by hiring individuals from all racial and ethnic groups.
4. Continuing to increase the student retention rate and reduce the student attrition rate.
5. Attempting to effectively serve the student population, colleagues (superiors), and addressing community concerns.

Stress occurs when individuals believe the demands from the environment are more than they can handle (Herdegen, 1982).

Wilcox (1981) documented the harmful effects of "stress" and the concern that it has created among physicians, psychologists, counselors, and stress management specialists. Various studies (Student 1978; Vetter, 1976) have shown that there are varieties of job stressors in the

positions held by individuals who are administrators of public schools, and managers of large business cooperations. However, very few studies are published in the literature about "stress" and the higher education administrator.

The major thrust for this investigation was to determine:

1. The student personnel administrator's opinion about job related and life event stress.
2. Interrelationships between job responsibilities and stress.
3. Preventive maintenance and coping mechanisms to deal effectively with stress.

The Purpose

The central purpose of this study was to investigate stress encountered by student personnel administrators from institutions of higher learning and draw conclusions regarding the impact of specific job-related and life event stressors on the job performance of these administrators.

In order to identify the student personnel administrator's opinion about stress, an attempt was made to answer the following specific questions:

1. Will job-related stressors vary with the level of the administrators (senior, middle, junior)?
2. Is there a relationship between pressures encountered by the administrator and stress experienced at work?
3. Is there a relationship between the management style of an administrator and job-related stressors?

4. Is there a relationship between stress encountered at work and job performance of the administrator?

In order to provide answers to the above questions, the Stress Survey Questionnaire developed by Davidson and Cooper (1983) was distributed to a sample population of college and university administrators who work primarily in the student services area. They occupy job positions at the senior (vice-president, dean), middle (director, associate dean), and junior (assistant director, coordinator) management levels in the Midwestern region of the United States. The Stress Survey Questionnaire contained items associated with on-the-job stress, life event stress, management style and ways to relax.

Statement of Hypotheses

For the purposes of this study the following points are presented:

1. There are significant differences in the types and degrees of job-related stressors experienced by senior, middle, and junior level administrators.
2. There is a significant relationship between pressures encountered by the administrator and stress experienced at work.
3. For all levels of administrators, there is a significant relationship between management style of an administrator and job-related stressors.
4. There is a significant relationship between stress encountered at work and job performance of the administrator.

Delimitations

This study focused on student affairs administrators employed in institutions of higher learning. The administrators were randomly selected from the current membership rosters of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and the Mid-America Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel.

Limitations

Due to the random selection procedure, not all administrators who might have been excellent subjects were included.

The opinions expressed by the participants may vary due to differences in cultural and social backgrounds, and differences in job setting.

Definitions of Terms

COPING: A protective mediating, adaptive behavior elicited when an individual is confronted with negative stressors. Coping serves to prevent, avoid or control emotional distress.

JOB PERFORMANCE: A condition that can be assessed by observation and diagnosis, valid self-report techniques, and by task analysis (i.e., typing speed, machine operation, operating on a patient, conducting a counseling session).

JUNIOR MANAGER: These persons are student affairs/personnel administrators with job titles of assistant directors, assistant deans, and coordinators in divisions and departments of student affairs.

MIDDLE MANAGER: These persons are student affairs/personnel administrators with job titles of associate/assistant vice presidents,

associate/assistant vice chancellors, and directors in divisions of student affairs.

ROLE AMBIGUITY: The discrepancy between the amount of information a person has and the amount he requires to perform his role adequately. Uncertainty as to the scope of one's job.

ROLE CONFLICT: Experienced when an administrator is torn by incompatible job demands made by superior or peer level administrators whose positions overlap his/her own in authority and/or responsibilities. Also, conflict that results when compliance with one of role pressures makes compliance with another set difficult or impossible.

SENIOR MANAGER: These persons are student affairs/personnel administrators with job titles of vice presidents, vice provosts, vice chancellors, and deans of divisions.

STRESS: An adaptive response, mediated by individual characteristics and/ or psychological processes, that is a consequence of any external action, situation, or event that places special physical and/or psychological demands upon a person.

STRESSOR: Any event, situation, or person that an individual may encounter in the environment and which requires change or adaptation on the individual's part. Also, that stimulus which elicits a stress response.

WORK OVERLOAD: A condition of being overloaded either quantitatively or qualitatively. Quantitative overload occurs when an individual has too much work to do or insufficient time to complete required work. Qualitative overload occurs when individuals feel they lack the skills,

abilities, or competences to do their jobs.

With the outcome of this study, it is hoped that the student personnel administrator will develop greater awareness of various sources of stress and will develop theories or new practices that will help him to relate to certain stressful situations. This will be a major step in the development of a better quality of life.

Organization of the Study

This study is presented in five chapters, a bibliography and appendices.

Chapter I presents an Introduction of college administrator stress. Sources of job-related and life event stressors are introduced to provide a foundation for the study. Also presented are the statements of the problem, the hypotheses, purpose of the study, delimitations and limitations, the definitions of terms, the importance of the study, and the organization of the study.

Chapter II presents a review of the literature which includes an introduction of stress research, definitions and theories of stress, models of stress, educational stressors, impact of stress on job performance, leadership, management and administrative styles, stress in the profession, and summary.

Chapter III, methodology, includes a description of the instrument, sources of data, treatment of data, field testing, and the statement of assumptions.

Chapter IV, the presentation and analysis of the data, includes an introduction, and data analysis.

Chapter V includes the summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

Following Chapter V are the bibliography and appendices.

CHAPTER II.

THE REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

In the past few hundred years we have created a social environment characterized by huge hierarchical organizations, in which the individual's life is subject to many conflicting pressures and stresses. We have become the confused victims of the miracles we have wrought (Laurence J. Peter, 1977).

Introduction

The stress of life is inescapable. There have been innumerable ideas and suggestions concerning stress and its causes and effects. In this chapter, research studies related to definitions and theories of stress, models of stress, educational stressors, the effect of stress on performance, the personalities of educators prone to the stress response, and a prognosis for stress in the profession are cited to provide a general overview of the topic. While some attention has been given to the topic of professional burnout in education, a review of the literature indicates that very few studies have focused specifically on stress and college administrators. Because of the lack of relevant research related to specific stress variables that affect college administrators, other studies are cited from the related fields of management, business and medical psychology, to support this study.

Definitions and Theories of Stress

Hinkle (1973) and Selye (1976) stated that stress has been defined in many conflicting ways - from hardship, straits, adversity, and affliction to force, pressure, and strain. Selye (1976) and Ivancevich and

Matteson (1980) maintained that all human beings experience stress, but many individuals respond to stressors and stressful situations in different ways. These researchers contend that stress is considered a thief and the person a potential victim. Stress affects all individuals regardless of their job capacity. According to Ivancevich and Matteson (1980), the executive who has a large organization to manage; the salesperson who has to meet his monthly sales quota; or the administrative assistant who has several reports due with a small amount of time to complete them experience stress in different ways. Whatever the job might be, there are always possibilities of susceptibility to stress and it affecting a person's health.

According to Selye (1976), it is often useful to define what stress is not.

Stress is not simply nervous tension. It is not an emergency discharge of hormones from the adrenal medulla. Stress is not everything that causes a secretion by the adrenal cortex of its hormones or the corticoids. Stress is not always the nonspecific result of damage, nor is stress a nonspecific reaction.

On the other hand, Selye (1976) stated that stress could be defined as the nonspecific response of the body to any demand made upon it. It is the rate of wear and tear on the body. Generally, stress cannot be avoided. It may be produced by pleasant stimuli as well as unpleasant experiences. Sparks and Ingram (1979) maintained that while some individuals (turtles) require a quiet relaxing environment for healthy functioning, others (racehorses) are happiest with a more stimulating,

fast-paced life style. An environment that "fits" one person may produce negative consequences (distress) for another. According to Koff, Loffey, Olsen, and Cichon (1980), one person's stress is another person's challenge.

A number of studies (Mueller, Edwards, and Yarvis, 1977) have reported that a relationship exist among life events or life crises, psychological and physiological problems. Studies by Holmes and Rahe (1967) indicated that events or experiences that are viewed to be pleasurable are often as stressful as many events that are considered to be negative. Holmes and Rahe (1967) defined stressful life events as any set of circumstances, the advent of which requires or signals change in the basic life pattern of an individual. A variety of laboratory and clinical studies (Dohrenwend and Martin, 1979) reported that stressful events are most harmful when they are perceived to be uncontrollable.

Sarason, Johnson, and Siegal (1978) have examined the relationship between life stress and psychological problems that a person encounters as a result of life crises. Holmes and Rahe (1967) indicated that a relationship exists between life stress and major and minor health changes. Their research also provided evidence that exemplified how life changes were related to chronic illness.

A significant factor that complicates the overall life event stress an individual encounters is a "specific stressor." A "specific stressor" is defined as a change in the internal or external environment in such a magnitude qualitative or quantitative) that it requires the adaptation and defense reactions to maintain its life and/or homeostasis. A

"stressor" is, therefore, different from a stimulus (which means any change in the environment) because of its intensity. The difference between a stimulus and a stressor is often quantitative rather than qualitative (McLean, 1974).

There are many stressors that are considered to be natural occurring life events, but produce a variety of stressful situations. Naturally occurring environmental stressors such as air pollution, severe weather, traffic jams, overcrowding, noise pollution, political, economic and financial crises, create stressful situations.

The General Adaptation Syndrome developed by Selye (1976) best explains the organism's (individual) reactions to somatic systems elicited by nonspecific stress such as environmental stress. This syndrome evolved into three stages. The alarm reaction, which is the first and perhaps the most important of the three, involves a process that elicits a somatic disturbance and a phase two which produces the activation of individual's defense mechanism. During these stages, significant alterations in biochemical structure occur. When a threat or stressor is encountered, the "alarm" is sounded and the body's entire stress system is mobilized. This mobilization activates the body's energy reserves.

According to Selye (1976) the stage of resistance produces biological responses that attempt to assist the organism in establishing equilibrium. The resistance against the stressor increases. This stage is characterized by the identification of the organ system that is best equipped to deal with the kind of threat represented by the stressors. The changes

associated with the alarm stage disappear and are replaced by changes characteristic of whatever adaptive strategy the individual adopts.

Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) explained that the stage of exhaustion, the final stage, involves the effects of the negative stressor. Prolonged and continual exposure to the same stressor may eventually use up the adaptive energy available, and the system fighting the stressor becomes exhausted. Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) concluded by stating that at this point many of the activities associated with the alarm reaction stage return. If the negative stressor persists or is not partially or totally eliminated in the resistance stage, further "exhaustion" occurs and bodily defenses continue to break down. The adjustment attempts have failed. If this persistence does not occur, the negative stressor can be overtaken and the organism (individual) will continue to function normally.

Life event stressors (like stimuli) can be manifold in nature: physical, chemical, viral, bacteriological, biological and interhuman. According to Groen (1971),

Interhuman conflicts (actual or anticipated) are the most common stressors. If acted out in the form of violence, an interhuman conflict may result in bodily damage. In most cases, however, interhuman conflicts are acted out verbally or symbolically; and in this case, they threaten or upset primarily the homeostasis of the central nervous system, and through this total organism.

Holmes and Rahe (1967) investigated the amount of life change caused by experiencing the following events marriage, loss of job, and change of residence. This study was designed to assess whether change alone

provides an adequate representation of the salient qualities of life events and to assess if individuals differ systematically in their perceptions of qualitative features of events. The results indicated that important characteristics of events may vary widely among individuals and that future assessment of the properties of life stress be both multi-dimensional and specific for individuals.

Models of Stress

There are several stress models that illustrate the processes that occur due to stress reactions exemplified by individuals who assume various job positions. The primary goal and theory of any stress and work model is to address two aspects of science: prediction and understanding (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980).

Prediction is concerned with the value of outcomes on one or more units in the model or the state of the entire system being studied (e.g., the person, the group, the organization). Understanding focuses on the interaction of variables in a model and attempts to address the following questions: How do variables interact? Why do they interact? When is the interaction most important? (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980). According to Ivancevich and Matteson (1980), administrators have not had models that predict stress and work outcomes which would also improve their understanding of the phenomena involved. Due to the lack of empirical data in this area, there appears to be a need to implement a working model of stress that would provide administrators and managers with some insight as to why and how they become stressed and how individuals respond

to stress (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980).

Several medical and behavioral models have been developed to explain stress and work. These models attempt to acquire information regarding experience, gather research findings, variables and practices that are general and not all theoretically based approaches to stress and work. Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) contended that "no stress model will parallel exactly the experience of a single manager nor can it be accepted as the final model." These researchers further stated that the goals of an integrative stress model should:

Improve managerial understanding of stress and work relationships; provide terminology and concepts that make sense from a managerial perspective. The model should appeal to managers in general and not a specific or a small group of managers. It should not be viewed as the complete or final solution to the issue concerning stress and work. It should suggest courses of action that managers can take to counter stress in subordinates and in themselves; offer suggestions for research on stress and work variables; incorporate individual, groups, and organizational, as well as extraorganizational variables that are potentially related to organizational outcome variables.

The biochemical model developed by Selye (1956) was concerned with the analysis of stress at the physiological and biochemical levels. Selye (1956) defined stress as "a state manifested by a specific syndrome which consists of all of the nonspecifically induced changes within a biological system." These nonspecifically induced changes occur as a result of the organisms responses to outside forces. They are sometimes described in terms of the General Adaptation Syndrome, alarm, resistance, and exhaustion.

While the research conducted by Selye (1956) is comprehensive, administrators may be unfamiliar with his medical terminology. Although this model is frequently cited in the literature and consistently applied in a variety of research studies, there is no evidence of research or any discussion regarding group or organizational variables in this model (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980).

The psychosomatic model refers to the tensions and strains in one system of the body that produce pathological consequences for other bodily systems. One example of this type of behavior is an administrator or manager who is awaiting a performance evaluation and depending upon this evaluation as the possibility for promotion (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980). During this period, the individual might experience significant physiological changes. These internal changes may cause significant alterations in the organizing process of the body: blood vessel and digestive tract constriction, an increase of red blood corpuscles into the body's circulatory system, an increase in the flow of epinephrine (adrenaline), and an increase in the sugar content of the blood (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980). This model attempts to assess other physiological reactions and how these reactions are set in motion by psychological processes. There is also an attempt to determine whether there is a linkage or correlation between the occurrence of physiological reactions and psychological responses. Alexander (1950) did not apply his psychosomatic model to stress and work. Neither were his findings of their model presented in a manner which could be beneficial to administrators and managers. Lachman (1972) stated that the psychomatic model

did not emerge from a framework from which managerial causes of action was the primary focus but could be possibly considered for application.

The adaptation model of stress was formulated by Mechanic (1962) to examine the stress responses exhibited by graduate students involved in taking doctoral preliminary examinations. This model was designed to assess the discomforting responses of persons in particular situations. Mechanic (1962) stated that whether or not a situation is stressful depends upon four factors:

The ability and capacity of a person to deal with the situation; skills and limitations produced by group practices and traditions; the means provided to individuals by the social environment; and the names that define where and how an individual may utilize these means.

The adaptation model demonstrated that when an individual is feeling unprepared to meet a situation, he experiences intense discomfort. Many of these feelings may result from a lack of appropriate knowledge and skills, the uncertainty of the situation, or particular personal traits such as low self-confidence. This particular model does not focus on organizational or work situations. However, the preparation of students for comprehensive examinations is generalizable to a situation whereby an administrator is preparing to present a budget or a plan to hire or eliminate new staff.

Another model that attempts to integrate existing data on the relationship of occupational stress to heart disease was developed by House (1974). House utilized existing research findings to explain the role of social and psychological factors involved in chronic heart disease.

The model showed that the experience of stress is a subjective response resulting from the interaction of social conditions and particular personal characteristics such as abilities, needs and values (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980). By using this model, it was shown that there is a significant relationship between heart disease and social conditions. House stated that this relationship exists as a result of an individual's perception of the situation, and that the perceived meaning of objective conditions depends on both the nature of the person and the nature of the social situation. Furthermore, this model implied that many individuals who encounter the same degree of subjective stress will seldom experience the same types of outcomes such as coronary heart disease (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980). An important factor is how the individuals adapt to the situation. Many responses to perceived stress may be physiological, psychological (cognitive/affective), and/or behavioral.

House's model offers a kinetic device for clarifying and integrating existing research and suggest ways to conduct further research. This model does not specifically illustrate or present variables of an organization, nor does it present specifics related to guidelines for college administrators and managers to follow in a further attempt to understand the relationships between stress and work. This model however attempted to provide an understanding by: illustrating how occupational stress is significantly contributable to the etiology of coronary heart disease and is also responsible for other chronic diseases.

A model that has been applied in many research studies dealing with occupational stress is the "Person-Environment/Role Fit Model." Several

researchers (French, 1974; Kahn, 1974; Cobb, 1974 and Cooper and Marshall, 1976) have conducted studies on the main effects of work role on health, and on job stress and individual strain. This model was developed by these researchers to assess the effects of organizational stresses and strain within the individual (French, 1974).

French and Caplan (1974) focused on two conditioning variables. The first one has goodness of fit between the environment and the person; and second, the conditioning effects of social support. A specific type of fit between the individual and their job environment is the degree to which their skills and abilities match the requirements of the job. Another type of fit is the degree to which the needs of the individuals are supplied to their job environment. An example of this fit would be the extent to which the need to utilize the best abilities is satisfied by the current job (French, 1974).

In attempting to apply the Person-Environment/Role Fit Model in any research situation, the uniqueness of each individual must be considered. Because of this factor, making generalizations about different individuals become difficult. In view of that, qualitative measurement techniques have been developed by researchers in order to test the theory of the goodness of fit between the person and the job.

French and Caplan (1973) obtained these measures by asking the person to rate the quality of their job environment along a quantitative scale. An example of their question was: "what responsibility do you have for the work of others?" After a series of questions were asked and answered, a quantitative score of the goodness of fit measure was derived by

subtracting the actual score for the job environment from the optimum or desired score on the same dimension of the job environment.

Several variables which influence the individual's ability to cope with stress also intervene in the process of deriving a goodness of fit measure. Holmes and Rahe (1967) developed a life events/life change scale to assess variables or factors that affect an individual's adaptation to the job such as: family problems, financial difficulties, health problems, psychological adjustment problems, and personality. Many research studies have documented the significant impact that these factors have on the individual in the workplace. Holmes and Rahe's (1967) life event scale or formally referred to as the "Social Readjustment Rating Scale" measures the amount of stress arising from positive or negative changes in a person's life over a period of one year. Persons with high scores on the scale have perhaps three times the probability of serious illness within two years from measurement as those with low scores. Preliminary findings also indicate the possibility of a direct relationship between suspected hypoglycemic individuals and Holmes-Rahe life change scores ($R = .4, p < .02$).

Both the Person Environment/Role Fit Model and Social Environment Model attempted to provide administrators and managers with a comprehensive theory of mental health. These models have been applied in a variety of research projects and have promoted efforts to understand the objective work environment and individual health and disease (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980).

The life events/life change scale developed by Holmes and Rahe (1967)

was utilized as an assessment tool in this study to measure stress variables and job performance of higher education administrators. This instrument was developed from research conducted by Meyer (1962) and Wolfe (1950). These researchers concluded from their results that "stressful" life events were prevalent in the natural etiologies of human diseases. Holmes and Rahe (1967) studied the clinical effects of major life changes of over five thousand clients suffering from stress-related illnesses. From the results of the interviews and responses from surveys, Holmes and Rahe assigned a numerical value to each life event, ranking them in order of magnitude. The participants in the initial development of their scale included executives, doctors, students, and athletes (Ivankevich and Matteson, 1980).

After Holmes and Rahe (1967) developed the scores for each life event, the medical histories of these clients were examined. These researchers discovered that individuals who had high scores on the life change index were more likely to contract illness following stressful events. The evidence provided by the study indicated that an individual's inability to adapt to change causes stress. This instrument however, does not account for a person's capacity for dealing with stress.

Educational Stressors

An educational stressor can be any condition in the educational environment that produces a stress reaction in an educator. Cooper and Marshall (1976) employed a framework for discussing five major categories of stressors in educational organizations:

1. Factors intrinsic to the job
2. Role in the organization
3. Relationships within the organization
4. Career development
5. Organizational structure and climate.

Individuals with different jobs encounter various types of stress and different qualities of stress. As a result, people experience different types of strain. Margolis et al. (1974) stated that job stress involved many events and processes. It is often conceived to be a nebulous concept, difficult to study in a scientific manner. However, there is at least one meaningful paradigm from which significant research is readily derived. Job stress may be defined as the condition in which some factors or combination of factors at work interact with the worker to disrupt their psychological or physiological homeostatis. These factors or combined factors at work are generally called job stressors and the disrupted homeostatis is often called job-related strain (Margolis et al., 1974).

Margolis et al. (1974) stated that controlled research as well as informal observations, have revealed that individuals respond to identical job situations in a variety of ways. For example, one worker is upset by a boss who closely supervises his work while another worker finds close supervision desirable. In a study at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Caplan, Cobb, and French (1975) reported that individuals who experience job stress and strain are frequently in a "poor-person environment fit" situation. A poor-person environment

fit situation is often the result of the workers needs not being met. They are usually frustrated. Their abilities are mismatched with their responsibilities hence they are prone to job-related strain.

Margolis et al. (1974) stated that the results of experiencing intense manifestations of job-related stress and strain may actually be the result of disorders and dysfunctions occurring from a variety of symptoms. These could be physical, psychological symptoms and/or behavioral disturbances. These researchers (Margolis et al., 1974) further stated that:

In order to better understand the impact of job stress we must be able to measure its effects on the worker. Too often, job-related strain is conceived of as being only unidimensional, or at most bidimensional. The basic goal in job stress studies is to relate specific job stressors to specific strain so that those stressors which are causing problems might be dealt with.

According to Margolis et al. (1974), the five-dimensions of job-related strain that should be measured in order to assess the impact of job stress upon the worker are:

The subjective states. These are states of anxiety, tension, anger, and feeling uptight. These are short-term or acute reactions, rather than chronic states, which occur in close temporal proximity to specific job stressors.

The second dimension of job-related strain is more reflective of the more chronic psychological responses to job stress. Chronic depression, feelings of fatigue, alienation, or general malaise become integrated within the individual's (worker) health status. While hypertension is distinguished from acute blood pressure, so can chronic mental health problems be distinguished from acute psychological responses to stress.

The third dimension involves individual physiological changes that occur due to the psychological stress of the job. Types of changes that occur are increases in blood pressure, changes in the level of catecholamines, blood lipids levels, and increased levels of cholesterol.

Physical health status is the fourth dimension. Illnesses such as gastro-intestinal disorders, coronary heart disease, asthmatic attacks, and other psychosomatic disorders are all manifested and are consequences of psychological stress.

The fifth dimension involves the measure of job-related strain and work-performance decrement. The focus here is primarily on the decreases in work-productivity (lower), increases in error rate, absenteeism, and job dissatisfaction.

Although these five dimensions included many of the traditional job related stress variables, the fifth measure needs to be expanded in order to include additional stress variables that are presently under study by several stress researchers. These variables are inclusive of but not limited to the habitual use and behavioral manifestation of stress such as dependency on caffeine and cigarettes, excessive use of prescribed and nonprescribed drugs, and the overuse of alcohol and food.

Margolis et al. (1974) concluded that "these five indices of job-related strain are not discrete, but all are derived from the same source. They are interdependent, with subjective states perhaps causally related to mental health status; physiologic state causally related to physical health status; and all four of these causally related to performance decrement." The types and kinds of stressors encountered on the particular job might be considerably different, however, all individuals experience some type of stressor (positive and negative) that contributes

to job-related strain.

In a study that included more than 400 female clerical workers at a multicampus Eastern university, Balshem (1984) found that nearly 40 percent of the sample reported their jobs to be always stressful. The stress was manifested in a variety of physical complaints, with 48.4 percent reporting headaches, 46.1 percent reporting eyestrain, 38.4 percent reporting back problems, and 25.1 percent reporting constant fatigue. Drawing from the responses received from the surveys as well as interviews, Balshem (1984) concluded that in contributing to the clerical workers stress, one factor stands out, and that is the unsupportive boss. A lack of support from a superior was associated with high stress and dissatisfaction. Balshem further stated that the present study reinforced a review of research by the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health in 1977 which stated that the "secretary" was the second most stressful job category.

Orphen (1982) stated that there are other sources that contribute to the problem of stress that are inherent in the position of the administrator, manager, counselor, teacher, and several other occupations. These sources are frequently referred to as the major types of role stress, each of which is supposed to have negative or deleterious implications for psychological and physical well-being.

The first source is role ambiguity. Role ambiguity occurs when the individual does not have a significant amount of information about the job requirements to perform his job satisfactorily. This arises when a person perceives his job expectations to be too vague or

ill-defined to properly carry out his daily obligations (Orphen, 1982). Furthermore, the individual is often uncertain about the authority (if any), scope, and responsibilities of the job (Kahn, 1974). When role ambiguity reaches the point of being stressful the individuals entire life suffers (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1982).

Cooper and Crump (1978) stated that role ambiguity was significantly related to feelings of job related threats to one's mental and physical well-being and to low job satisfaction. There was also some correlation between role ambiguity and increased blood pressure, pulse rate and additional determinants of physiological functions.

Kahn (1974) reported that role ambiguity was significantly related to: sense of futility, job dissatisfaction, low self-confidence, and job-related tension. Kahn concluded that the primary outcome of role ambiguity was poor communication and poor interaction between workers, this in turn leads to lower job satisfaction.

The second source is role conflict. Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) stated that when an individual is faced with a situation in which two or more role pressures are working against each other, role pressures are encountered. Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) and Cooper and Crump (1978) stated that role conflict also exists when an individual serves two or more persons who impose expectations and demands for logically incompatible behaviors. Often this leads to requiring the individual to perform tasks that he may not want to do and are not included in his job description.

Weiman (1977) stated that a significant relationship exists between

role conflict and indices of disease. The subjects for this study were 1500 financial officers. Further research on private sector occupations done by French and Caplan (1970) indicated that the mean heart rate for these subjects was significantly related to self-report of role conflict. Kahn and others (1964) found that lower job satisfaction and higher job related stress were strongly related to role conflict. In this study, occupations were differentiated in terms of the degree or frequency of role conflicts. Supervisory and management position had a higher frequency of role conflicts than did nonsupervisory jobs (Kahn and others, 1964).

The third type of occupational stress is "role overload." Sales (1969) stated that role overload is a condition in which the individual is faced with a set of obligations which, taken as a set, requires him/her to do more than he/she is able to do in the allotted time. Orphen (1982) stated that research on role overload has focused primarily on its presumed relationship with coronary heart disease. A number of studies, usually of a correlational nature, have shown associations between overload and variables presumed to be related in heart disease.

Further evidence of role overload was reported by Rosenman and others (1964). These researchers stated that persons who were rated as hard-driving, persistent, and involved in their jobs, experienced more overload in the same objective situation than persons who lacked these characteristics. They further stated that the high level of role overload in such persons and the resulting psychological strain it produces has been regarded as the intervening link in the apparent association between

coronary disease and personality factors.

Another source of job/occupational stress is "responsibility for people." Ivancevich and Matteson (1982) stated that responsibility for people usually means being accountable for people in relation to their jobs, health, well-being, and career progress or development. Evidence has supported the idea that having responsibility for people is a much more powerful stressor than responsibility for things. Responsibility for things means to be accountable for equipment. This concept requires a totally different approach when the intent is to have responsibility for people and not things.

Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) contend that responsibility for people generally increases once you become a manager or supervisor. It is also increased if you enter an occupation which is people oriented such as fire fighting, policing, nursing or teaching. They stated that if you are in a managerial job or a people oriented job, you likely have, at some point, become a victim of responsibility for people because you must spend more and more time with subordinates, wrestling with the jobs, careers, and personal problems.

Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) reported that responsibility for people contributed to job-related stress for managerial, technical/professional, and clerical employees. The greater this responsibility, the more likely the person is to have high blood pressure and elevated cholesterol levels. The evidence from research in the area of management indicate that responsibility for people cannot be eliminated from jobs for those who have this responsibility. According to Ivancevich and

Matteson (1982), there may not be any escape for the administrator who has a position that required the responsibility for people, however, this individual should be particularly mindful of this variable of stress.

Frew (1977) identified eight sources of work-related stress as:

The unwritten psychological contract regarding the individual's expectations of what the job will provide; the stressors surrounding careers and career development; the negative impact on the family of job demands; the trauma of change particularly as it relates to human obsolescence, and organizational obsolescence.

Additional stressors occur from attempts to cope with job demands. These include coping with expectations of superiors and maintaining the ideology of the organization.

Career development accounts for two major sources of potential stressors: job insecurity and status incongruity. Some researchers (Constandse, 1972; Levinson, 1973) depicted many middle-aged workers as experiencing a leveling career progression. Additionally, pressures from workers new to an organization are perceived by middle-aged workers as threatening to job security. The inability to accept the reality of professional goal incompleteness disposes many middle-aged administrators to feelings of frustration and to health problems.

Organizational structure and climate represent a source of stress if they are perceived as threats to freedom, autonomy, and identity. Lack of participation in the decision-making process, poor communications, restrictions on behavior, and organizational politics are related to poor physical health, depression, low motivation to work, low life satisfaction, and low job satisfaction (Margolis, Kroes, and Quinn, 1974).

That organizations are a serious source of stress has been known for some time. French (1974) wrote:

If you could perfectly control cholesterol, blood pressure, smoking, glucose level, serum uric acid, and so on, you would have controlled only about one-fourth of the coronary heart disease. There is little solid evidence, he adds to show that programs of exercise substantially reduce some of the risk factors. However, the stresses of today's organizations can pose serious threats to the physical and psychological well-being of organization members. When a man dies or becomes disabled by a heart attack, the organization may be as much to blame as is the man and his family.

The Impact of Stress on Job Performance

The issue of stress on job performance has become the concern of many managers, administrators and several other individuals who are employed in different occupations. A number of research studies (Davidson and Cooper, 1983) have shown that stress has produced significant effects (positive and negative) on individuals in all fields and professions. In fact, all humans need change-induced stimulation to increase creativity (Albrecht, 1979). A small amount of stress can actually improve job performance (Dubrin, 1981). When the level of stress exceeds this "comfort zone," however, stress becomes dysfunctional.

According to Goldberg (1978), statistics concerning the negative consequences of stress are readily available from industry:

Premature employee deaths cost American industry \$19.4 billion a year, more than the combined 1976 profits of Fortune's top five corporations.

An estimated \$10 to \$20 billion is lost due to the absence, hospitalization, and premature deaths of executives.

Alcoholism costs industry about \$15.6 billion annually due to absenteeism and medical expenses.

About 32 million workdays and \$8.6 billion in wages are lost annually as a result of heart-related diseases.

According to the American Heart Association, the cost of recruiting replacements for executives disabled or killed by heart disease is about \$700 million a year.

The negative effects of excess stress on the performances of student personnel administrators are often manifested by emotional responses related to fear, anger, and anxiety; a change in attitude toward other people and work, stress induced physical problems, and a sense of isolation (Jardin, 1980).

In another research study that relates to "stress and performance," Friend (1982) indicated that high levels of stress-related states such as anxiety/arousal activation, and even high motivation itself, impair performance. In this study, subjective workload, time urgency, and other stress/motivation variables were measured. Management personnel were given demanding problem-solving examination at the end of a two-week management training period. When comparing measures of precourse ability and final exam performance, the primary findings were that the corrected performance score had strong negative linear relation with both subjective work load and time urgency. General state anxiety and task involvement did not substantially relate to performance.

Friday (1980) conducted a study to determine if a different level of stress was experienced by black and white administrators in a state university system. Job related psychosocial stress was investigated in the organizational setting. A sample of administrators was taken from the finite population of nonacademic administrators from a system

comprised of nine universities. Eight of the nine were predominantly white in terms of faculty, staff, and student body. Three hundred administrators including 135 blacks and 165 whites comprised the sample.

The results of this study revealed that:

Black administrators as a group tend to experience more job-related stress than their white counterparts.

Black male administrators tend to experience higher degrees of job-related stress than any of the other categories; black females, white females, or white males.

Job-related stress tended to be experienced in the following order of intensity from high to low: black males, black females, white females, and white males.

The lower the level of administration the more stress the administrator tends to experience.

Female administrators tend to experience more stress than their male counterparts.

As the number of years of administrative experience increased, the degree of stress experienced decreased.

No significant differences were found for the variables of marital status, level of academic attainment, and salary level. Also, no significant interactive effects were shown between any of these variables and the variable ethnic background (Friday, 1980).

Another major type of response to stress that has a significant effect on work performance is "burnout". Pelletier (1977) stated that in many work settings, especially human services, burnout has been a growing concern in recent years. Burnout has implications for both men and women at every level of employment. The administrator/manager in higher education is no exception. Their work definitely has high

potential and occurrence rate for burnout. Sparks and Ingram (1979) indicated that the literature on burnout in the field of education has been very extensive, however, the focus has been mainly upon the public school administrator and teacher. Because of this fact, more research is being proposed that will focus on the higher education setting.

Leadership, Management and Administrative Styles

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) states that management leadership are often thought of as one and the same. However, they feel that there is an important distinction between the two concepts. These researchers maintain that leadership is a broader concept than management. They indicated that management is thought of as a special kind of leadership in which the achievement of organizational goals is prominent. They indicate further that the key difference between the two concepts, therefore lies in the word organization. Leadership occurs anytime one attempts to influence the behavior of an individual or group regardless of the reason. It may be for one's own goals or that of others, and they may or may not be congruent with organizational goals (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982).

Robinson (1984) explains that the leadership role can be seen as a result of two interacting elements: content and context. The content of leadership is made up of the attributes of a particular manager and the decision to be made. The context of leadership refers to the nature of the situation or circumstances under which leadership is exercised.

Listed below is a summary of what Robinson (1984) describes a leader to be and what a leader should do:

A leader demonstrates a mixed competence in technical, interpersonal, and conceptual skills. A leader understands technical matters without necessarily knowing how to do them. A leader understands that people do the work and must interact effectively if they are to work well. A leader conceptually understands the balance of interests between organizational subunits and the whole organization.

A leader gets organizational work done by motivating people, by getting commitment, by energizing behavior, by creating personal interest and excitement in the organization's goals. A leader is keenly aware of what decisions and events mean to other members of the organization.

A leader gives direction and coordinates efforts without dominating decisions; facilitates goal achievement by removing obstacles, getting resources, and clarifying paths to objectives. A leader shapes ideas in a preferred direction. Leaders know their own capabilities, but also their own limits.

A leader represents an organizational unit's interests in creating working relations and negotiating issues with other organizational units. The leader is a "link" in defining, projecting, and defending her/his organization's interests. While representing an organization purpose, the leader is at the same time flexible and adaptable.

A leader develops subordinates by sharing power and responsibility with them, by providing opportunities for individual development, by challenging people to go beyond their self-imposed limits and be creative.

A leader represents and clearly communicates real and symbolic values, goals, and a vision of organizational purposes. A leader does this by being active and not reactive, by seeing or creating opportunities, by taking intelligent risks, by being as concerned with ideas as with facts.

A leader sets performance standards. The leader does this by communicating clear standards and modeling good performance. An effective leader knows how to recognize good performance and reward it appropriately and acts decisively when poor performance threatens reaching goals.

According to Yukl (1981), definitions in the field of leadership and administrative style tends to vary depending upon the orientation or purpose of the author or researcher. However, Yukl states that common to the majority of writings in the field are three assumptions: (1) leadership is a group phenomenon, involving the interaction of two or more persons; (2) the leader is a group member who can be distinguished from other group members (followers or subordinates); and (3) leadership is a process whereby intentional influences is exerted by leaders over followers. Yukl (1981) cites five models as a basic framework for theories of leadership and administrative style. They are: (1) power-influence models of leadership; (2) trait models; (3) behavior models; (4) situational models; and (5) transformational models, a recent form that has aroused great interest.

Pfeffer (1981) reports that the understanding of power can enhance an individual's effectiveness as a manager. He can be used to affect interdependence of units and people, achievement of heterogeneous goals, and the relative importance of issues or resources, especially when it is present.

Katz (1974) provided an influential model within the trait approach that emphasizes three managerial skills. Technical skill refers to the professional expertise or skill the individual practices prior to becoming

a manager. This kind of skill may be considered most important at lower levels. In a university setting, it would be represented by teaching and research in an academic discipline. Human relations skills are important at every level of management. These skills are defined as interpersonal skills applied when a manager relates to superior, peers, and subordinates. Conceptual skills, suggested as innate, are most important at upper levels of management. They are shown in the ability to think strategically through coordination and intergration of the organization's diverse activities.

Fiedler's 1976 model and research suggest that leaders may be represented into those who value task success and those who value interpersonal success. He contends that the relative success of these leaders values is contingent upon a complex variable termed "situational control," this is defined as the extent to which a situation provides the leader with influence over a subordinate's performance. Although this model has been subjected to many empirical tests, the results remain inconclusive. From the managerial point of view, the model is very complex.

Bass (1985) describes leadership traits and characteristics labeled transformational as emerging in response to a need for radical changes in the values of individuals and organizations. He states that the transformational leader motivates behavior beyond that expected, raises the consciousness level of followers to transcend self-interest, set high standards, and encourages autonomy and self-development. These goals are accomplished by leaders who exhibit charisma, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation. Charisma separates leaders

from managers through infusion of loyalty, respect, enthusiasm, and a unique sense of determining priorities and mission.

McClelland's (1975) research on managerial motivation suggests that needs for achievement, power, and affiliation play a role in leadership effectiveness. Effective use of power requires assertiveness and self-confidence.

Ringle and Savickas (1983) developed a three-factor model conceptualizing individual and institutional "subjective time" based on a literature review and factor analysis of important experience. They suggest that academic administrative leaders who subjectively intergrate past, present, and future create an atmosphere of optimism, continuity, and accomplishment that facilitates productivity.

Lewis and Dahl (1976) conducted a study that deals predominantly with department heads rather than deans or presidents. They found that the greatest source of stress in such people is fulfillment of administrative functions - but the stress reducer is voluntarily spending more time on administration.

Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) have posed a controversial question: "Which leadership or management style or influence is the best?" They contend that answers to this question have resulted in much confusion. They simply state that there is no best leadership/management influence package for all situations. The effect of leader influence and whether it is a significant stressor are two issues requiring more careful research and analysis. Ivancevich states further that what is lacking in numerous studies and in the explanations of leadership and management

styles are guidelines concerning the linkage between leader behavior and stress. They believe that it only seems reasonable to assume that a leader's influence and how it is applied can be viewed as a stressor by individuals at different times. They also feel that few employees have never experienced stress when interacting with their leader. Of course, the reverse is also true. Leaders are stressed in many cases by employee behavior. Therefore, additional research is needed on this topic to prove that a connection exists between stress and leadership/management style.

Stress in the Profession

Schuler (1981) stated that the way to deal with responsibilities and situations that are stress-producing in nature is to deal with the stress directly and to reduce the uncertainty associated with a stressful situation or reduce its importance. He further stated that in order to become aware of stress, it is required that college administrators analyze the conditions they face for the purpose of recognizing typical sources of stressors.

Recent attempts at stress intervention in educational institutions are aimed at reducing the effects of pressure, not at eliminating the pressure itself (Kaiser and Polczynski, 1982). Student personnel administrators should be encouraged to develop professional but detached concern for students. Administrators who become emotionally involved with the needs of students often overload themselves with emotional attachment rather than professional involvement. Compartmentalization is also

recommended. Compartmentalization is the process of dividing one's life into compartments between which little passes. For example, an administrator's social life would remain purely social with no thoughts of work to interrupt it. Compartmentalization is particularly difficult for Type A administrators who tend to spend many of their leisure hours thinking about or working in institution-related matters.

Although job enrichment through selected, increased decision-making power is usually treated as a factor of motivation, it also has the added benefit of preventing anomie and alienation. Responsibility increases motivation and decreases stress as long as the responsibility remains within a comfortable level. Excess of responsibility can heighten or increase the duration of the stress response. According to Dubrin (1981), the practice of good management by administrators is the essential ingredient in any stress-reduction effort within an organization.

Fortunately, there are a variety of ways in which we can prevent or treat stressful experiences. Polonowski (1984) stated that administrators would benefit from focusing on the following methods of managing stress:

Values and life goals should be clear. Recognize your limitations and do not feel guilty if you do not reach perfection. A person should identify stressful events that can be controlled and those that cannot be controlled. Be clear about your values and do not waste energy regretting a decision once it has been made.

Do not try to change others into something you'd like them to be. The attempt to change them may be more stressful than their behavior. Accept differences in individuals

as positive experiences. However, a person should rid himself/herself of "toxic" people in his/her lives. If you must be near them physically, block them out mentally.

Control your time. Work and family will dictate how a person spends some of his/her time, but each individual must know when not enough time becomes an enemy. Set priorities for managing and organizing time without letting others or insignificant events waste ten minutes of it. People must learn to say no and not feel guilty.

Change your attitude toward a stressful event. Educators must know exactly where the stress is coming from; try to leave home out of the classroom and the classroom out of the home.

Health, diet and exercise are important in managing stress. Consider changing your eating habits, eating only those foods that make you feel and look good. Be cautious about using food, alcohol or drugs to help you manage stress. Many books and articles on stress management include methods to develop breathing exercises that decrease stress. These can be stressful in some situations and with some individuals.

Whatever methods are used for managing stress, keep in mind that they are directed toward keeping alive for a good number of years; remaining happily alive with a maximum of joy, satisfaction and self-fulfillment and with a minimum of needless pain, discomfort, dissatisfaction and self-defeat.

Summary

A list of the many stressors affecting administrators includes those perceived and real. Although the notion of stress defies precise definition, certain key points are agreed upon:

1. Stress is a response to a stimulus. The stress response involves a complete mind-body (psychophysiological interrelationship

(Selye, 1976).

2. The stress response is characterized by a potentially wide constellation of reactions which entail psycho-physiological arousal, including at one time a paradoxical depressive effect (Cooper, 1981).
3. The stimulus that elicits a stress response is called a stressor. An otherwise neutral stimulus becomes a stressor by virtue of the meaning given it by the individual. As the old adage goes, "It's not what happens to you, but it's how you react to it." Clearly the greater part of excessive stress stems from our assigning a meaning to the stimulus. Of course, there are some stimuli (sympathomimetics that are inherently capable of causing a stress response without an interruption of them on our part (for example, caffeine, noise intensities in excess of 85 decibels, excessive exercise). Even in the case of sympathomimetics, it is the individual who chooses to eat, drink or expose himself/herself to excessive noise or exertion (Tubesing, 1981).
4. Most stress can have positive characteristics as well (Singer, 1980).

Selye (1975) distinguished constructive from destructive stress.

He argues that stress arousal can be a positive, constructive force which improves the quality of one's life. He calls such positive stress "eustress" ("eu" is a Greek prefix meaning "good"), and debilitating excessive stress "distress." Thus, there is an optimal stress level for each individual.

From the point of view of the administrator, stress arises in two ways. First, they themselves as normal human beings experience pressure

as a basic part of their own jobs. If they find themselves struggling with intolerable levels of stress, then they are paying too much in terms of their own health and well being for the satisfaction they get. The quality of their lives will not be what it should. They lose, and the organization loses. Second, if the administrators experience intolerable levels of stress, then their lives will lack the quality to which they are entitled. They too will not function as effectively as they should. Because administrators have the special job of deciding and directing action, they have the opportunities to take the stress factor into account at work, and to take constructive action toward stress reduction and stress management.

CHAPTER III.

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter includes the techniques used to secure and analyze the data examined in this study. These include the instrument, the population and sampling procedures, methods of collecting data, the techniques used in their processing and analysis, and any assumptions that were made.

The Social Readjustment Rating Scale and
The Stress Survey Questionnaire

The instruments utilized in this study was the Social Readjustment Rating Scale developed by Holmes and Rahe (1967), and the Stress Survey Questionnaire developed by Davidson and Cooper (1983). Both instruments were combined to formulate the Life, Stress, and Work Questionnaire utilized in this study.

The social readjustment rating scale evolved from psychological research generated by Meyer (1962), and the works of Wolfe (1950) that generated evidence proving that "stressful" life events played an important causative role in the natural history of many human diseases. This instrument is designed to measure events that are significantly associated with life stress, emotional stress, object loss, and illness.

Social readjustment, as defined by Holmes and Rahe (1967), is the amount and duration resulting from various life events. Social readjustment measures the intensity of length of time necessary to accommodate

to a life event, regardless of the desirability of this event.

For this instrument, the subject is asked to rate a series of life events as to their relative degrees of necessary readjustment. The subject is instructed to apply all experiences in scoring when arriving at their answer (Appendix A, Part VII). Rate death of spouse, divorce, marital separation, etc. This would mean using personal experience where it applies as well as what they have learned to be the case for others. Holmes and Rahe (1967) stated that some persons accommodate to change more readily than others; some persons adjust with particular ease or difficulty to only certain events. Therefore, subjects should strive to give their opinion of the average degree of readjustment necessary for each event rather than the extreme.

The Stress Survey Questionnaire was developed by Davidson and Cooper (1983) for the purpose of obtaining informational data concerned with stress variables encountered by male and female administrators who work in an industrial organization, company or business oriented environment. In their initial study, seven self-report questionnaires listing one hundred and eighty (80) questions were distributed to each subject. The primary objective of their study was to evaluate similarities and differences between female and male managers.

The instrument is divided into several sections that include: demographic data, a stress vulnerability profile, social and personality orientation profile, work performance data, coping ability scale, management style, and several other topics. For example, Part I, Section A, of the Life, Stress, and Work Questionnaire utilized in this study,

focuses on obtaining demographic and other related information from student personnel administrators. This section permits the researcher to ascertain such information as the job title of the subject, age, sex, marital status, educational degree, salary level, type of institution that the subjects are employed, etc. Part I, Section B, of the questionnaire is designed to ascertain information on potential job, organizational, home and social sources of stress factors. For the purpose of analysis, pressure dimensions were scored on a 5-point, Likert-type scale from 1 (no pressure at all) to 5 (a great deal of pressure).

Part IV of the questionnaire ask subjects to identify coping strategies adopted for stress reduction. The coping dimensions were scored on a 5 point, Likert-type scale from 1 (Never) to 5 (Always); the question being "How often do you use the following to relax?"

Additional sections in the questionnaire adopted the same format as mentioned above, however, asking different questions regarding sources of stress.

Sources of Data

Data collected for this study were conducted in three phases: sample identification, distribution and collection of the instrument, and follow-up.

Phase 1. Sample Identification

A total of 400 college and university administrators from selected states in the midwestern region of the United States (Kansas, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Michigan, Nebraska

and West Virginia) were selected for the study. The administrators were randomly selected from the current membership rosters of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and the Mid-American Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel.

As previously mentioned in Chapter One, administrators were identified who occupied job positions at the senior (vice president, dean), middle (associate dean, director), junior (assistant dean, coordinator) management levels. For additional verification regarding job positions of administrators who were selected for the study, questions were listed on the questionnaire asking each administrator to identify the following: job title, the level of management at which their position was in the particular organizational structure of the unit, division or department in which they were employed, and to describe themselves as an entry level manager, junior manager, middle manager, or senior manager.

Phase 2. Distribution and Collection of the Instrument

Each participating administrator received a packet containing a cover letter explaining the project (Appendix A) and a copy of the research instrument and its instructions (Appendix B). A name and address list of the participants were kept to determine which member of the sample had responded to the questionnaire.

Phase 3. Follow-Up

As the materials were returned, a running count was kept on the type of administrators responding and the geographic area from which the materials came. When the level of response was low or when the

purposive design of the sample was not being achieved, administrators who had not responded were sent follow-up letters (Appendix C), again asking for their participation. Table 1 shows the distribution of usable survey instruments by geographic locations.

Field Testing the Instrument

Prior to distributing the instrument to the 400 randomly selected target groups of administrators, a pilot sample of 20 student personnel administrators from Mid-Western colleges and universities were identified to review and complete the Life, Stress, and Work Questionnaire.

Treatment of Data

The data obtained from this research were analyzed by applying several descriptive statistical techniques. Analyses of variance were applied to evaluate relationships and allow for comparison between groups and variables such as stress and age, and sex of administrators who hold positions at different levels of management.

A correlational method was used to evaluate variables such as the dependent variable of job performance and its relationship to management style.

Lastly, other statistical methods were used to explore relationships between variables by the process of data reduction by grouping variables that are moderately or highly correlated with one another.

Statement of Assumption

It was assumed that educational stressors are of major concern to student personnel administrators.

It was assumed that student personnel administrators, as members of the university community, were capable and willing to react to the questionnaire honestly after receiving a clear explanation of the purpose of the research project.

It was assumed that generic items could be written to describe the behavior underlying the day-to-day activities of the student personnel administrator and that the functions performed by the administrators would be generally similar but would vary in their importance according to type of institution and other operational variables.

CHAPTER IV.
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

In Chapter I, the hypotheses under consideration in this study were stated. Briefly, the hypotheses were that reliable group differences could be found in the types and degrees of job-related stressors experienced by student personnel administrators; and that all human beings experience stress which often is, a result of various pressures encountered at work. However, many individuals respond to stressors and stressful situations in different ways, in some cases, affecting their job performance.

The classification variables and the data on each, were obtained directly from the data summary sheet. In the case of discrete variables, such as the sex of the administrator, the data were taken directly from the responses on the stress questionnaire. In the case of continuous variables, such as age of the administrator, the total ranges were divided into seven sections.

While useful information can be obtained by analyzing responses to individual items, a more parsimonious and ultimately more meaningful procedure is to analyze associated groups of items which represent interpretable dimensions of administrators reactions to the questionnaire. Such underlying dimensions were identified by determining the strength of associations between each pair of the variables. The statistical procedure involved began with computing the analysis of variance, post

hoc multiple comparison tests, and the partial correlation coefficients on the total scores on each variable under investigation. The information presented from the ANOVA summary tables and correlation matrixes reflected directly on the acceptance or failure of acceptance for each of the four hypotheses. In order to maximize clarity, each hypothesis will be reported separately with respective conclusion. Explanations, tables, and statistical comparisons are provided to illustrate the results from each hypothesis.

Data Analysis

Hypothesis I

There is a significant difference in the types and degrees of job-related stressors experienced by senior, middle, and junior level administrators.

The One-Way ANOVA Summary in Table II illustrates that the stress scores on the Survey Instrument for Student Personnel Administrators were significantly different between pressures that are related to job stress when comparing the three levels of administrators. The F ratio of 5.0813 presents a significant value between job-related stressors across all levels of administrators. In rank order the upper level administrators recorded the highest mean score (2.6540) with middle level administrators next (2.3770) and lower level administrators lowest (2.2180) (Table III). Submitting those mean scores to both Newman-Keuls and Scheffé Post Hoc Tests (Table IV) revealed that the upper level administrators scores were significantly different than the middle and

lower level administrators scores at both 0.050 and 0.010 levels, while at the same time the middle level administrators scores were not significantly different than lower level administrators scores. In view of the above findings, it may be concluded that there is a significant difference in the types and degrees of job-related stressors experienced by senior, middle, and junior level administrators. The lower the level of administrators the more stress the administrator tends to experience.

Hypothesis II

There is a significant relationship between pressures encountered by the administrator and stress experienced at work.

A partial correlation was carried out to determine the strength of relationship between the scores for the variables "pressures encountered" and "stress experienced at work" by student personnel administrators (Table V). A positive correlation shown in the analysis, indicates a strong relationship exists between the two variables. The mean scores in Table V represent all administrators (Junior, Middle, Senior) who responded to a question concurrent with a specific variable (ex job-related stressors - are time pressures and meeting deadlines a source of extreme pressure or no pressure at all). Further analyses were carried out by controlling for other possible intervening variables (Table VI). The two variables were statistically significant at 0.001 level thus confirming that pressures encountered by administrators do contribute significantly as a predictor variable for stress among administrators.

Hypothesis III

For all levels of administrators, there is a significant relationship between management style of an administrator and job-related stressors.

Intercorrelation among selected variables for the three groups of administrators were computed (Table VII). As the variations in mean scores would suggest, the relatively low level correlation between the scores for job-related stressors and management style indicates that for this group, management style of an administrator does very little in differentiating the amount of stress experienced by the administrator. Since other factors influence job-related stressors; and knowing that as the group under study becomes increasingly homogeneous on one or both variables as illustrated in Table IX, the absolute value of the correlation coefficient tends to be smaller. In view of the above, it becomes necessary to control for the variable (institutional size - Table VIII). The correlation coefficient for variables "management style and job-related stressors" increased positively. The two variables were significant at the 0.001 level hence we conclude that management style of an administrator helps to control the amount of job-related stress an individual experiences.

Hypothesis IV

There is a significant relationship between stress encountered at work and job performance of the administrator.

A partial correlation coefficient was computed using the mean scores

for the selected variables. The analysis results in a high positive correlation between work stress and job performance of an administrator. A high positive correlation previously established in Table V, shows that stress affects job performance (positive or negative) of an administrator. The two variables were significant at the 0.001 level.

Large sample average ratings of the amount of life change caused by experiencing selected events (e.g., marriage, loss of job, change of residence, and death of spouse) were used for indexing levels of stress in this study. The results shown in Table X confirm that death of spouse was ranked as the highest stressful life event. This was followed by divorce, and death of close family member in second and third places. It is important to note that even though important characteristics of events may vary widely among individual administrators, most of the subjects favored undesirability as the characteristic of stressful life events. These findings presented the negative aspects of stress.

Various analyses involving the impact of stress on: administrators who are from different ethnic backgrounds (Tables XI and Table XII); administrators with different educational backgrounds (Tables XIII, Table XIV, and Table XV); administrators of different age groups (Table XVI and Table XVII); administrators with different marital status (Table XVIII); administrators with different salary ranges; and administrators with different years of experience, were carried out. The results of all the analyses gave rise to the following conclusions:

1. A significant level of stress was experienced by administrators between ages 35 to 45 years. This leads to the conclusion that middle-aged administrators experience more stress than other age groups.
2. No two ethnic groups of administrators were significantly different at 0.050 level but the mean scores for the blacks were slightly different from other group means. In view of the above finding, we may conclude that blacks as a group, tend to experience more job-related stress than members of other ethnic groups.
3. A Scheffé Post Hoc Test on the variables "job-related stress and level of academic attainment" confirm that administrators with associate degrees and bachelors degrees experience more stress than administrators with master's or doctorate degrees.
4. No significant differences were found for the variables marital status and salary level. The salary of an administrator does not contribute to the amount of stress the administrator experiences.
5. The lower the level of administration the more stress the administrator tends to experience. This is explained by the fact that lower level administrators have more contact with students. This responsibility for students contribute to job-related stress. The greater this responsibility, the more more likely the administrator is to have high blood pressure and elevated cholesterol levels.

6. The results from the data analysis on effect of years of work experience indicate that as the number of years of administrative experience increased, the degree of stress experienced by the administrator decreased.
7. No significant interactive effects were shown between any of these variables, age, academic attainment, marital status, salary, years of administrative experience, and the variable ethnic background.

Table I. Sample distribution by geographic location inventories returned

State	Junior	Middle	Senior	Total
Kansas	2	8	5	15
Iowa	19	14	18	51
Michigan	15	12	25	52
Ohio	11	21	31	63
Wisconsin	13	13	12	38
Indiana	7	17	16	40
Illinois	7	27	23	57
Missouri	6	4	3	13
Minnesota	3	3	9	15
Nebraska	1	4	5	10
West Virginia	0	1	3	4
Total				358

Table II. One-way analysis of variance summary table for scores on variables job-related stressors by level of administrator

Source of variation	Sum of squares	DF	Mean square	F	Signif. of F
Between groups	34.2105	2	17.1053	5.0813	0.0064
Within groups	3854.4401	1145	3.3663		
Total	3888.6507	1147			

Table III. Data on job-related stressors for all administrators

Group	Count	Mean	Deviation	Error	95% Conf. Int. for Mean
Junior	477	2.2180	1.6936	.0775	2.0657 TO 2.3704
Middle	382	2.3770	1.8512	.0947	2.1907 TO 2.5632
Senior	289	2.6540	2.0271	.1192	2.4193 TO 2.8887
	1148	2.3807	1.8413	.0543	2.2740 TO 2.4873
Fixed Effects			1.8348	.0542	2.2744 TO 2.4869
Random effects				.1250	1.8426 TO 2.9187

Table IV. Multiple range tests on mean scores for degrees of job-related stressors on all administrators

Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Tests

Mean	Group	Junior	Middle	Senior
2.2180	Junior			
2.3770	Middle			
2.6540	Senior			*

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the 0.050 level.

Scheffé Post Hoc Tests

Mean	Group	Junior	Middle	Senior
2.2180	Junior			
2.3770	Middle			
2.6540	Senior			*

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the 0.010 level.

Table V. Partial correlation on variables job-related stress

<u>Description of variables</u>						
Variables			Mean			Standard Dev.
Job-related stressors			2.2369			2.5635
Lack of support			3.0395			11.5156
Stress affecting performance			2.1875			2.5164
Level of administrator			2.9605			10.6013
Behavior of administrator			2.9755			10.1371
Management style			2.7835			9.2270
<u>Pearson product moment correlation</u>						
	Job related	Lack of support	Stress affecting performance	Level of admin.	Behavior of admin.	Management style
Job related	1.0000	.1439**	.4582**	.0513*	.0888**	.1749**
Lack of support	.1439**	1.0000	.1521**	.0198	.0369	.0238
Stress affecting person	.4582**	.1521**	1.0000	.0452	.1396**	.1992**
Level of administration	.0513*	.0198	.0452	1.0000	-.0102	-.0035
Behavior of administration	.0888**	.0369	.1396**	-.0102	1.0000	.0264
Management style	.1749**	.0238	.1992**	-.0035	.0264	1.0000
(* significant level 0.010 ** significant level 0.001)						

Table VI. Controlling for data on selected variables

Controlling for organizational position (level of administration)

	Job related	Lack of support	Stress affecting person
Job related	1.0000	.1431**	.4570**
Lack of support	.1431**	1.0000	.1513**
Stress affecting person	.4570**	.1513**	1.0000

Controlling for behavior of administrator

	Job related	Lack of support	Stress affecting person
Job related	1.0000	.1412**	.4520**
Lack of support	.1412**	1.0000	.1485**
Stress affecting person	.4520**	.1485**	1.0000

Controlling for management style

	Job related	Lack of support	Stress affecting person
Job related	1.0000	.1419**	.4388**
Lack of support	.1419**	1.0000	.1504**
Stress affecting person	.4388**	.1504**	1.0000

(** significant level 0.001)

Table VII. Partial correlation on variables for job-related stressors, lack of support, and management style by institution

<u>Description of variables</u>				
Variables	Mean	Standard deviation		
Job-related stressors	2.2094	2.4210		
Lack of support	3.0106	11.3876		
Management style	2.7449	8.1708		
Size of institution	3.2573	13.6014		

<u>First Order Partial</u>				
	Job related stressors	Lack of support	Management style	Size of institution
Job Related stressors	1.0000	.1432**	.1741**	.0047
Lack of support	.1432**	1.0000	.0247	-.0088
Management style	.1741**	-.0247	1.0000	-.0055

(** significant level 0.001)

Table VIII. Controlling for data on variable institution size

	Job related stressor	Lack of support	Management style
Job related Stressors	1.0000	.1432**	.1742**
Lack of support	.1432**	1.0000	.0246
Management style	.1742**	.0246	1.0000

(** significant level 0.001)

Table IX. One-way analysis of variance summary table for scores on management style by level of administrator

Source of variation	sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif. OF F
Between groups	11.3436	2	5.6718	1.0888	0.3370
Within groups	5969.9845	1146	5.2094		
Total	5981.3281	1148			

Data on management style for all administrators

Group	Count	Mean	Deviation	Error	95% Conf. Int for Mean
Junior	479	2.3236	1.7229	.0787	2.1689 TO 2.4783
Middle	383	2.3107	1.8320	.0936	2.1267 TO 2.4948
Senior	287	2.5470	3.3809	.1996	2.1542 TO 2.9398
	1149	2.3751	2.2826	.0673	2.2430 TO 2.5072
Fixed effects			2.2824	.0673	2.2430 TO 2.5072
Random effects				.0704	2.0720 TO 2.6782

There are no two groups significantly different at the 0.050 level. There are no two groups significantly different at the 0.010 level.

Table X. Stress rating scale

SRSQ Item Order No.	Life Event	Frequency of rank response	
1.	Death of Spouse	1	2
2.	Divorce	2	5
5.	Death of close family member	3	3
3.	Marital separation	4	4
30.	Trouble with boss	5	11
6.	Personal injury or illness	6	2
17.	Death of close friend	7	3
8.	Fired from job	8	0
7.	Marriage	9	3
10.	Retirement	10	0
9.	Marital reconciliation	11	1
12.	Pregnancy	12	4
14.	Gain of new family member	13	2
13.	Sex difficulties	14	1
11.	Change in health of family member	15	2
15.	Business readjustment	16	0
19.	Change in number of arguments with spouse	17	0
21.	Foreclosure of mortgage or loan	18	0
18.	Change to different line of work	19	10
27.	Begin or end school	20	12
20.	Mortgage over \$10,000	21	35
16.	Change in financial state	22	13
33.	Change in school	23	5
22.	Change in responsibility	24	12
23.	Son or daughter leaving home	25	1
25.	Outstanding personal achievement	26	1
28.	Change in living conditions	27	3
24.	Trouble with in-laws	28	1
32.	Change in residence	29	5
26.	Wife begins or stops work	30	2
31.	Change in work hours or conditions	31	0
36.	Change in social activities	32	1
34.	Change in recreation	33	3
37.	Mortgage or loan less than \$10,000	34	0
29.	Revision of personal habits	35	7
38.	Change in sleeping habits	36	8
40.	Change in eating habits	37	21
39.	Change in number of family get together	38	1
41.	Vacation	39	2
42.	Christmas	40	15
35.	Change in church activities	41	0
4.	Jail term	42	0
43.	Minor violations of the law	43	2

Table XI. One-way analysis of variance summary table for scores job-related stressors by ethnic background

Source of variation	sum of squares	DF	Mean square	F	Signif. of F
Between groups	36.4703	5	7.2941	2.2256	0.0494
Within groups	5499.2827	1678	3.2773		
Total	5535.7530	1683			

Table XII. Data on job-related stressors by ethnic background

Group	Count	Mean	Deviation	Error	95% Conf. Int. for Mean
Black	508	2.3661	1.7004	.0754	2.2179 TO 2.5144
Asian	355	2.6225	1.8621	.0988	2.4282 TO 2.8169
Native American	283	2.5124	1.8610	.1106	2.2946 TO 2.7301
Hispanic	275	2.6691	1.6795	.1013	2.4697 TO 2.8685
Caucasian	158	2.8228	2.0207	.1608	2.5053 TO 3.1403
Other	105	2.6667	1.9984	.1950	2.2799 TO 3.0534
	1684	2.5558	1.8136	.0442	2.4691 TO 2.6425
Fixed effects			1.8103	.0441	2.4693 TO 2.6423
Random effects				.0706	2.3743 TO 2.7373

There are no two groups significantly different at the 0.050 level.
 There are no two groups significantly different at the 0.010 level.

Table XIII. Three-way analysis of variance summary table on stress at work by level of administrator, sex, ethnic background, with highest educational degree

Source of variation	Sum of squares	DF	Mean square	F	Signif. of F
Covariates	6.418	1	6.418	2.746	0.098
Higher Ed. degree	6.418	1	6.418	2.746	0.098*
Main effects	47.565	8	5.946	2.544	0.010
Level of adm.	6.870	2	3.435	1.469	0.231
Sex	1.746	1	1.746	0.747	0.388
Ethnic background	38.949	5	7.790	3.333	0.006
2-way interactions	84.397	17	4.965	2.124	0.005
Level of adm./sex	10.391	2	5.196	2.223	0.109
Level of adm.	71.116	10	7.112	3.042	0.001*
Sex/ethnic back.	4.324	5	0.865	0.370	0.869**
3-Way interaction	14.264	10	1.426	0.610	0.806
Level of adm./sex	14.264	10	1.426	0.610	0.806**
Explained	152.644	36	4.240	1.814	0.003
Residual	1234.205	528	2.338		
Total	1386.850	564	2.459		

*not significant **significant

The 3-way interactions are not significant.
 The 2-way interactions/sex, is not significant but together, the 2-way interactions are significant.

Table XIV. One-way analysis of variance summary table for scores on job-related stressors by highest educational degree

Source of variation	sum of squares	DF	Mean square	F	Signif. of F
Between groups	173.7679	4	43.4420	14.6094	0.0000
Within groups	4623.9013	1555	2.9736		
Total	4797.6692	1559			

Data on job-related stressor by highest educational degree

Group	Count	Mean	Deviation	Error	95% Conf. Int. for mean
Assoc.	499	2.1563	1.5431	.0691	2.0206 TO 2.2920
Bach.	381	2.5459	1.7263	.0884	2.3720 TO 2.7198
Master's	265	2.7019	1.8293	.1124	2.4806 TO 2.9232
Doctorate	251	2.9841	1.8308	.1156	2.7565 TO 3.2117
Other	164	3.0671	1.8933	.1478	2.7751 TO 3.3590
	1560	2.5731	1.7543	.0444	2.4860 TO 2.6602
Fixed effects			1.7244	.0437	2.4874 TO 2.6587
Random effects				.1803	2.0725 TO 3.0737

Table XV. Multiple range tests for job-related pressures
by highest educational degree

Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Tests

Mean	Group	1	2	3	4	5
2.1563	Associate					
2.5459	Bachelor	*				
2.7019	Master's	*				
2.9841	Doctorate	*				
3.0671	Other	*	*			

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different
at the 0.050 level

Scheffé Post Hoc Tests

Mean	Group	1	2	3	4	5
2.1563	Associate					
2.5459	Bachelor					
2.7019	Master's	*				
2.9841	Doctorate	*				
3.0671	Other	*				

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different
at the 0.010 level

Table XVI. One-way analysis of variance summary table for scores on lack of support by age of administrator

Source of variation	sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif. of F
Between Groups	4335.4074	7	619.3439	5.8704	0.0000
Within Groups	237170.4791	2248	105.5029		
Total	241505.8865	2255			

Data on lack of support by age of administrators

Group	Count	Mean	Deviation	Error	95% Conf. Int. for Mean
0-25	566	0.8834	1.8740	.0788	0.7287 TO 1.0381
25-30	534	2.8596	10.0759	.4360	2.0030 TO 3.7161
30-35	349	5.2808	22.1539	1.1859	2.9484 TO 7.6132
35-40	281	3.1388	5.0205	.2995	2.5492 TO 3.7283
40-45	256	3.3125	2.4132	.1508	3.0155 TO 3.6095
45-50	156	2.8654	2.3171	.1855	2.4989 TO 3.2318
50-55	91	3.0110	2.7182	.2849	2.4449 TO 3.5771
55-over	23	2.3913	3.2855	.6851	0.9706 TO 3.8121
	2256	2.8262	10.3488	.2179	2.3990 TO 3.2535
Fixed effects			10.2715	.2163	2.4022 TO 3.2503
Random effects				.6257	1.3466 TO 4.3059

Table XVII. Multiple range tests for lack of support
by age of administrator

Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Tests

Mean	Group	0	7	1	5	6	3	4	2
0.8834	0-25								
2.3913	55-over								
2.8596	25-30	*							
2.8654	45-50								
3.0110	50-55								
3.1388	35-40	*							
3.3125	40-45	*							
5.2808	30-35	*		*			*	*	

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different
at the 0.050 level

Scheffé Post Hoc Tests

Mean	Group	0	7	1	5	6	3	4	2
0.8834	0-25								
2.3913	55-over								
2.8596	25-30								
2.8654	45-50								
3.0110	50-55								
3.1388	35-40								
3.3125	40-45								
5.2808	30-35		*						

(*) Denotes pairs of groups significantly different
at the 0.010 level

Table XVIII. One-way analysis of variance summary table scores on job-related stressors by marital status and academic attainment

Source of variation	sum of squares	DF	Mean square	F	Signif. of F
Between groups	42.2802	4	10.5701	2.7160	0.0285
Within groups	6106.1874	1569	3.8918		
Total	6148.4676	1573			

Data on job-related stressors by marital status

Group	Count	Mean	Deviation	Error	95% Conf. Int. for Mean
Assoc.	538	2.3699	2.2635	.0976	2.1782 TO 2.5616
Bach.	352	2.5028	1.7230	.0918	2.3222 TO 2.6835
Master's	286	2.7517	1.8894	.1117	2.5318 TO 2.9717
Doctorate	246	2.7642	1.8141	.1157	2.5364 TO 2.9921
Other	152	2.6382	1.7997	.1460	2.3497 TO 2.9266
	1574	2.5565	1.9771	.0498	2.4588 TO 2.6543
Fixed effects			1.9728	.0497	2.4590 TO 2.6541
Random effects				.0874	2.3138 TO 2.7993

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.010 level.
No significant interactive effects were shown between marital status and academic attainment.

Table XIX. Three-way analysis of variance summary table on stress at work by level of administrator, size of institution, and pressure encountered

Source of variation	Sum of squares	DF	Mean square	F	Signif. of F
Main effects	166.128	11	15.103	5.827	0.000
Level of admin.	13.583	2	6.792	2.620	0.073
Size of Inst.	73.422	5	14.684	5.665	0.000
Job-related	79.123	4	19.781	7.632	0.000
2-way interactions	85.220	38	2.517	0.971	0.523
Admin./Institution	25.345	10	2.535	0.978	0.461
Admin./Job stress	18.459	8	2.535	0.978	0.524
Inst./Job stress	38.044	20	1.902	0.734	0.793
3-way interaction	100.685	40	2.517	0.971	0.523
Org./Inst./Job	100.685	40	2.517	0.971	0.523
Explained	352.033	89	3.955	1.526	0.002
Residual	2070.955	799	2.592		
Total	2422.988	888	2.729		

CHAPTER V.
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

All human beings are confronted with various sources of stress (positive and negative) everyday. While reviewing the literature on the topic of stress on administrators and managers, it was indicated repeatedly that individuals are experiencing more stress on both personal and professional levels.

Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) indicate that for most employed individuals, work is far more than a mere forty-hour a week commitment. If the actual work time is forty hours, by the work-related activities such as lunch during work, breaktime, and preparation for work are added in, a minimum of ten hours a day, and more likely eleven on twelve hours are next in job related activities. This only represents the forty-hour a week job. Many people stay longer hours at the office, take work home in the evenings, and regularly return to the office on the weekend spending sixty to ninety hours a week on work related activities. That may represent as much as 70 percent of nonsleep time including weekends being devoted to job pursuits.

Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) concluded that not only do administrators and managers spend a great deal of time at work; many people find a substantial portion of their satisfaction and identity in their work. Consequently, their work and nonwork lives are intertwined and interdependent. The distinction between work-related stress and

nonwork-related stress is the, an artificial one at best. Sources of stress on the job spill over into a person's nonprofessional life affecting stressors and stress there. Lastly, as a consequence of stressors experienced during the working day, the manager/administrator may come home irritable, uncommunicative, or even abusive toward his or her spouse, thereby subjecting the marriage relationship to strain. This strain may be a source of subsequent stress that in turn negatively affects job performance and causes even more work related stress (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980).

The purpose of this study was to investigate the work environment, job position, and life events and situations that student personnel administrators consider to be stressful and could possibly have implications or might hinder their job performances; and to discover what approaches or techniques these administrators adopted to cope with stress.

Selye (1976) indicated that stress varies from person to person. Herdegen (1982) states that stress occurs when individuals believe the demands from the environment are more than they can handle. In considering this statement, this study initially set out to discover the answer to four questions:

1. Will job-related stressors vary with the level of the administrator (senior, middle, junior)?
2. Is there a relationship between pressures encountered by the administrator and stress experienced at work?
3. Is there a relationship between the management style of an administrator and job-related stressors?

4. Is there a relationship between stress encountered at work and job performance of the administrator?

The review of the literature indicates that administrators are experiencing more stress on both personal and professional levels. What is challenging for one person may seem exceptionally difficult and stressful for another. All people have experienced days of operating effectively followed by days of feeling stress and anxiety when responding to the same type of pressure. Stress occurs when individuals believe the demands from the environment are more than they can handle (Herdegen, 1982). Often it is possible to alter the experience of stress by changing the perception of the situation.

The data presented in Chapter IV represent findings from hypothesis that were tested to determine what significant differences existed between college and university student personnel administrators who occupied job positions at the senior (vice president, dean) middle (director, associate dean), and junior (assistant director, coordinator) management levels in the midwestern region of the United States. Each administrator was asked to express his/her opinion by completing the "Life, Stress, and Work Questionnaire".

Conclusions

Student personnel administrators are indeed dealing with high levels and various sources of stress. The results of the overall analyses were significant at .001 level thus leading to the conclusion that student personnel administrators are indeed with more stress. There were many

reasons that administrators were causative factors thus contributed to their high stress levels. Work overload, financial problems, time pressures and deadlines, staff shortages, taking work home, etc. Not surprising, thus, the combination of these job-related and personal pressures make stress a prevalent health problem in the field of education (Schuler, 1981).

There are significant differences in the types and the degrees of job-related stressors experienced by senior, middle, and junior level administrators.

Individuals with different jobs encounter various types of stress and different qualities of stress. As a result, administrators experience different types of strain. Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) have earlier been quoted as indicating that "responsibility for people contribute to job-related stress for managerial, technical/professional, and clerical employees. The greater this responsibility, the more likely the person is to have high blood pressure and elevated cholesterol levels." This study has confirmed the fact that there are significant differences in the types and degrees of job-related stressors experienced by different levels of administrators. The lower the level of administration the more stress the administrator tends to experience.

There is a significant relationship between pressures encountered by the administrator and stress experienced at work.

Various researchers (Woolfolk and Richardson, 1978; Albrecht, 1979; Cooper, 1981) have indicated that "the individual who assumes the job

title of administrator in an institution of higher education is often confronted with many demands from colleagues, students, and the university or college community. The individual is often required to operate his program on a reduced budget. This chain reaction results in increased gloom and stress." The positive correlation between the scores for the variables "pressures encountered and stress experienced at work," confirms that there is strong relationship between the two variables (Table IX).

There is a significant relationship between management style of an administrator and job-related stressors.

All stressors particular to the education profession are mediated by the personality of the individual administrator, which acts to filter out potential stressors or to allow them to actualize. Intercorrelation among variables were computed (Table IX). The positive correlation shows that job-related stressors are associated with the management style of individual administrators.

There is a significant relationship between stress encountered at work and job performance of the administrator.

The issue of stress on job performance has become the concern of many managers, administrators and several other individuals who are employed in different occupations. A number of research studies (Schuler, 1981; Friend, 1982; Davidson and Cooper, 1983) have shown that stress has produced significant effects (positive and negative) on individuals in all fields and professions. In fact, all humans need change-induced stimulation to increase creativity (Albrecht, 1979). A small amount

of stress can actually improve job performance (Dubrin, 1981); however, when the level of stress exceeds the "comfort zone" it becomes dysfunctional.

Average ratings of the amount of life change caused by experiencing selected life events were used to determine levels of stress among administrators. It was concluded that although important characteristics of events may vary widely among administrators, most of the subjects sampled favored undesirability as the characteristic of stressful life events.

Data collected from this study were also used to determine the extent to which the following variables were affected by stress: Age, ethnic background, marital status, salary level, and level of academic attainment. The results of the investigation revealed that no significant differences were found for the variables of marital status and academic attainment. Although the variable ethnic background was not significant, the mean scores for the blacks were slightly different from the scores for other ethnic groups: This led to the conclusion that blacks may tend to experience more job-related stress than any of the other ethnic groups. There were significant differences in the variables age and level of academic attainment. The findings indicate that middle-aged administrators experience more stress than other age groups. Furthermore, administrators with associate and bachelor's degrees experience more stress than those with master's and doctorate degrees.

Recommendations

Administrators in higher education have a very demanding and challenging job. While attempting to meet these demands and challenges, there are many stressful situations that often arise in their work environment. A study should be conducted to assess whether change alone provides an adequate representation of the salient qualities of life events and to assess if individuals differ systematically in their perceptions of qualitative features of events.

Various studies (Student, 1978; Vetter, 1976; Schuler, 1981) have shown that there are varieties of job stressors in the positions held by individuals who are administrators of public institutions, and managers of large business corporations. Furthermore, Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) stated that stress disorders cost organizations an estimated \$17 to \$25 billion each year in lost performance, absenteeism and health benefit payments. In view of the above, there is a need to conduct research that would provide more information about suitable preventive maintenance and coping mechanisms to deal effectively with stress.

Other studies (Brown et al., 1986) have also indicated that for student personnel administrators, job responsibilities and stress levels increase during specific times of the school year. A study should be conducted to determine what types and sources of stressors are encountered by various levels of administrators at different times of the semester or quarter.

Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) state that managers and administrators must proceed with proper consideration in their attempts to reduce stress.

He states "if we are not careful and proceed within proper consideration, our attempts to reduce stress may serve only to increase it." With this in mind, the student personnel administrator must develop a sound organizational approach to stress management.

Many researchers today have established a trend in medicine that involves preventive practice. The emphasis of a preventive program is to identify potential problems at an early stage, thereby, enabling the medical practitioner to treat and/or prescribe in a manner that the likelihood that the problem will become irreversible.

Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) suggest that a preventive management program or strategy should have an emphasis on keeping people healthy not just making them well. A preventive management strategy that seeks to identify and correct environmental and job problems before they become organizationally and individually pathological is a sound investment. He concludes by stating that improvement in the health and job effectiveness of employees is possible if prevention or promotion is the managerial focal point rather than a traditional reactive strategy. Dealing with a problem after it has become a problem, crisis management, is the managerial equivalent of the disease approach in medicine. Likewise, student personnel administrators in institutions of higher education must also look for new, healthier, and more productive ways of organizing and emphasizing preventive stress management and maintenance programs. When individuals are able to make early diagnosis of stressors and stress, they are becoming knowledgeable about the awareness concept of preventive maintenance. Although this is a necessary step, this is only a first

step that should encompass many other intervention strategies. There has to be action taken to eliminate or minimize stressors. Many senior level student personnel administrators have the authority and/or power to redesign job positions, alter reward systems, assist individuals in identifying career paths, clarify roles, alter organizational structures, and provide other opportunities for staff communication and growth are only a few examples of potential strategies for preventative management and maintenance programs. As the research literature on this topic indicates, these and other managerial interventions can minimize the negative effects associated with job, social and organizational stressors.

Researchers (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980) have provided empirical evidence over the last few years that there are many individually initiated approaches to stress management. The techniques that follow are all individual approaches and coping strategies that assist the individual with stress management.

While respondents from this study found several techniques and/or coping strategies useful in stress reduction (exercise, dedication, etc.), no administrator indicated using biofeedback and several other techniques to reduce stress. Biofeedback can be utilized to monitor neurophysiological functions. Numerous studies have shown that biofeedback to be successful with reducing migraine and tension headaches, regulating blood pressure, decreasing heart beat rate, etc. Another asset of biofeedback is the ability of dealing with gastrointestinal problems. It is highly recommended that student personnel administrators seek this technique and for a possible stress reduction technique. Other individual

approaches are having a stress diary and muscle monitoring. The rationale for having a stress diary is to have a record on a personal log of the events that precipitate a negative stress response in the person. These are two steps involved in the use of diary as a stress management technique: the recording phase and the analysis phase. In the recording phase the individual keeps a running recording of the events that caused stress. Whenever a situation is encountered that causes significant discomfort, tension, upset stomach, etc., a description of that event is recorded including, as specifically as possible, what it was that caused the individual to become upset and what kinds of feelings (e.g., anger, frustration, anxiety) were experienced as a result. It is recommended that events be recorded as objectively as possible, making sure to avoid evaluative or subjective statements. The length of time an individual should keep this record before entering the record phase will vary, but generally two to three weeks is a minimum.

The purpose of the analysis phase is to examine the accumulated events with the purpose of identifying common variables in the recorded incidents. For example, one may discover that a common theme in many of the stressful events in the log is that stress was precipitated when people did not respond to you the way you felt they should. This knowledge, coupled with a decision not to take responsibility for other people's reaction to you might lead to a significant reduction in the degree of stress experienced by the individual in those situations.

It is also recommended that muscle monitoring be used as a technique for stress reduction and/or identification. Individuals often become

very tense. Frequently, there are problems such as tightening of the muscles, our jaw is set, clenching our teeth and often we do not realize it. If one becomes aware of these idiosyncracies, one can usually relax our jaw and facial muscles, our neck muscles, and other parts of our body that may become tense. The most important component is to become aware.

Hopefully, as people's awareness of this problem becomes clearer, constructive methods of dealing with the problem will become incorporated in organizational and educational planning for student personnel administrators. This will be a big step in improving the quality of life for individuals who work in our profession. Isn't this what each of us wants? Yes, the key to living a quality life, full of vitality, celebration, and joy, comes from within - through our attitudes, expressions, thoughts, and the ways in which we view ourselves and the world around us.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albrecht, K. (1979). Stress and the Manager. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Alexander, F. (1950). Psychosomatic Medicine, Its Principles and Application. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc.
- Astin, A. W., Mortimer, K. P., Blake, J. H., Bowen, H. R., Gamson, L. F., Hodgkinson, H. L., and Lee, B. (1984). "Text of New Report on Excellence in Undergraduate Education." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 12, 34-49.
- Balshem, M. (1984). "Secretaries Suffer More Stress Than Their Bosses." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 12, 7-8.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). "Leadership: Good, Better, Best." Organizational Dynamics, 13, 16-40.
- Bortner, R. W. (1969). "A Short Rating Scale as a Potential Measure of Pattern A Behavior." The Journal of Chronic Diseases, 22, 41-47.
- Brown, R. D., Bond, S., Gerndt, J., Kroger, L., Krantz, B. Lukin, M., and Prentice, D. (1986). "Studying Stress among Student Services Professionals: An Interactional Approach." NASPA Journal, 23, No. 4, 2-9.
- Burke, R. J., and Deszca, E. (1982). "Career Success and Personal Failure Experience and Type A Behavior." Journal of Occupational Behavior, 3, 161-170.
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., and French, J. R. (1975). "Relationships of Cessation of Smoking with Job Stress, Personality and Social Support." Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 211-219.
- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1980). Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Cobb, S. (1974). "A Model for Life Events and their Consequences." In B. S. Dohrenwend and B. P. Dohrenwend, Eds., Stressful Life Events: Their Nature and Effects. New York: Wiley.
- Constandse, W. (1972). "Mid-40's Man: A Neglected Personnel Problem." Personnel Journal, 21, 42-60.
- Cooper, C. (1981). The Stress Check. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

- Cooper, Cary L., and Crump, John. (1978). "Prevention and Coping with Occupational Stress." Journal of Occupational Medicine, 20, 420-425.
- Cooper, C. L., and Marshall, J. (1977). Understanding Executive Stress. New York: Petrocelli.
- Cooper, C. L., and Marshall, J. (1976). "Occupational Sources of Stress: A Review of the Literature Relating to Coronary Heart Disease and Mental Ill Health." Journal of Occupational Psychology, 49, 11-28.
- Davidson, M., and Cooper, C. (1983). Stress and the Woman Manager. Oxford: Martin Robertson Co.
- De Slong, B. (1981). The Special Educator: Stress and Survival. Rockville, Maryland: Aspen.
- Dohrenwend, B. S., and Martin, J. L. (1979). "Personal Versus Situational Determination of Anticipation and Control of the Occurrence of Stressful Life Events." American Journal of Community Psychology, 7, No. 4, 167-175.
- Dubrin, A. (1981). Personnel and Human Resource Management: An Applied Behavioral Perspective. New York: D. Van Nostrand.
- Evangelauf, J. (1985). Tuition Hikes of 5 to 10 Percent Seen for Fall. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 4, 1.
- Everly, G., and Rosenfield, R. (1981). The Nature and Treatment of the Stress Response: A Practical Guide for Clinicians. New York: Plenum Press.
- Farquhar, J. (1978). The American Way of Life Need Not Be Hazardous to Your Health. New York: W. W. Norton and Co.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1976). A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Forney, D. S., Wallace-Schutzman, F., and Wiggers, T. T. (1982). "Burn-out Among Career Development Professionals Preliminary Findings and Implications." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 61, 55-59.
- Frankenhaeuser, M. (1980, October). "Do Women Cope with Stress Better Than Men?" Social Change in Sweden, 20, 30-39.
- Frankenhaeuser, M., Lundberg, U., and Forsman, L. (1980). "Note on Art Arousing Type A Persons by Depriving them of Work." Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 24, 45-7.

- French, John R. P., Jr. (1974). "Person Role Fit." In A. McLean (Ed.), Occupational Stress (pp. 73-78). Springfield, Illinois: C. C. Thomas.
- French, J. R. P., and Caplan, R. (1973). "Organizational Stress and Individual Strain." In A. J. Marrow (Ed.), The Failure of Success. New York: Amacon.
- French, R. P., and Caplan, R. D. (1970). "Psychosocial factors, in coronary heart disease." Industrial Medicine, 39, 383-397.
- French, J. R. P., and McQuade, W. (1972, January). "What Stress Can Do to You." Fortune, 5, 10-14.
- Frew, D. R. (1977). Management of Stress. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, Publishers.
- Friday, E. (1980, January). "A Comparative Analysis of Job Related Psychosocial Stress Experienced by Black and White Nonacademic Administrators in a State University System." Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, No. 07, 132-139.
- Friend, K. E. (1982). "Stress and Performance: Effects of Subjective Workload and Time Urgency." Personnel Psychology, 35, 623-632.
- Friedman, M., and Rosenman, R. (1974). Type A Behavior and Your Heart. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Goldberg, P. (1978). Executive Health: How to Recognize Health Danger Signals and Manage Stress Successfully. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Groen, J. J. (1971). "Social Change in Psychosomatic Disease." In Lennart Levi (Ed.), Society, Stress, and Disease. New York: Oxford University.
- Herdegen, L. J. (1982, February 7). "Little Daily Stress Could Be Killing You". Grand Rapids Press, p. 13B.
- Hersey, P., and Blanchard, K. (1982). Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Resource (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Hinkle, L. E. (1973). "A Study of the Precursors of Acute and Fatal Coronary Heart Disease." Public Annual Report, Cornell University Medical College. NHL1: 70-2069.
- Hodge, J., and Marker, P. (1978, December). "Assessing Teacher Stress: A Beneficial Task for the Administrator." American Secondary Education, 8, No. 4, 49-57.

Holmes, T. H., and Rahe, R. H. (1967). "The Social Readjustment Rating Scale." Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 11, 213-218.

House, J. S. (1974). "Occupational Stress and Coronary Heart Disease: A Review and Theoretical Integration." Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 15, 12-27.

Howard, J. H., Cunningham, D. A., and Rechnitzer, P. A. (1976). "Health Patterns Associated with Type A Behavior: A Managerial Population." Journal of Human Stress, 2, 24-31.

Ivancevich, J. M., and Matteson, M. T. (1980). Stress and Work: A Managerial Perspective. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Ivancevich, J. M., and Matteson, M. T. (1982). Managing Job Stress and Health. New York: The Free Press, Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Jardin, T. (1980). Staff Burn-out. What Causes It and What Can One Do About It? Unpublished paper. Reserve Library, University of Texas at Austin.

Jenkins, R. L. (1971). "Psychologic and Social Precursors of Coronary Disease." New England Journal of Medicine, 284, 244-255.

Kahn, R. (1974). "Conflict, Ambiguity, and Overwork: Three Elements in Job Stress." In A. McLean Thomas (Ed.), Occupational Stress. Springfield, Illinois: Charles Thomas.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., and Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. New York: Wiley.

Kaiser, J., and Polczynski, J. (1982, January). "Education Stress: Sources, Reactions, Preventions." Peabody Journal of Education, 59, 2.

Katz, R. (1974). "Skills of an Effective Administration." Harvard Business Review, 52, 90-102.

Koff, R., Loffey, J., Olsen, G., and Cichon, D. (1980). "Stress and the School Administrator." Administrators Notebook, 28, No. 9, 63-66.

Lachman, L. (1972). Psychosomatic Disorders: A Behavioral Interpretation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Lazarus, R. (1971). Society, Stress, and Disease. Vol. 1. London: Oxford University Press.

- Levinson, H. (1973). "Problems That Worry Our Executives." In A. Morrow (Ed.), The Failure of Success. New York: Amacon.
- Lewis, D. R., and Dahl, F. (1976). "Time Management in Higher Education Administration: A Case Study." Higher Education, 5, 49-66.
- Manera, E., and Wright, R. (1981, October). "Can You Identify Your Source of Stress?" The Clearing House, 55, No. 2, 53-58.
- Margolis, B., Kroes, W., and Quinn, R. (1974). "Job Stress: An Unlisted Occupational Hazard." Journal of Occupational Medicine, 16, 659-661.
- Marshall, J. R. (1975). "Comment on Pearlin and Schooler." Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 20, 200-201.
- Marstonana, S. V., and Kuhns, E. (1975). Managing Academic Change. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Mayhew, Lewis B. (1979). Surviving the Eighties Strategies and Procedures for Solving Fiscal and Enrollment Problems. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc.
- McClelland, D. C. (1975). Power: The Inner Experience. New York: Irvington.
- McLean, A. (1974). An Occupational Stress. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Shuman.
- Mechanic, D. (1962). Student Under Stress. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Meyer, R. J. (1962). Streptococcal Infections in Families. Pediatrics, 29, 539-549.
- Mueller, D. P., Edwards, D. W., and Yarvis, R. M. (1977). "Stressful Life Events and Psychiatric Symptomatology: Change or Undesirability?" Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 18, 307-317.
- Orphen, C. (1982). "Type A Personality as a Moderator of the Effects of Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity, and Role Overload on Individual Strain." Journal of Human Stress, 8, No. 2, 8-14.
- Pelletier, K. R. (1977). Mind as Healer, Mind as Slayer. New York: Delacoarte.
- Peter, L. J. (1977). Peter's Quotations: Ideas for our Time. New York: Morrow.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). Power in Organizations. Mansfield, Mass.: Pitman.

- Polonowski, Mary, C. (1984). "Stress Among Selected Educators In Michigan." Education Specialist Thesis. Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, MI.
- Raudsepp, E. (1987). "Overcoming Job Related Stress." Supervision, 49, 3-7.
- Ringle, P. M., and Savickas, M. L. (1983). "Administrative Leadership: Planning and Time Perspective." Journal of Higher Education, 54, No. 6, 649-661.
- Robinson, R. D. (1984). Internationalization of Business: An Introduction. Hinsdale, IL: Dryden Press.
- Rosenman, R., Friedman, M., Straus, R., Wrum, M., Jenkins, C., and Messenger, H. (1964). "Coronary Heart Disease in the Western Collaborative Group Study: A Follow-up Experience of Two Years." Journal of American Medical Association, 195, 130-136.
- Sales, S. (1969). "Organizational Role as a Risk Factor in Coronary Disease." Administrative Science Quarterly, 14, 325-336.
- Sarason, J. G., Johnson, J. H., and Siegal, J. M. (1978). "Assessing the Impact of Life Changes: Development of the Life Experience Survey." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 932-946.
- Schuler, R. S. (1981). Stress Management for College Administrators. Educational Record, 62, No. 3, 14-18.
- Selye, H. (1956). The Stress of Life. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Selye, H. (1975). Stress without Distress. New York: Signet Books.
- Selye, H. (1976). Stress in Health and Disease. Boston: Butterworth Publishers.
- Siegal, J. M., Johnson, J. H., and Sarason, J. G. (1978). "Mood States and Reporting of Life Change." Unpublished Manuscript. Reterene Library, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
- Singer, J. (1980). The Mind Play. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Sparks, D. (1979, May). "A Biased Look at Teacher Job Satisfaction." The Clearing House, 52, 447-449.
- Sparks, D., and Ingram, M. J. (1979). "Stress Prevention and Management: A Workshop Approach." The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60, 197-200.

Stanke, L. (1979, February). "The Advantages of Training People to Handle Stress." Training, 16, No. 2, 23-26.

Steinmetz, L. (1980). Managing Stress before it Manages You. Palo Alto: Bull Publishing Co.

Student, K. R. (1978). "Personnel's Newest Challenge: Helping to Cope with Greater Stress." Personnel Administrator, 23, 20-24.

Swent, B., and Gmelch, W. (1977). "Stress at the Desk and How to Cope Creatively." Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, 21, No. 4, 8-11.

Tubensing, D. (1981). Kicking Your Stress Habits. Duluth: Whole Persons Association.

Tung, R., and Koch, J. (1980). "School Administrators: Sources of Stress and Ways of Coping with it." In C. Cooper and J. Marshall (Eds.), White Collar and Professional Stress. London: John Wiley and Sons.

Vanderpool, M. (1981, March). "School Administrators Under Stress." Principal, 21, 39-41.

Vetter, E. (1976, November). "Coping With Demands: Role Pressure and the School Principal." NASPA Bulletin, 34, 11-23.

Weiman, C. G. (1977). "A Study of Occupational Stressors and the Incidence of Disease Risks." Journal of Occupational Medicine, 19, 119-22.

Wilcox, B. L. (1981). "Social Support, Life Stress, and Psychological Adjustment: A Test of the Buffering Hypothesis." American Journal of Community Psychology, 9, No. 4, 371-384.

Wolfe, H. G. (1950). "Life Stress and Bodily Disease--A Formation." In H. G. Wolfe, S. G., Wolfe, Jr., and C. C. Hare (Eds.), Life Stress and Bodily Disease. Baltimore: The Williams and Wilkins, Co.

Woolfolk, R., and Richardson, F. (1978). Stress, Sanity and Survival. New York: Monarch Press.

Yukl, A. (1981). Leadership in Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

**APPENDIX A:
LIFE, STRESS, AND WORK**

Part I, Section A

Please circle the most appropriate response unless otherwise instructed.

1. What is your job title?
2. At what type of institution are you employed?

Public	1
Private	2
2-Year	
4-Year	4
Proprietary	5
Other	6
3. What is the size of your institution?

under 1,000	1
1,000-4,999	2
5,000-9,000	3
10,000-19,999	4
20,000-30000	5
30,000 +	6
4. What is the title of the division, department or unit in which you work?
5. Are you the first person to hold this job title?

Yes	1
No	2
6. Are you the first person of your sex to hold this title?

Yes	1
No	2
7. At what level of management does your position fit within the organizational structure of the unit, division, or department in which you work?

Entry level management	1
Middle level management	2
Upper level management	3
8. Would you describe yourself as a:

Entry level manager	1
Junior manager	2
Middle manager	3
Senior manager	4

9. What is your age?

under 25	0
25 - 30	1
30 - 35	2
35 - 40	3
40 - 45	4
45 - 50	5
50 - 55	6
55 and over	7

10. What is your sex?

Female	1
Male	2

11. What is your racial/ethnic background?

Black/Afro American	1
Asian American or Pacific Islander	2
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3
Hispanic or Spanish origin	4
White/Caucasian, not of Hispanic origin	5
Other	6

12. Number of children:

None	1
One	2
Two	3
Three	4
Four or more	5

13. What is the highest educational degree, if any, you have attained?

Associate degree (2-year)	1
Bachelor's degree	2
Master's degree	3
Doctorate degree (i.e. Ph.D., Ed.D.)	4
Other (please specify)	5

14. How many years have you been an employee for the college/university you currently work for?.....

15. What is your annual salary?

10,000 or under	1
10,001 to 20,000	2
20,001 to 30,000	3
30,001 to 40,000	4
40,001 to 50,000	5
50,001 to 60,000	6
60,001 to 70,000	7
70,001 to 80,000	8
80,001 and over	9

16. How many people do you supervise (i.e., How many people in total are directly and indirectly under your supervision)?.....

17. Are your colleagues/peers at work:

All female	1
Both male and female	2
All male	3
Have no colleagues	4

18. Does your institution constitute:

Predominantly women at all levels of the hierarchy	1
About 50% women and 50% men at all levels of hierarchy	2
Predominantly women, with predominantly men in senior management	3
About 50% women and 50% men, with predominantly women in senior management	4
About 50% women and 50% men, with predominantly men in senior management	5
Predominantly men at all levels of the hierarchy	6

Part I, Section B

Could you please circle the number that best reflects the degree to which the particular statement is a source of pressure at work.

When a statement/situation does not apply to you, or is not a concern or create any type of pressure, circle NA.

Again, do not spend too much time pondering, there are no right or wrong answers. You will find completion of this questionnaire easiest if you do it rapidly.

Definitions

Pressure is defined as a problem, something you find difficult to cope with, about which you feel worried or anxious.

Codes: 5 = a source of extreme pressure
 4 = a source of high pressure
 3 = a source of moderate pressure
 2 = a slight pressure
 1 = no pressure at all
 NA = not applicable

Example: If work overload is a slight pressure for you, you would circle 2.

1. Work overload	1	2	3	4	5	NA
2. Work underload	1	2	3	4	5	NA
3. Time pressure and deadlines	1	2	3	4	5	NA
4. Promoted beyond my competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
5. Employed beneath my competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
6. Rate of pay	1	2	3	4	5	NA
7. The amount of travel required by my work	1	2	3	4	5	NA
8. Taking my work home	1	2	3	4	5	NA
9. Managing/supervising people	1	2	3	4	5	NA
10. Office politics	1	2	3	4	5	NA
11. My beliefs conflicting with those of the company/organization	1	2	3	4	5	NA
12. Clarity of my job role/duties	1	2	3	4	5	NA
13. Inadequate supervision	1	2	3	4	5	NA
14. Lack of support from superiors	1	2	3	4	5	NA
15. Staff shortages and staff turnover rates	1	2	3	4	5	NA
16. Disciplining subordinates	1	2	3	4	5	NA
17. Inadequate feedback on my work	1	2	3	4	5	NA
18. Inability to delegate	1	2	3	4	5	NA

19. Poor work environment	1	2	3	4	5	NA
20. Inadequate resources and finances	1	2	3	4	5	NA
21. Sex discrimination	1	2	3	4	5	NA
22. Inadequate job and training experience compared to colleagues of the opposite sex	1	2	3	4	5	NA
23. Attending meetings	1	2	3	4	5	NA
24. Long working hours	1	2	3	4	5	NA
25. Equipment failures	1	2	3	4	5	NA
26. Too much responsibility	1	2	3	4	5	NA
27. Administration and paperwork	1	2	3	4	5	NA
28. Sexual harassment of a verbal or physical nature	1	2	3	4	5	NA
29. Feeling isolated	1	2	3	4	5	NA
30. Feeling undervalued	1	2	3	4	5	NA
31. Working relationships with male/ female superiors/colleagues/peers	1	2	3	4	5	NA
32. Members of the opposite sex seem uncomfortable working with me because of my sex	1	2	3	4	5	NA
33. I feel my sex is a disadvantage when it comes to job promotion/ career progress	1	2	3	4	5	NA
34. Feeling I have to perform better at my job than colleagues of the opposite sex	1	2	3	4	5	NA
35. My spouse/partner's attitude towards my career	1	2	3	4	5	NA
36. Demands of work on my relationship with my spouse/children	1	2	3	4	5	NA
37. Earning more than my spouse/partner	1	2	3	4	5	NA
38. Dependants (other than children) living at home	1	2	3	4	5	NA
39. My career related dilemma concerning whether to start a family	1	2	3	4	5	NA
40. Lack of emotional/domestic support at home	1	2	3	4	5	NA
41. Demands of work on my private/social life	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Other (please state).....						

Part III

Listed below are a list of items that are the result of pressures and illnesses encountered by many individuals, subsequently affecting them in their work environment and their daily lives. Please circle the number which best reflects how often you have had any of these experiences within the past one year.

Codes:

Never	1
Rarely	2
Sometimes	3
Often	4
Always	5

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Do you ever have any trouble getting to sleep or staying asleep? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Have you ever been bothered by nervous, feeling fidgeting or tense? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Are you ever troubled by headaches or pains in the head? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Are there any times when you just don't feel like eating? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Are there times when you get tired very easily? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. How often are you bothered by having an upset stomach? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Do you find it difficult to get up in the morning? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Does ill-health ever affect the amount of work you do? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Are you ever bothered by shortness of breath when you are not exercising or working hard? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. Do you ever have spells of dizziness? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Do your muscles ever tremble enough to bother you (e.g. hands tremble, eyes twitch)? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Do you ever feel mentally exhausted and have difficulty in concentrating or thinking clearly? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Have there ever been times when you couldn't take care of things because you just couldn't get going? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Do you ever just want to be left alone? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. Do you feel you are bothered by all sorts of pains and ailments in different parts of your body? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. Do you have any particular physical or health problem? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Part IV

Q I. How often do you use the following measures to relax?

Codes:

Never	1
Rarely	2
Sometimes	3
Often	4
Always	5

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Take aspirin | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Use tranquilizers or other medication | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Drink coffee, Coke or eat frequently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Smoke | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Have an alcoholic drink | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Use relaxation techniques (medication, yoga) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Use informal relaxation techniques (i.e. take time out for deep breathing, imagining pleasant scenes) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Exercise | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Leave your work area and go somewhere (time out, sick days, lunch away from organization, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. Use humor | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Other (specify)..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Q II. Over the past year, which of the following best describes your typical drinking habits?

An occasional drink	1
Several drinks a week, but not every day	2
Regularly, 1 or 2 drinks a day	3
Regularly, 3-6 drinks a day	4
Regularly more than 6 drinks a day	5

Q III. Re: cigarette smoking. Which of the following statements is most nearly true for you?

I have never smoked regularly	1
I have given up smoking	2
I am currently smoking	3

Q IV. If you are currently smoking, please circle the number which constitutes your average daily consumption of cigarettes:

0 - 5 a day	1
5 - 10 a day	2
10 - 15 a day	3
15 - 20 a day	4
20 - 30 a day	5
30 - 40 a day	6
40 plus a day	7

Part V, Section C

The type of administrative or management style/philosophy which an individual adopts is significantly related to that individual's personality. The terms listed below reflect whether one is exhibiting Type A or Type B behavior in his particular management style. Please circle the number which reflects how often you adopt the following management/supervisory styles at work?

Codes:

Never	1
Rarely	2
Sometimes	3
Often	4
Always	5

1. Flexible	1	2	3	4	5
2. Efficient	1	2	3	4	5
3. Directive	1	2	3	4	5
4. Authoritative	1	2	3	4	5
5. Positive	1	2	3	4	5
6. Sensitive, sympathetic, calm	1	2	3	4	5
7. Consultative, e.g. joint problem solving	1	2	3	4	5
8. Cooperative	1	2	3	4	5
9. Assertive, aggressive	1	2	3	4	5
10. Dogmatic, explosive	1	2	3	4	5

Part VI, Section C

Stress at work can significantly affect job performance. Listed below are the results of what many individuals report to be factors associated with on-the-job stress. Ultimately, these factors affect the way in which job responsibilities are approached and the job performance of the individual.

Would you please circle the number under the response that best represents how often you experience the following at work?

Codes:

- Never 1
- Rarely 2
- Sometimes 3
- Often 4
- Always 5

- 1. Able to use my skills and knowledge 1 2 3 4 5
- 2. Able to make decisions 1 2 3 4 5
- 3. Able to meet deadlines 1 2 3 4 5
- 4. Able to produce a satisfactory quality of work 1 2 3 4 5
- 5. Able to manage/supervise people satisfactorily 1 2 3 4 5
- 6. Lack confidence in putting forward any point of view (e.g. at meetings) 1 2 3 4 5
- 7. Able to do my best 1 2 3 4 5
- 8. Able to plan and organize work 1 2 3 4 5
- 9. Able to 'sell myself' in competitive situations 1 2 3 4 5
- 10. Able to cope well in conflict situations 1 2 3 4 5
- 11. Reacting too emotionally when faced with problems 1 2 3 4 5
- 12. Making mistakes 1 2 3 4 5
- 13. Lack of self-confidence in the ability to do my job 1 2 3 4 5

List any additional factors that might have negatively affected the way in which you perform your job responsibilities.

Part VII. Would you please circle the one number which you feel most closely represents your own behavior?

The phrases at the end of each scale represent the two end points of what that particular scale. The 0 represents midpoint of the scale.

- Never late 5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5 casual about appointments
- Always rushed 5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Never feels rushed (even under pressure)
- Can wait patiently 5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Impatient while waiting
- Goes all out 5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Casual
- Takes things one at a time 5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Tries to do many things at once
- Emphatic in speech (may pound desk) 5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Slow, deliberate talker

Wants good job recognized by others	5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5	Cares about satisfying him/ herself no matter what others think
Fast (eating, working, etc.)	5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5	Slow doing things
Hides feelings	5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5	Expresses feelings
Many outside interests	5 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4 5	Few interests outside work

Life Events - Stress Rating Scale

The items listed below are events that individuals often experience during the course of a year, month, or day. Please indicate in rank order the events that you have most recently experienced. Use the column to the right of each event to indicate the event.

Item No.	Life Events	Rank
1.	Death of Spouse
2.	Divorced
3.	Marital separation
4.	Jail term
5.	Death of close family member
6.	Personal injury or illness
7.	Marriage
8.	Fired from job
9.	Marital reconciliation
10.	Retirement
11.	Change in health of family member
12.	Pregnancy
13.	Sex difficulties
14.	Gain of new family member
15.	Business readjustment
16.	Change in financial state
17.	Death of close friend
18.	Change to different line of work
19.	Change in number of arguments with spouse
20.	Mortgage over \$10,000
21.	Foreclosure of mortgage or loan
22.	Change in responsibility
23.	Son or daughter leaving home
24.	Trouble with in-laws
25.	Outstanding personal achievement
26.	Wife begins or stops work
27.	Begin or end school
28.	Change in living conditions
29.	Revision of personal habits

- | | | |
|-----|---|------|
| 30 | Trouble with boss | |
| 31. | Change in work hours or conditions | |
| 32. | Change in residence | |
| 33. | Change in school | |
| 34. | Change in recreation | |
| 35. | Change in church activities | |
| 36. | Change in social activities | |
| 37. | Mortgage or loan less than \$10,000 | |
| 38. | Change in sleeping habits | |
| 39. | Change in number of family get-together | |
| 40. | Change in eating habits | |
| 41. | Vacation | |
| 42. | Christmas | |
| 43. | Minor violations of the law | |

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please write below any other comments you may wish to add, e.g., experiences/techniques you have personally found useful in coping with the problems and stressors associated with being in administration/management at an institution of higher education.

APPENDIX B:

COVER LETTERS AND INSTRUCTIONS

Dear Administrator:

As a component of my doctoral dissertation, I am conducting a study concerning the relationship between various stress factors and the job performance on student personnel administrators employed by institutions of higher education. We would greatly appreciate it if you would volunteer 25-30 minutes of your valuable time to participate in this study.

Administrators in higher education have a very demanding and challenging job. While attempting to meet these demands and challenges, there are many stressful situations that often arise in your work environment. From this study, we hope to learn more about your work environment, job position, and events or situations that you consider to be stressful and could possibly have implications or might hinder your job performance. We would also like to know what approaches or techniques you use to cope with stress and whether stress on the job or other stressful life events have affected your health in any way.

Currently, there has been no other research done of this nature which examines the interaction of the factors cited above. With this in mind, there certainly appears to be a compelling need to conduct a research study on this topic.

We are sincerely grateful to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and the Mid-America Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel (MAEOPP) for their participation in this study. Results of this study will be available to you upon request. Again, thank you for your cooperation and time.

Sincerely,

Bruce D. LaVant, Researcher
Doctoral Candidate

Dr. Daniel C. Robinson
Asst. to the Vice President
for Student Affairs and
Assoc. Professor Professional
Studies in Education

Dr. Larry Ebbers, Chair
Dept. of Prof. Studies in Education

APPENDIX C:

FOLLOW -UP

The attached questionnaire is being used for research purposes only. When analyzing the data from the results of this study, your name will remain strictly confidential.

This questionnaire will take between 25-30 minutes to complete. There are no right or wrong answers. It would be greatly appreciated if you could return this questionnaire by March 4, 1986.

Obtaining these data from you is crucial for the completion of this study.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Bruce D. LaVant