Asian Journal of Managerial Science
ISSN: 2249-6300 (P) Vol.10 No.2, 2021, pp.27-33

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51983/ajms-2021.10.2.2914

Factor Analysis of Occupational Stressors among Academicians from Autonomous Colleges in Madhya Pradesh, India

Alka Shrivastava
Assistant Professor, IBS, ICFAI University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India
E-mail: alkams28@gmail.com
(Received 4 August 2021; Revised 25 September 2021; Accepted 2 November 2021; Available online 8 November 2021)

Abstract **- Occupational stress or work stress is one of the major factors affecting employees at the workplace. It is evident from the available literature that occupational stress is present among the faculties of the higher education. It is increasing due to intense competitive pressure and new challenges in the academic environment. The objective of this paper is to identify the main factors or stressors of occupational stress among the academic faculty of higher educational institutions in India. This study was done on a sample of 400 faculty members, which was drawn randomly from different autonomous colleges of Madhya Pradesh. Exploratory factor analysis was applied for determining the stressors. The stress level was measured, and t-test was performed for data analysis. The study has confirmed five factors namely, Work-Related Stressors; Personal and professional development Stressors; Techno Stressors; Colleagues and Students Interaction Stressors and Organizational Climate Stressors. The results also revealed that major causes of occupational stress. The significant differences in stress level between Male and Female faculties and between Government and Private College faculties are also reported.**
Keywords: **Occupational Stress, Stressors, Stress Factors, Stress Level**

I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of work stress is very common in present-day world. A significant level of work stress is an integral part and largely unavoidable component of the work environment. The work transformation in higher education institutions over the last two decades has resulted in significant changes in work environment and therefore increased pressure on staff. As a result, occupational stress has become a popular subject of research studies among academicians throughout the world.

Occupational stress adversely affects individuals' psychological and physical health, as well as organizations' effectiveness and productivity. According to World Health Organization (WHO), "Occupational stress is the response people may have when presented with work demands and pressures that are not matched to their knowledge and abilities and which challenge their ability to cope".

Stress has become a major challenge among teachers due to quick changes in the education system during 1980-1990 (Ravichandran and Rajendran, 2007). In their paper, Adnan and Husam (2011) reported that University faculty experienced higher than normal levels of stress and these high levels of stress have increased over the last 6 years. According to Colangelo (2004), faculty stress is defined as an unpleasant feeling that teachers experience because of their work.

The present study focuses on identifying occupational stressors among the faculty members of higher educational institutes in Madhya Pradesh, India. The different government and private autonomous colleges have been taken for the study assuming that the faculty of autonomous colleges in Madhya Pradesh experiences more stress than non-autonomous colleges. Exploratory factor analysishas been used for determining the factors affecting the occupational stress of faculty members.

A. Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the present study are

1. To explore and group the key factors causing occupational stress among faculty members.
2. To identify the level of occupational stress introduced by various factors.
3. To identify the level of occupational stress experienced by the faculty members.
4. To find the differences in the level of stress concerning the age and type of college.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Leung *et al.,* (2000) identified the six factors of faculty stress: recognition, perceived organizational practices, factors intrinsic to teaching, financial inadequacy, home/work interface, and new challenges. The factor analysis has been applied among 106 university teachers in Hong Kong. Step-wise multiple regression technique was applied and identified that recognition, perceived organizational practices, and financial inadequacy were best predictors of job satisfaction, whereas perceived organizational practices and home/work interface were the best predictors of psychological distress.

In their study, Abbas *et al.,* (2012) investigated the various role stressors to occupational stress and job burnout on 80 faculty members in a public sector university of Pakistan.

The dimensions of the stress scale were identified by the factor analysis. Results revealed that role ambiguity is having the biggest impact on the organizational role stress and job burnout among the faculty members.

Rajarajeswari (2013) conducted a study amongst the college teachers in Madurai District. The research sample size was 208 and a structured questionnaire was used as an instrument for the study. Factor analysis, t-test, and Percentage analysis have been used as statistical techniques for data analysis. The work stressors in each factor, its respective factor loadings, its reliability co-efficient, and percent of variation have been calculated. The factor analysis revealed four important work stress factors namely students' behaviour, question paper setting, office work, and placements.

Areekkuzhiyil (2014) investigated the various factors that influence the organizational stress of teachers working in the higher education sector in the state of Kerala. The data was collected from 200 teachers working in the higher education sector. Exploratory factor analysis was applied for dimension reduction. The result revealed nine factors, which significantly influence organizational stress. These are: Interpersonal relationship in the organization; professional and competence development; recognition in the organization; work environment; autonomy in work; work-family interaction; role conflict; job security and remuneration; and non-academic works.

Soujanya and Devi (2015) studied the level of stress experienced by the faculty members and examined the main factors contributing the faculty stress. Factor analysis was applied for determining the factors affecting the job stress of faculty members. The sample consists of 673 faculty members from the Krishna & Guntur Districts in A.P., India. The following major factors were identified: faculty members having an insufficient reward for institutional/departmental service; attending meetings that take up too much time; and having insufficient time to keep abreast of current developments in their field.

Hassan and Jazli (2015) examined the relationship of workload, time pressure and work interruption on the level of stress among lecturers in one public university in Kelantan, Malaysia. A total of 247 (97 males and 150 females) lecturers responded the survey. Factor analysis was performed for finding the stress dimensions. Findings of the analysis revealed that the lecturers were facing a high level of stress while doing their work. Overall results identified that workload is the greatest source of stress among the university lecturers.

Meng and Wang (2018) investigated the stress level of university faculty members and the important determinants of their stress. There were 240 (109 males and 131 females) faculty members who responded from a large university in Jinzhou, Liaoning Province, China. Cronbach's alpha and varimax rotation were used to assess the reliability and validity of the scale. The results of the factor analysis confirmed that scientific research, professional development, and administrative affairs are significant influencing factors of faculty members' occupational stress.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1. Sample: The population for the present study consists of all the faculty members working in autonomous colleges from different cities of Madhya Pradesh. The sample consists of 400 respondents which comprise faculty of private and government autonomous colleges. The sample was chosen randomly from various disciplines (Science, Commerce and Humanities) and various designations.

2. Instrument: The structured questionnaire was developed by the researcher in consultation with senior professors and experts and based on the extensive literature review. A total of 27 stress factors were chosen for the study. The chosen items were converted into a questionnaire and used for data collection and analysis. The respondents were asked to rate these items on a 5 pointLikert scale ranging from 1 to 5, being highly stressful to not at all stressful.

3. Reliability of the Instrument: The Cronbach alpha test was calculated to measure the internal consistency and reliability of the instrument. The collected data has been analyzed with the help of factor analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) was used to determine the sufficiency of the sample size, and the Bartlet test of sphericity was applied to calculate the meaningfulness of the correlation matrix.

4. Factor Extraction: The extraction method used was Principal Component Analysis, followed by Varimax with Kaizer Normalization. As per the Kaiser criterion (Kaiser, 1960), only factors with eigen values greater than 1 were retained. Also, the variables (items), which clearly loaded on one factor, with loadings of greater than 0.5 were retained.

5. Scoring Procedure: The scores obtained by each faculty is calculated in terms of an index. This index is called the 'Agreeability Index' (Senthil Kumar *et al.,* 2013).The formula for calculating the Agreeability Index (A.I.) is

A.I. = Score /Maximum score X 100
The Agreeability Index of each item was used for respondents' analysis.
The A.I. is calculated as given below:
The minimum score of each item: 400
The maximum score of each item: 400X 5= 2000

A.I. = (Total Score / 2000) X 100
Similarly, the A.I. of each respondent is calculated by calculating the maximum score depending on the number of items in each factor.

6. Measuring level of Stress: Total scores of A.I. from all the respondents on each of the items were calculated. Quartile breakdown was performed on this A.I. A quartile divides data into three cut points, a lower quartile (Q1), median or second quartile (Q2), and upper quartile (Q3), to form four groups of the dataset.

Now, the stress levels have been divided into the four levels formed from the quartiles.

a. *Below Average:* The first group of values contains the smallest number up to Q1.
b. *Average:* The second group of values includes Q1 to the median (Q2).
c. *Above Average:* The third group of values is above the median (Q2) to Q3.
d. *High:* The fourth category comprises values hither than Q3.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

1. Respondents' Statistics: The respondents' demographic data is shown in table I.

TABLE I RESPONDENTS' DATA

Gender	Government Colleges	Private Colleges	Total	%
Male	137	78	215	53.75
Female	111	74	185	46.25
Total	248 (62%)	152 (38%)	400	100%

(Source Primary data)

2. The Instrument Reliability: The Cronbach alpha test was calculated to measure the internal consistency and reliability of the instrument. Cronbach alpha came as 0.901 as shown in table II, thus the instrument was considered reliable for the study.

TABLE II RELIABILITY STATISTICS

Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
.901	27

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity have been applied to assess the suitability of the respondent data for factor analysis. The results of these tests are shown in Table III. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy is 0.836indicating an excellent level of intercorrelations among the items (Kaiser, 1974). Similarly, Bartlett's test of sphericity showed that there were significantly sufficient correlations between the items to perform factor analysis, approximate $\chi 2 = 5283.581$, df=531, $p < .001$. So factor analysis is appropriate.

TABLE IIIADEQUACY TESTING

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.836
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	5283.581
	Df	351
	Sig.	.000

3. Exploratory Factor Analysis: Principal Component Analysis was the method of extraction. Varimax was the rotation method. Table IV shows the eigen values of the factors.

TABLE IV EIGENVALUES OF THE FACTORS AND TOTAL VARIANCE EXPLAINED

Component	Initial Eigen Values			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	7.752	28.710	28.710	3.935	14.574	14.574
2	2.926	10.835	39.545	3.372	12.488	27.062
3	2.184	8.089	47.634	2.926	10.838	37.900
4	1.707	6.320	53.954	2.908	10.769	48.668
5	1.314	4.866	58.821	2.741	10.152	58.821

(Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis; Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization)

4. Factor Loading: The factors along with their loadings are mentioned in table V.

TABLE V FACTOR LOADING - ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX

Sl. No.	Component	1	2	3	4	5
1	Your non- teaching assignments/ academic administration/ other duties	.699	.087	.131	-.012	.219
2	Examination related work (invigilation, conduction, evaluation etc.)	.668	.193	.024	.038	-.022
3	Working under strict deadlines to complete the work	.760	.188	.037	.074	.035
4	Extra workload/additional responsibilities due to insufficient staff in your department/ college	.641	-.166	.260	.050	.206
5	Participating in different committees and attending meetings	.741	-.018	.097	.088	.198
6	Having insufficient time to keep up-to-dateon current developments in my field	.036	.540	.385	-.016	.229
7	Unable to do timely research and publication work due to much workload and shortage of time	.395	.566	.159	.028	-.021
8	Achieving or Increasing API as per UGC norms	.182	.791	.241	-.082	.016
9	Lack of promotion/ career prospects	.002	.771	-.025	.152	.094
10	I am not getting opportunities to utilize my training, knowledge and expertise in my role	.158	.656	.124	.168	.272
11	Not happy with career growth as per my expectation	.087	.501	.037	.237	.007
12	Experiencing difficulties to work with latest technology in my work	.218	-.064	.566	.002	.557
13	The heavy use of Information technology for work activities (Office automation, online notices and email communication etc.)	.366	-.116	.558	-.134	.510
14	Inadequate technological support /tool for teaching and academic work	-.133	-.330	.593	-.434	.282
15	Unavailability / Lack of support from technical staff in using the latest technologies	.196	.057	.850	.096	.108
16	My unpleasant relations with my colleagues cause me a great deal of anxiety	.133	.391	-.020	.609	.082
17	I lack the freedom to ask for any sort of academic help from my superiors	.021	.427	-.122	.544	.036
18	Poor attendance of students and then course completion	.092	-.135	.263	.708	.229
19	Students' impolite/ indiscipline behaviour during teaching	-.018	.166	.106	.823	.001
20	The bad attitude of Students in classroom teaching	.103	.308	.115	.766	-.092
21	The evaluation of my teaching performance from the students	.085	.274	.079	.764	-.017
22	Conflict between academic responsibilities and administrative roles	.489	.028	.042	.116	.577
23	More responsibility and less authority	.026	-.057	-.128	.181	.684
24	I worry about the transfer to other college / location	.138	.117	-.066	-.309	.536
25	I am not getting proper and favourable college/location to work	-.105	.379	-.023	-.356	.504
26	Performance appraisals of your work / Peer review process/ Moderation	.005	.176	.245	.181	.688
27	Delay in administrative file processing/ leave sanction etc.	-.136	.161	-.040	.003	.641

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

1. Factor Identification: Factor analysis is used for determining the factors affecting the occupational stress of faculty members. The results show thefive factors came out from the different dimensions with Eigen values greater than 1. These factors explained 14.57, 12.48, 10.83, 10.76, and 10.15 of the total variances respectively. So, these five factors explained 58.82 % of the total variances of variables.

The items falling under each of these factors have been dealt with quite carefully. These five factors of faculty stress are shown in table VI. The names of these factors have been given as follows: Work Related Stressors; Personal and professional development Stressors; Techno Stressors; Colleagues and Students Interaction Stressors and Organizational Climate Stressor.

TABLE VI FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE STRESS DIMENSIONS

Factor	Items	Factor loading	Extracted Factor name (stressor)
1	Working under strict deadlines to complete the work	.760	Work Related Stressors
	Participating in different committees and attending meetings	.741	
	Your non- teaching assignments/ academic administration/ other duties	.699	
	Examination related work (invigilation, conduction, evaluation etc.)	.668	
	Extra workload/additional responsibilities due to insufficient staff in your department/ college	.641	
2	Having insufficient time to keep up-to-date on current developments in my field	.540	Personal and professional development Stressors
	Unable to do timely research and publication work due to much workload and shortage of time	.566	
	Achieving or Increasing API as per UGC norms	.791	
	Lack of promotion/ career prospects	.771	
	I am not getting opportunities to utilize my training, knowledge and expertise in my role	.656	
	Not happy with career growth as per my expectation	.501	
3	Experiencing difficulties to work withthe latest technology in my work	.566	Techno Stressors
	The heavy use of Information technology for work activities (Office automation, online notices and email communication etc.)	.558	
	Unavailability / Lack of support from technical staff in using latest technologies	.593	
	Inadequate technological support /tool for teaching and academic work	.850	
4	My unpleasant relations with my colleagues cause me a great deal of anxiety	.609	Colleagues and Students Interaction Stressors
	I lack the freedom to ask for any sort of academic help from my superiors	.544	
	Poor attendance of students and then course completion	.708	
	Students' impolite/ indiscipline behaviour during teaching	.823	
	The bad attitude of Students in classroom teaching	.766	
	The evaluation of my teaching performance from the students	.764	
5	Conflict between academic responsibilities and administrative roles	.577	Organizational Climate Stressors
	More responsibility and less authority	.684	
	I worry about the transfer to other college / location	.536	
	I am not getting proper and favourable college/location to work	.504	
	Performance appraisals of your work / Peer review process/ Moderation	.688	
	Delay in administrative file processing/ leave sanction etc.	.641	

Factor 1: Work Related Stressors: This factor reflects the faculty member's feelings of work related stress. This Factor is an important factor accounting for 14.5% of the variance. Item loadings ranged from 0.641 to .760.There are 5 items in this factor as shown in the table.

Factor 2: Personal and professional development Stressors: This aspect of stress emanates faculty member's feelings of insufficient time to keep abreast of current developments in the domain area. This factor is an important factor accounting for 12.5% of the variance. Item loadings ranged from 0.501 to .791. The six items have been included in this factor.

Factor 3: Techno Stressors: The concept related to this factor describes the stress related to heavy use of Information technology at work. This is the new type of emerging factor widely reported in recent research. This Factor is an important factor accounting for 10.8% of the variance. Item loadings ranged from 0.558 to 0.850.

Factor 4: Colleagues and Students Interaction Stressors: The items related to this factor deals with the stress due to colleagues and students' interaction in everyday work. This factor is the important factor accounting for 10.76% of the variance. Item loadings ranged from 0.544 to .823.

Factor 5: Organizational Climate Stressors: The variables under this stressor are identified as stressors due to various organizational issues in daily administrative work. This factor is the important factor accounting for 10.15% of the variance. Item loadings ranged from 0.504 to .688 consisting of six items.

2. Level of Stress Calculation: The quartile analysis was done on the A.I. of each factor. The Q1, Q2 and Q3 are calculated as shown below.

First Quartile (Q1): 41.97	Second Quartile (Q2):48.55	Third Quartile (Q3):53.32

The stress levels are calculated as described in the earlier section.

A.I. <=41.97	A.I. >41.97 &<=48.55	A.I. >48.55<=53.32	A.I.>53.32
Below Average	Average	Above Average	High

The following table VII shows the factors contributing to the levels of stress on faculty of autonomous colleges in Madhya Pradesh.

TABLE VII FACTORS AND LEVEL OF STRESS

Item No.	Factor	A.I.	Level of Stress
1	Your non- teaching assignments/ academic administration/ other duties	54.2	High
2	Examination related work (invigilation, conduction, evaluation etc.)	49.8	Above Average
3	Working under strict deadlines to complete the work	53.85	High
4	Extra workload/additional responsibilities due to insufficient staff in your department/ college	60.25	High
5	Participating in different committees and attending meetings	52.45	Above Average
6	Having insufficient time to keep up-to-date of current developments in my field	55.9	High
7	Unable to do timely research and publication work due to much workload and shortage of time	58.7	High
8	Achieving or Increasing API as per UGC norms	52.65	Above Average
9	Lack of promotion/ career prospects	52.25	Above Average
10	I am not getting opportunities to utilize my training, knowledge and expertise in my role	48.55	Average
11	Not happy with career growth as per my expectation	46.6	Average
12	Experiencing difficulties to work with latest technology in my work	45.45	Average
13	The heavy use of Information technology for work activities (Office automation, online notices and email communication etc.)	45.3	Average
14	Unavailability / Lack of support from technical staff in using latest technologies	56.25	High
15	Inadequate technological support /tool for teaching and academic work	55.7	High
16	My unpleasant relations with my colleagues cause me a great deal of anxiety	34.05	Below Average
17	I lack the freedom to ask for any sort of academic help from my superiors	34.85	Below Average
18	Poor attendance of students and then course completion	49.05	Above Average
19	Students' impolite/ indiscipline behaviour during teaching	39.75	Below Average
20	The bad attitude of Students in classroom teaching	39.15	Below Average
21	The evaluation of my teaching performance from the students	34.5	Below Average
22	Conflict between academic responsibilities and administrative roles	45.95	Average
23	More responsibility and less authority	52.8	High
24	I worry about the transfer to other college / location	47.7	Above Average
25	I am not getting proper and favourable college/location to work	36.5	High
26	Performance appraisals of your work / Peer review process/ Moderation	39.2	High
27	Delay in administrative file processing/ leave sanction etc.	44.2	Above Average

3. Difference between the Levels of Stress: The independent-sample t-test was conducted to examine the significant difference between male and female faculties. According to the results, there is no significant difference between male and female faculties in all the five factors of occupational stress as the value of t (stat) is less than the table value of t (t-critical). The results are shown in the following table VIII.

TABLE VIII SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE IN STRESS LEVEL BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE FACULTIES

Factors	t-stat	p-value	Stress level difference
Work Related Stressors	1.14	0.25	Not Significant
Personal and professional development Stressors	0.58	0.55	Not Significant
Techno Stressors	1.19	0.23	Not Significant
Colleagues and Students Interaction Stressors	0.65	0.51	Not Significant
Organizational Climate Stressors	0.16	0.87	Not Significant

According to the results as shown in table IX, there is a significant difference between government and private college faculties in three factors, i.e. Work Related Stressors, Techno Stressor and Organizational Climate Stressors of occupational stress whereas in the remaining two factors, there is no significant difference between them as the value of t (stat) is less than the table value of t (t-critical).

TABLE IX SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE IN STRESS LEVEL BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE COLLEGE FACULTIES

Factors	t-stat	p-value	Stress level difference
Work Related Stressors	2.23	0.026	Significant
Personal and professional development Stressors	0.31	0.75	Not Significant
Techno Stressors	3.82	0.00	Significant
Colleagues and Students Interaction Stressors	0.12	0.90	Not Significant
Organizational Climate Stressors	6.78	0.00	Significant

VI. CONCLUSION

It has been found that both the government and private college facultyof autonomous colleges experience work stress.Therefore, the main objective of this study was to conduct a research for identifying the factors of ooccupational stress.The factors derived from the application of factor analysis have been discussed in detail. The five major stressors have been found in this study. The study revealed that academic faculties of autonomous colleges of Madhya Pradesh are experiencing an above average level of stress. The results also revealed that major causes of faculty stress are:faculty members are having an insufficient reward for institutional/ ddepartmental services; attending meetings that take up too much time and having insufficient time to keep abreast of current developments in their field as these are having the highest values of the agreeability index. There is no significant difference between male and female faculties in their stress levels. However, there is a significant difference in Work related stressors, Techno stressors and Organizational climate stressors between the faculties of the government and private colleges. The result of this study will help administrators and decision makers to explore the stress causing factors and appropriate ways to handle them better.

VII. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND SCOPE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Like any other study, this study also has some limitations. The research is conducted only in Autonomous colleges of Madhya Pradesh. The present study analyzed only 400 responses to conclude. However, for more robustness and validity of results, future research in this direction should go for a larger sample size. Future research may include other colleges and institutions across India and may consider other relevant factors.

REFERENCES

[1] Abbas, Syed Gohar, Roger Alain, & Asadullah Muhammad Ali. (2012). Impact of organizational role stressors on faculty stress &burnout (An exploratory analysis of a public sector University of Pakistan), *4èmecolloque international (ISEOR - AOM), 5*(6), 1-18, Université Jean Moulin Lyon France.

[2] Adnan Iqbal, & Husam Kokash. (2011). Faculty perception of stress and coping strategies in a Saudi private university: An exploratory study. *International Education Studies, 4*(3), 137-149, Canadian Center of Science and Education.

[3] Areekkuzhiyil Dr. Santhosh. (2014). Factors influencing the organizational stress among teachers working in higher education sector in Kerala: An empirical analysis, *Research and Pedagogic Interventions, 2*(2).

[4] Colangelo, T. M. (2004). *Teachersstress and burnout and the role of physical activity and parent involvement.* M.A. Dissertation, Department of Psychology, Central Connecticut State University New Britain, Connecticut.

[5] Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis, *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20*, 141-151. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001316446002000116

[6] Leung, Tat-wing, Oi-ling Siu, & Spector Paul, E. (2000). Faculty stressors, job satisfaction, and psychological distress among university teachers in Hong Kong: The role of locus of control, *International Journal of Stress Management*, *7*, 121-138.

[7] Meng Qian, & Guan Wang. (2018). Research on sources of university faculty occupational stress: a Chinese case study, *Psychology Research and Behavior Management, 11*, 597-605.

[8] Rajarajeswari, S. (2013). Work stress among arts college faculty in Madurai-An empirical study, *PARIPEX - Indian Journal of Research, 3*(4), 245-247.

[9] Ravichandran, R., & Rajendran R. (2007). Perceived sources of stress among the teachers. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 33*(1), 133-136.

[10] Senthil Kumar A., Mohan S., & Velmurugan R. (2013). Causes of work stress of teachers in engineering education. *Asian Journal of Management Research, 3*(2), 406-419.

[11] Soujanya, K., & Devi Anitha, S. (2015). A study on dimensions of faculty stress: A factor analytical approach. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development, 2*(2), 104-108.

[12] WHO: World Health Organization, Retrieved from http://www.who.int/occupational_health/topics/stressatwp/en.