

379
N8H
NO. 3346

STRESS IN ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS IN PUBLIC
AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN THAILAND

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Achara Kittikorn, B.Ed., M.Ed.

Denton, Texas

May, 1991

Kittikorn, Achara, Stress in Academic Administrators in Public and Private Universities in Thailand. Doctor of Philosophy (Higher Education), May, 1991, 63 pages, 7 tables, References, 44 titles.

The purposes of this study were to measure and compare stress levels of academic administrators in public and private universities which are under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of University Affairs in Thailand. The administrators surveyed included vice rectors (vice presidents), deans, department chairpersons, and secretary officers from five public and five private universities. The four administrative stress factors studied included role-based stress, task-based stress, conflict-mediating stress, and social-confidence stress.

The University Administrative Concerns Questionnaire was used to measure stress. A t -test and analysis of variance were computed using the Statistic Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS/PC+).

Data collected revealed that (a) academic administrators in public and private universities in Thailand reported mild stress, (b) there was no significant difference in overall stress between public and private university administrators, (c) public university administrators experienced more task-based and conflict-

mediating stress than private university administrators, and
(d) there were no significant differences in the levels of
stress of vice rectors, deans, department chairpersons, and
secretary officers in public and private universities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Grateful appreciation is expressed to the following persons, whose thoughtful consideration made this study possible:

Dr. William Augustus Miller, Professor and Chair of the Department of Higher and Adult Education, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas.

Dr. Tommie Montgomery Lawhon, Professor of Elementary, Early Childhood and Reading Education, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas.

Dr. Howard Wellington Smith, Professor of Higher and Adult Education and Special Assistant, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas.

Dr. Michael Beyerlein, Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas.

Krisana Whattananarong, doctoral candidate of Vocational Education, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas.

Prasit Pongruangphant, Researcher, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Rana Pongruangphant, Assistant Professor of the Nursing College, Purapha University, Bangsaen, Thailand, and doctoral candidate at Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois.

Chitchanok Kittikorn Niparat, Southeastern Insurance Company, Bangkok, Thailand.

Pattinya Kittikorn, Songkhla Hospital, Songkhla, Thailand.

Kusol Nakhachart, Assistant Professor of the College of Education, Prince of Songkhla University, Pattani, Thailand.

Harisadee Pattharadirok, Assistant Professor of the College of Agriculture Extension and Co-Operatives, Sukhothai Thammathirat University, and doctoral candidate at Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purpose of the Study	
Hypotheses	
Need for the Study	
Delimitations of the Study	
Basic Assumptions	
Definition of Terms	
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	10
Definitions of Stress	
Effects of Stress	
Stress and Work	
Stress in the Academic Workplace	
Sources of Stress in the Academic Workplace	
Stress in Thai Universities	
3. METHODOLOGY	26
Research Design	
Instrumentation	
Samples	
Data Collection	
Data Analysis	
4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	34
Restatement of the Null Hypotheses	
Presentation and Analysis of the Data	
5. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	45
Summary	
Findings	
Conclusions	
Implications	
Recommendations	

	Page
APPENDIX	52
REFERENCES	60

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. <u>t</u> -Test Analysis for Overall Stress Scores Rated by Public and Private University Administrators	36
2. <u>t</u> -Test Analysis for Role-Based Stress Scores Rated by Public and Private University Administrators	37
3. <u>t</u> -Test Analysis for Task-Based Stress Scores Rated by Public and Private University Administrators	38
4. <u>t</u> -Test Analysis for Conflict-Mediating Stress Scores Rated by Public and Private University Administrators	39
5. <u>t</u> -Test Analysis for Social-Confidence Stress Scores Rated by Public and Private University Administrators	41
6. Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Overall Stress Scores Rated by Public and Private University Administrators	42
7. One-way Analysis of Variance for Overall Stress Scores Rated by Public and Private University Administrators Categorized by Administrative Positions	44

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Stress, a regular part of everyone's life, can be a stimulating force for those working under pressure to achieve and encourage performance. This type of positive stress is known as eustress. Stress can also produce tension, frustration, conflict, feelings of insecurity and failure, and feelings of helplessness or depression. This type of negative stress is known as distress (Saleh & Kashmeeri, 1987, p. 93). Some degree of stress is essential to individuals' growth, change, development, and performance both at work and at home.

In recent years, stress has received increasing attention as an area of concern to the workforce, including colleges and universities. The occupation of academic administration has been recognized as a highly stressful profession (Orpen & King, 1986; Rasch, Hutchison, & Tollefson, 1986; Saleh & Kashmeeri, 1987). University administrators have always faced such situations as budget management, personnel recruitment and termination, mediation of conflict with students and faculty, and increased accountability of their institutions (Rasch et al., 1986, p. 419). These situations can be sources of stress.

Educators and university administrators need to be aware that stressors can seriously reduce job performance and effectiveness. Moreover, administrators can suffer physiological symptoms such as disabling ulcers or coronary heart disease which force them to retire prematurely from active organizational life before they have had opportunities to fully actualize their potential. These and other stress related effects (e.g., tension, poor adjustment, and so forth) also affect the family, becoming potential sources of disturbance and, thus, pervading the quality of life of the individual. The mental and physical health effects of job stress are not only disruptive influences on an individual academic administrator--they are also a real cost to universities (Cooper & Marshall, 1978, p. 81).

However, university administrators can learn to cope with internal and external sources of stress by understanding stressors and by developing a plan of attack, management, and coping techniques to deal with excessive demands. The destructive consequences of administrative stress are not inevitable. They result from improper management and reactions to stressful events. This study was designed to measure and compare the stress encountered by academic administrators in public and private universities in Thailand. The findings of this inquiry provide information about which of two administrator groups

experienced the greatest amount of stress, and how sources of stress differed among the four administrative stress groups: role-based stress, task-based stress, conflict-mediating stress, and social-confidence stress.

The findings from this study of stress differences between public and private university administrators should enable chief executive officers to better evaluate the work environment in their institutions. Having a better understanding of administrative stressors that occur in the educational organization could encourage the development of specific methods to reduce particular sources of stress. In addition, the findings of this study might influence leaders in universities to consider whether stress management programs should be set up for the administrators in their institutions.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to identify stress and stress differences in academic administrators in public and private universities in Thailand.

Purposes of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to measure and compare stress between academic administrators in public and private universities in Thailand. The second purpose was to compare the self-reported stress of public university administrators and private university administrators among

the four administrative stress groups: role-based stress, task-based stress, conflict-mediating stress, and social-confidence stress. A final purpose was to compare overall stress between the two administrator groups at each administrative level: vice rectors (vice presidents), deans, department chairpersons, and secretary officers.

Hypotheses

To carry out the purposes of this study, the following hypotheses were tested:

1. There is a significant difference in stress between public university administrators and private university administrators.
2. There is a significant difference in role-based stress between public and private university administrators.
3. There is a significant difference in task-based stress between public and private university administrators.
4. There is a significant difference in conflict-mediating stress between public and private university administrators.
5. There is a significant difference in social-confidence stress between public and private university administrators.
6. There is a significant difference in overall stress between vice rectors in public and private universities.
7. There is a significant difference in overall stress between deans in public and private universities.

8. There is a significant difference in overall stress between department chairpersons in public and private universities.

9. There is a significant difference in overall stress between secretary officers in public and private universities.

Need for the Study

Stress is an integral part of the work environment and is usually multidimensional in nature. The job environment is perhaps the major cause of stress among adults. Some educational administrators estimate that 75% of the stress experienced in their lives comes from their jobs (Rasch et al., 1986, p. 422).

Higher education in Thailand has developed and expanded rapidly. There are 16 public colleges and universities and 26 private colleges and universities under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of University Affairs (International Association of Universities, 1989, pp. 1084-1095). Like their American counterparts, Thai university administrators experience pressures, both internally and externally. Noel (1987) found that "university administrators work in large, complex organizations, have time demands and deadlines, interact with a diversity of people, make decisions in the course of the day, and have families and mortgages. They are not immune to the tensions and pressures of everyday life" (p. 65).

External and internal demands upon persons are referred to as stressors. Work environments can be characterized by the type and intensity of stressors that are present (Wiggins, 1988, p. 120). The effects of stress can be deleterious. Individuals suffering from stress are prone to health problems, psychological impairment, loss of self-esteem, and a growing dissatisfaction with the job (Maslach, 1982, p. 7). Giammatteo and Giammatteo (1980) also found that "there is a relationship between stress and illness, and that in many instances, reaction to stress precipitates physical as well as emotional illness" (p. 18). Brown (1983) found that

excessive stress becomes internalized as distress, with consequences affecting the body. Ulcers are common reactions for those executives unable to cope adequately with stress. The body's chemistry is thrown out of balance, with the stomach's acidity rate rising to dangerous levels. Perforations in the stomach's linings are the end result of untreated ulcers. (p. 123)

In order to manage stress reactions and to reduce damage incurred during past stress situations, a person must be able to relax sudden tensions, to assay a situation objectively and without anxiety, to stay relaxed when appropriate, and to mentally and possibly physically disassociate from a stressor. An administrator must have a positive attitude toward handling stress situations, be capable of self-assertion in the face of external pressures, and have appropriate and selective adaptability. In short,

the administrator must be capable of facing life (Giammatteo & Giammatteo, 1980, p. 49).

The success of any effort to prevent or minimize stress and maximize job satisfaction depends upon an accurate diagnosis, for different stressors require different action. Any approach to stress reduction in an organization which relies on one particular approach (e.g., transcendental meditation or job enrichment), without taking into account the difference within work groups or divisions, is doomed to failure (Cooper & Marshall, 1978, p. 81).

In the past, there has been little attention or study of stress in academic administrators in public and private universities in Thailand. This inquiry provides important information about stress and stress differences between public and private university administrators in Thailand. The findings of this study should enable chief executive officers of both types of institutions to evaluate the work environment of their universities. Such an evaluation could lead chief executive officer to consider ways to make improvements to help their administrators reduce stress. Moreover, the results of this research can provide other academic administrators with a better understanding of administrative stress and how to reduce chances of personal harm and learn to cope. Finally, the findings should also allow administrators to estimate how functional they are within their administrative jobs.

Delimitations of the Study

During the course of this investigation, several limiting factors were encountered. These factors include the following:

1. This study was limited to academic administrators in public and private universities that were under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of University Affairs in Thailand.

2. This study was limited to the administrative positions of vice rector, dean, department chairperson, and secretary officer.

3. This study was limited to the measurement and comparison of stress differences between public and private university administrators as determined by use of the University Administrative Concerns Questionnaire.

Basic Assumptions

This study was based on the following assumptions:

1. It was assumed that stress is a condition that can be measured.

2. It was assumed that academic administrators in public and private universities in Thailand provided the most accurate perceptions of their work experiences on the self-report type survey instrument used.

3. It was assumed that data gathered from the randomly-selected subjects were normally distributed.

4. It was assumed that the University Administrative Concerns Questionnaire that was utilized for measuring the stress of the subjects was accurate and valid and that translation did not change the meanings.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, these terms were defined as follows:

Stress is defined as the body's physical, mental, and chemical reactions to all the things that surround it and impinge on it (Seldin, 1987, p. 1).

Academic administrators include vice rectors, deans, department chairpersons, and secretary officers in public and private universities.

Public university is an institution of higher education established by the government that is under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of University Affairs in Thailand.

Private university is an institution of higher education established by the private sector that is under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of University Affairs in Thailand.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Research within the workplace is a somewhat new phenomenon; behavior in work settings has been a major target of interest only since the Industrial Revolution. Between 1920 and 1940, sociologists began to show interest in job stress through the identification and solution of problems at organizational gatherings. However, these early studies of stress at work were criticized for their lack of concern with such issues as defining methods or conceptualizing stress at work or for focusing on stressors either within the individual or within the organization rather than the relationship between the two. By the end of World War II, the Institute for Social Research emerged with its conceptual model for the interrelationship between individuals and their environment and its effects on work stress and health (Melendez & Guzman, 1983, pp. 18-19).

Many studies on work stress concern definitions of stress, effects of stress, stress and work, stress in the academic workplace, sources of stress in the academic workplace, and stress in Thai universities. This literature has led to an awareness of stress in higher education.

Definitions of Stress

According to the original scientific definition of stress by Hans Selye, the father of stress research, stress is "the state manifested by a specific syndrome which consists of all the nonspecifically induced changes within a biological system" (Selye, 1965, p. 54). During its response to stress, the body changes in many ways to mobilize its defenses and guard itself against damage, according to the general adaptation syndrome. This syndrome is divided into three stages: the alarm reaction, which entails bodily changes for quick actions and is associated with emotion; the resistance stage, in which the body recovers from the initial outburst of emotions and tries to endure the situation as well as possible; and exhaustion, a stage reached if the stress is overwhelming and the individual is unable to manage and cope with the stress. Burnout occurs in the zone between resistance and the beginning of the exhaustion stage (Selye, 1978, p. 32).

In Selye's 1982 article entitled "History and Present Status of the Stress Concept," he defined stress as "a stimulus event of sufficient severity to produce disequilibrium in the homeostatic physiological systems" (p. 7). Stress also has been conceptualized variously as a non-specific response of the body to any demand that exceeds the person's ability to cope, as a person-environment relationship that threatens personal resources, and as a

mental state in response to strains. Agents or demands that evoke these patterned response are called stressors (Selye, 1982, pp. 8-14).

Job and work stress researchers offer varying definitions of stress but many are based on Selye's concept. French, Cobb, Caplan, Harrison, and Penneau (1976) defined stress in the study of job demands and worker health as

any characteristic of the job environment which poses a threat to the individual, either excessive demands or insufficient supplies to meet his/her needs. Stress also refers to a misfit between the person and his/her environment. Stressors, on the other hand, refer to the sources of stress, such as the task itself. (p.3)

Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) stated that

stress involves the interaction of the organism with the environment. The organism is human and the environment may be either physical properties (e.g., heat, noise, pollution) or the other organisms in the environment. While there are a multitude of ways in which stress may be defined, most definitions of stress fall into one of these categories: stimulus definitions, response definitions, or stimulus-response definitions. A stimulus definition of stress would be the force or stimulus acting upon the individual that results in a response of strain, where strain is pressure or, in a physical sense, deformation. The response definition is the physiological or psychological response an individual makes to an environmental stressor, where a stressor is an external event or situation which is potentially harmful. A stimulus-response definition is the consequence of the interaction between an environment stimulus and the idiosyncratic response of the individual. (pp. 6-8)

Quick and Quick (1984) defined stress as "the patterned, unconscious response to the actual event or circumstance which is called the stressor. Organizational stress is the general, patterned, unconscious mobilization

of the individual's energy when confronted with any organizational or work demand" (p. 9).

Effects of Stress

Stress is a personal experience. Each individual's specific response to stress is unique due to factors such as genetic potential, general state of health and fitness, and previous experience in dealing with stress. Everyone experiences some degree of stress virtually all the time. Some people do their best work under stress. In this sense, stress has a positive impact. Problems relating to stress are apparent when there is too much stress, or too much stress for too long a period of time. The intensity and duration of stress one can endure depends on individual capacity (Noel, 1987, p. 66). The positive impact of stress is called eustress; it is the adaptive, constructive, healthy response to a stressful situation. The negative impact of stress is called distress; it is the maladaptive, detrimental, dysfunctional response (Quick & Quick 1984, p. 9).

Stress affects both emotional and physical health on many levels. Negative stress contributes to ill health and disease, and can kill. It is estimated that one out of every four persons in the United States is suffering severe emotional stress, although they are not perceived as suffering from any diagnosable mental or other illnesses. People are dying from stress-related disorders, primarily

arteriosclerosis and associated coronary heart disease, at higher rates than at other times in recorded history. In 1980, almost 400,000 Americans died of problems related to coronary heart disease, and stress has been viewed as the major risk factor for this disease. Type A behavior, which has been accepted as a major risk factor for the coronary-prone behavior pattern, is associated with persons displaying predominantly work-oriented, hurried, isolated, impatient styles and often manifests preoccupation with deadlines (Wiggins, 1988, p. 120).

Another unique stress facing today's work force is known as the syndrome of job burnout. Job burnout is a concept applied to situations where individuals experience physical ills, become emotionally upset, or are troubled with family problems. All of these can arise from too much job pressure. Job burnout affects employers as well as employees. Burnout is a pattern of behavior which is a reaction to job stress. Other symptoms include exhaustion, both emotional and physical, and doing only enough to get by at work. Many executives experience a loss of idealism, a failure to perceive their positions or progress as exciting and challenging. Sometimes burnout victims are plagued with physical symptoms which include sleep disturbances, high blood pressure, headaches, and all types of gastrointestinal problems, such as ulcers. Even back and neck pain become legitimate physical complaints for those suffering from the

psychophysiological stresses resulting from burnout (Brown, 1983, p. 117).

Stress and Work

Many researchers believe that work and the work environment are the major sources of stress in individuals' lives today. In studies of stressful occupations, Ivancevich and Matteson (1982) found that "all occupations have people who are highly stressed, become ill, quit work, and even try to hurt themselves. They also have people who are not stressed, are happy, and enjoy life" (pp. 55-56). In their study of organizational stressors, Ivancevich and Matteson (1982) also found that

occupational stress is a contributor to ill health, poor job performance and disease. It is important to people to identify and to understand how organizational stressors work. Each organization has its own set of stressors. In organizational structure, the top level people (president or vice president) may be stressed by competition. The middle level may be stressed by requests received from the top, complaints from the next lower level, and not having qualified subordinates and enough say in decision making. The lower level people are stressed by too many policies, lack of support from the immediate boss, and not being able to participate in decisions that affect the job. And a common complaint of middle and lower level people is they have a lot of responsibility and little authority about the job. This can be associated with job dissatisfaction, low self-esteem, and high absenteeism. (pp. 64-67)

Stress in the Academic Workplace

Higher education is a relatively new focus for concern about occupational stress. For many years the quality of worklife in colleges and universities has been seen as ideal

compared to working conditions in other settings. Now higher education is experiencing pressures from several directions that may alter the assumed advantages for those employed in the academic workplace. Colleges and universities are mixed organizations, operating basically with a bureaucratic structure on the administrative side and a collegial structure on the academic side. This duality has complicated decision making in these institutions for a long time. As current environmental pressures require the allocation of resources among competing groups, these internal structural tensions are heightened. In the face of rising costs, public demands for accountability, and a tight labor market, the collegial structure of colleges and universities is fragmenting. As more decision making occurs in the bureaucratic structure, power shifts away from faculty toward the administration (Austin & Gamson, 1983, p. 1).

The nature of the work of academic administrators can be stressful. Pierce (1988) found that "the nature of the work itself is a great source of stress for the academic professional" (p. 79). Generally, the work of academic administrators is associated with responsibility. Cooper and Marshall (1977) found that "responsibility is another major source of managerial stress. This includes responsibility for people and responsibility for things (equipment, budgets, etc.). Responsibility for people

frequently means that one has to spend more time interacting with others, attending meetings, working alone, and more time in trying to meet deadline pressures and schedules (p. 87). Melendez and Guzman (1983) also found that "responsibility can be another type of stress, because it affects a person physically by increasing his or her risk of coronary attack" (p. 33).

Other studies have revealed that the nature of college and university administrators' work contributes to job-related tension that can lead to stress and strain. In their study, "University Faculty and Administrator Responses to Job Strain" at the University of Michigan, Blackburn, Horowitz, Edington, and Klos (1986) found that "faculty and administrators were experiencing a great extent of emotional (e.g., nervousness) and physical (e.g., headaches) problems within the last year" (p. 36). However, Orpen and King (1986) conducted a study, "Relationship Between Perceived Job Stress and Physical and Psychological Strain among University Administrators," among 56 administrators at five Australian universities and found that "among the university administrators role-related job stress is weakly related to experienced physical and psychological strain. It was suggested that this kind of job might attract persons who are able to cope fairly easily with job stress" (pp. 1137-1138).

Sources of Stress in the Academic Workplace

Many researchers have investigated the sources of stress or stressors in the academic workplace. McGrath hypothesized that there are six possible classes of stressors in an organizational setting. These are task-based stress, role-based stress, stress intrinsic to the behavior setting, stress arising from the physical environment, stress arising from the social environment, and stress within the person's system (McGrath, 1976, p. 1369). Tung and Koch (1980) organized administrative stressors into the following four groups: role-based stress, task-based stress, conflict-mediating stress, and boundary-spanning stress. They found that

role-based stress resulted from the lack of clarity about the scope and responsibilities of the job. Task-based stress resulted from routine activities such as talking on the telephone, attending meetings, writing letters, and preparing reports. Conflict-mediating stress resulted from trying to resolve differences between and among individuals and groups. Boundary-spanning stress resulted when an administrator worked with individuals or groups in the external environment. (pp. 68-69)

Other researchers have studied the sources of stress, grouped stressors, and measured and compared the types of stress reported by academic administrators. Rasch et al. (1986) studied the sources of stress among administrators at research universities, and categorized the following four groups of stressors: role-based stress, task-based stress, conflict-mediating stress, and social-confidence stress. Social-confidence stress relates to perception of job

qualification, speaking in front of groups, and attempting to meet social expectations. They found that

higher education administrators reported some forms of stress common to other managers in education. The constructs of role- and task-based stress appear to be generic across many types of management. These two sources of stress appear to have the greatest impact at lower levels of administration. A third factor, conflict-mediating stress, can also be found in other settings but was a fairly weak stressor. The fourth factor, social-confidence stress, was also perceived to be a weak stressor. (pp. 429-433)

Other factors and sources of stress in universities have been studied individually by a number of researchers. These include factors intrinsic to the job, one's role in the organization, interpersonal relationships, career development, and organizational structure and climate.

For factors intrinsic to the job, Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) found that

improper lighting, high noise levels, uncomfortable temperatures, poor ventilation, and offices that are too small, too crowded, or too open are examples of stressors in the work setting. Long hours, frequent interruptions, and numerous meetings can lead to job tension and dissatisfaction, lower self-esteem, embarrassment, feeling threatened, increased heart rate, high cholesterol levels, skin disorders, and smoking. (pp. 105-109)

McGrath (1976) labeled these stressors as task-based stress (p. 1351).

For role factors, Margolis, Kores, and Quinn (1974) found that role ambiguity, role conflict, and boundary spanning cause role stress. Role ambiguity exists when individuals are unsure about the scope and responsibilities of their job, about job objectives, and about colleagues'

expectations. Role ambiguity results in lower job satisfaction, greater feelings of futility, high job-related tension, and lower self-confidence (pp. 654-661). Miles (1980) found that

role conflict results when a worker is torn by conflicting job demands, by differences of opinions with superiors, by having to do things he or she really doesn't want to do, or by difficulty in handling superiors. Role conflict produces job dissatisfaction and anxiety and contributes to physiological strain. Boundary-spanning occurs when individuals cross the regional boundaries of the organization and must link two or more organizations with different goals. These individuals must maintain a delicate association with outside organizations in which they have little formal authority. (pp. 82-83)

For interpersonal factors, Cooper and Marshall (1977) found that "work relationships can be divided into the following three categories: relationships with supervisors, with subordinates, and with colleagues" (pp. 30-33). French and Caplan (1973) found that "the mistrust of work associates was positively related to high role ambiguity, psychological strain, and low job satisfaction" (pp. 36-37).

For career development factors, Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) found that "career development stressors are aspects of the individual's interaction with the organizational environment that influence the person's perception of the quality of his or her career progress" (p. 115). Erickson, Pugh, and Gunderson (1972) found that

two groups of stressors can be identified as lack of job security and status incongruity. Real or imagined obsolescence and fear of early retirement can lead to feelings of job insecurity. Status incongruity results from inadequate promotion, overpromotion, or

dissatisfaction with career aspirations and current level of attainment. (pp. 523-525)

For organizational factors, Cooper and Marshall (1977) found that

the structure and climate of an organization may make work satisfactory and supportive or stressful. Having little participation in the decision-making process, having no sense of belonging, being subjected to inappropriate office policies, and operating with ineffective communication processes can cause stress. (p. 37)

And Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) found that "higher levels of stress are reported by individuals: typically middle- and low-level managers, in hierarchical administrative structures who have little control over their jobs" (p. 131).

Stress in Thai Universities

In Thailand, universities come under two groups: government and private. Both are under government supervision, because it is deemed that the provision of education is the function of the state. The government may delegate the sharing of this responsibility to the private sector but it remains under government supervision. Both government universities and private universities are under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of University Affairs (Srisa-an, 1983, p. 86).

Most of the laws and regulations used by the Ministry of University Affairs to control private institutions were adopted from state universities; however, there is some

relaxation on the control of certain aspects such as tuition fees and administrative procedures (Ministry of University Affairs, 1989a, pp. 5-16). For internal affairs in administration, each university has a policy and governing board--the University Council. Members of the council include the Prime Minister as Chairman, the rector, deans, several department heads, a few senior government officials, and a few scholars from other institutions. The chief administrator is the rector or president, who carries out the tasks according to the policy laid down by the University Council (Ketudat, 1972, pp. 127-128).

Academic administrator, in Thai universities, is a term that includes rectors or presidents, vice rectors or vice presidents, deans, directors, committee of faculty, department chairpersons, and secretary officers. Rectors, vice rectors, deans, directors, and committee of faculty are senior administrators; department chairpersons and secretary officers are middle administrators (Ministry of University Affairs, 1989a, p. 8). All of these administrators are likely to experience the university workplace in different ways according to the nature of their work.

Vice Rectors

In Thai public and private universities, there are three to six or seven vice rectors or vice presidents who are assigned to each of the administrative or managerial areas. These are vice rectors for administration, vice

rectors for academic affairs, vice rectors for research, vice rectors for foreign affairs, vice rectors for planning and development, vice rectors for student affairs, and vice rectors for special assignments. However, in private universities, vice rectorships may be assigned to three or four of the administrative areas, because most private universities are smaller than public universities. In addition, vice rectors act as rectors in campuses in public universities which have more than one campus.

Because of the various administrative or managerial areas, the actual tasks and functions of vice rectors in Thai universities can be subdivided into several basic areas. Generally, they have responsibilities delegated by the rectors to manage all the university affairs with government and organizational rules and policies. Delegated administrative work involves controlling and monitoring budgets, physical plants, facilities, and other resources, being a university representative, proposing the annual report of university affairs to the rectors, appointing committees or persons, and other assigned activities in the administrative line (Ministry of University Affairs, 1989a, pp. 6-8). The nature of their work requires that vice rectors spend a great deal of time in work-related activities and assume high responsibility for things and for people.

Deans and Department Chairpersons

Deans and department chairpersons are caught between the differing expectations of faculty and administrators. Traditionally, deans have been faculty members appointed by the president, who were expected to stand between the top administration and the faculty (Gould, 1964; Meeth, 1971; Okun, 1981; Wisniewski, 1977). Deans usually have had no special administrative training and have held their posts for a limited period of time after which they have returned to the faculty (Moore, 1983, pp. 3-6). Their power is often restricted, since faculty members typically control curricular decisions and their own research. A dean is often described as "a mediator, a problem-solver, a consensus-former, a conciliator, but rarely as a decision-maker" (Okun, 1981, p.26). As deans acquire more control over budgets, hiring, and policy making, conflict between the faculty and deans may increase. Deans are less satisfied than chief executive officers.

While role conflict seems to be built into the dean's position, department chairs also experience role conflict. A study of seven Florida universities found role conflict among department chairs: "Department chairs experienced incompatible expectations from deans, other chairs, and faculty. They also felt the greatest conflict about such personnel decisions as promotion and salary level, which are

increasingly constrained by limited budgets" (Carroll, 1976, p. 245).

Secretary Officers

Secretary officers are required to interact with many constituencies within Thai higher education: other administrators, faculty, rectors and executive officers, university committee, and lower administrative personnel. As middle administrators, secretary officers occupy a peculiar role in the university because of their responsibilities to various groups and to the "mixed organizational structure" (Sri Nakharinwirot University, 1989. p. 27). Secretary officers work as "linking pins" between vertical and horizontal levels. As Scott (1979) stated, "These administrators implement but seldom develop policy. Their positions force them to face the conflict between service for others versus control of others and their actions. They are instruments of institutional policy set by senior administrators and trustees" (p. 20).

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains a description of the methodology for this study. Review of the research design, instrumentation, samples, data collection, and data analysis are also presented. This study was conducted during the fall semester of the 1990 academic year in Thailand.

Research Design

This survey type research study was designed to measure and compare stress differences between academic administrators in public and private universities in Thailand. Survey research seems ideally suited to this study, and a questionnaire is the best tool to obtain personal facts, opinions, and perceptions (Kerlinger, 1986, p. 386). The University Administrative Concerns Questionnaire was utilized to determine the perceptions of Thai public and private academic administrators' work experiences and to measure their levels of stress.

Instrumentation

The University Administrative Concerns Questionnaire was used to measure stress experienced by public and private university administrators. It is a 29-item scale developed

by Rasch et al. (1986) to measure stress (see Appendix). The University Administrative Concerns Questionnaire was developed from the Job-Related Strain (JRS) by Indik, Seashore, and Slesinger (1964) and from the Administrative Stress Index (ASI) by Tung and Koch (1980).

The questionnaire items were clustered or grouped into four factors by using varimax rotation (Rasch et al., 1986, p. 424) so that they could be used to compare types of administrative stress between public and private academic administrators. The four factors, or types, of administrative stress are as follows: items 1 through 11 are grouped as role-based stress, items 12 through 20 are grouped as task-based stress, items 21 through 26 are grouped as conflict-mediating, and items 27 through 29 are grouped as social-confidence.

The instrument had two parts. The first part asked participants for general information, and the second part included 29 items and used a five-point response scale. Respondents indicated their degree of concern for each item by marking 1 (never bothers me); 2 (rarely bothers me); 3 (occasionally bothers me); 4 (frequently bothers me); or 5 (usually bothers me). The University Administrative Concerns Questionnaire was tested for validity and clarity by eight central administrators, five deans, and five department chairpersons (Rasch et al., 1986, p. 423). When data collections from 139 Thai public and private academic

administrators were completed, internal consistency reliability was computed using the Statistic Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS/PC+). Chronbach's Alpha was .90.

Item 23 of the instrument was reworded to be appropriate for higher education in Thailand. "Complying with state, federal, and organizational rules and policies" was changed to "Complying with government and organizational rules and policies." The questionnaire was translated into the Thai language and was checked and verified by three Thai university administrators. The first administrator read and translated the English version of the questionnaire into the Thai language. The second administrator read and translated the Thai version of the questionnaire into English. The third read and translated the second English version of the questionnaire that was translated by the second into Thai. Then the original questionnaire was compared with the translated versions, both in Thai and in English.

Samples

Academic administrators in five public and five private universities under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of University Affairs in Thailand were the population of the study. These five public and five private universities were randomly selected from a list of public and private universities in Thailand. The public universities were Chiangmai University, Kasetsart University, Khon Kaen University, Prince of Songkhla University, and Sri

Nakharinwirot University. The private universities were Bangkok University, Dhurakijpundit University, Payap University, Siam Technics University, and University of Thai Chamber of Commerce. Administrators, which included vice rectors, deans, department chairpersons, and secretary officers, were randomly selected from a list of public and private universities. A simple random sampling procedure was used to select 100 administrators from the public universities and 100 administrators from the private universities.

Data Collection

A letter requesting permission and explaining the purpose, need, and importance of the study and questionnaire was mailed to each rector or president of the five public and five private universities. An addressed, stamped envelope was included for return of the questionnaire to research assistants in Thailand. The office of the rector or president distributed the questionnaires to randomly-selected administrators. The respondents sent their questionnaires to the research assistants in Thailand. The research assistants gathered the returned questionnaires and mailed them to the researcher.

Data Analysis

A t -test was computed to determine if there was a significant difference in the mean scores of 29 stress

questions in the second part of the questionnaire scored by the public and private university administrators. The t -test was also computed to determine if there was a significant difference in role-based stress, task-based stress, conflict-mediating stress, and social-confidence stress between public and private university administrators. A two-way analysis of variance was computed to determine if there was a significant difference in overall stress between vice rectors, deans, department chairpersons, and secretary officers in public and private universities. The findings are presented in tabular form.

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant difference in stress between public university administrators and private university administrators. This hypothesis was analyzed using a t -test statistic comparing difference between two groups. The mean score of 29 stress questions from the second part of the questionnaire scored by public university administrators was compared with the mean score of 29 stress questions from the second part of the questionnaire scored by private university administrators. There were 72 public and 67 private university administrators.

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant difference in role-based stress between public and private university administrators. This hypothesis was analyzed using a t -test statistic, comparing the two groups of public and private university administrators. The total scores on the role-

based stress of each public university administrator were compared with the total scores on the role-based stress of each private university administrator. There were 72 public and 67 private university administrators.

Hypothesis 3: There is a significant difference in task-based stress between public and private university administrators. This hypothesis was analyzed using a t-test statistic, comparing the two groups of public and private university administrators. The total scores on the task-based stress of each public university administrator were compared with the total scores on the task-based stress of each private university administrator. There were 72 public and 67 private university administrators.

Hypothesis 4: There is a significant difference in conflict-mediating stress between public and private university administrators. This hypothesis was analyzed using a t-test statistic, comparing the two groups of public and private university administrators. The total scores on the conflict-mediating stress of each public university administrator were compared with the total scores on the conflict-mediating stress of each private university administrator. There were 72 public and 67 private university administrators.

Hypothesis 5: There is a significant difference in social-confidence stress between public and private university administrators. This hypothesis was analyzed

using a t-test statistic, comparing the two groups of public and private university administrators. The total scores on the social-confidence stress of each public university administrator were compared with the total scores on the social-confidence stress of each private university administrator. There were 72 public and 67 private university administrators.

Hypothesis 6: There is a significant difference in overall stress between vice rectors in public and private universities.

Hypothesis 7: There is a significant difference in overall stress between deans in public and private universities.

Hypothesis 8: There is a significant difference in overall stress between department chairpersons in public and private universities.

Hypothesis 9: There is a significant difference in overall stress between secretary officers in public and private universities.

Hypotheses 6 through 9 were analyzed using a two-way analysis of variance, comparing four groups of public and four groups of private university administrators. They were vice rectors, deans, department chairpersons, and secretary officers. The mean score of 29 stress questions in the second part of the questionnaire scored by the vice rectors, deans, department chairpersons, and secretary officers in

public universities was compared with the mean score of 29 stress questions in the second part of the questionnaire scored by the vice rectors, deans, department chairpersons, and secretary officers in private universities. There were 30 vice rectors, 37 deans, 39 department chairpersons, and 33 secretary officers in public and private universities. The test scores and findings are summarized in tables which show mean scores, standard deviation, t statistic, F-statistic, variance, and significance levels in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The findings and a description of stress and stress differences in academic administrators in Thai public and private universities are presented in this chapter. The administrative stress factors include role-based stress, task-based stress, conflict-mediating stress, and social-confidence stress. Administrators were vice rectors, deans, department chairpersons, and secretary officers. The University Administrative Concerns Questionnaire was used to identify stress and stress differences of these two administrator groups.

Of the 200 questionnaires mailed, 156 were returned. This was a 78% return rate. Of the 156 questionnaires returned, 139, or 69.5% were usable. Among the 139 public and private university administrators responding to the survey, 30 were vice rectors, 37 were deans, 39 were department chairpersons, and 33 were secretary officers. The return rate of the public university administrators was 72 (18 vice rectors, 17 deans, 20 department chairpersons, and 17 secretary officers) and the return rate of the private university administrators was 67 (12 vice rectors, 12 deans, 19 department chairpersons, and 20 secretary officers).

The data gathered from the respondents were statistically analyzed using the t -test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistics. Each hypothesis was analyzed as described in Chapter 3. The Statistic Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS/PC+) was used for computations.

Restatement of the Null Hypotheses

For the purposes of the study, the following null hypotheses were formulated.

1. There is no significant difference in stress between public university administrators and private university administrators.
2. There is no significant difference in role-based stress between public and private university administrators.
3. There is no significant difference in task-based stress between public and private university administrators.
4. There is no significant difference in conflict-mediating stress between public and private university administrators.
5. There is no significant difference in social-confidence stress between public and private university administrators.
6. There is no significant difference in overall stress between vice rectors in public and private university administrators.

7. There is no significant difference in overall stress between deans in public and private university administrators.

8. There is no significant difference in overall stress in department chairpersons in public and private university administrators.

9. There is no significant difference in overall stress between secretary officers in public and private university administrators.

Presentation and Analysis of the Data

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in stress between public university administrators and private university administrators.

The mean scores of overall stress questions from part 2 of the questionnaire rated by public and private university administrators are compared in Table 1. There were 29 overall stress questions.

TABLE 1

t-Test Analysis for Overall Stress Scores Rated by Public and Private University Administrators

Administrator Groups	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Public administrators	72	2.2323	.554	1.46	1.46
Private administrators	67	2.1004	.506		

Analysis of the t -test, reported in Table 1, indicates that there was not a significant difference in overall stress between public university administrators and private university administrators. With a t -statistic of 1.46 and p of .146, the scores of 29 stress questions rated by the two groups of public and private university administrators failed to reflect a significant difference at the .05 level ($p > .05$). The null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in role-based stress between public and private university administrators.

The mean scores of role-based stress of the two groups of public and private university administrators are compared in Table 2. There were 11 role-based stress questions.

TABLE 2

t-Test Analysis for Role-Based Stress Scores Rated by Public and Private University Administrators

Administrator Groups	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Public administrators	72	1.9470	.657	-.68	.497
Private administrators	67	2.0163	.531		

Analysis of the t -test, reported in Table 2, indicates that there was no significant difference in role-based stress between public and private university administrators.

With a t -statistic of $-.68$ and p of $.497$, the scores of 11 role-based stress questions rated by the two groups of public and private university administrators failed to reflect a significant difference at the $.05$ level ($p > .05$). The null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in task-based stress between public and private university administrators.

The mean scores of the task-based stress of the two groups of public and private university administrators are compared in Table 3. There were 9 task-based stress questions.

TABLE 3

t-Test Analysis for Task-Based Stress Scores Rated by Public and Private University Administrators

Administrator Groups	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Public administrators	72	2.4907	.780	1.72	.088
Private administrators	67	2.2769	.679		

Analysis of the t -test, reported in Table 3, indicates that there was a significant difference in task-based stress between public and private university administrators. With a t -statistic of 1.72 and p of $.088$, the scores of task-based stress rated the two groups of public and private

university administrators reflected a significant difference at the .05 level ($p < .05$). The mean score in task-based stress of public university administrators was 2.4907, and the mean score in task-based stress of private university administrators was 2.2769. This shows that public university administrators had more task-based stress than did private university administrators. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference in conflict-mediating stress between public and private university administrators.

The mean scores of the conflict-mediating stress of the two groups of public and private university administrators are compared in Table 4. There were 6 conflict-mediating stress questions.

TABLE 4

t-Test Analysis for Conflict-Mediating Stress Scores Rated by Public and Private University Administrators

Administrator Groups	<u>N</u>	Mean	SD	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
Public administrators	72	2.4375	.670	3.38	.001
Private administrators	67	2.0547	.662		

Examination of the t-test, reported in Table 4, indicates that there was a significant difference in

conflict-mediating stress between public and private university administrators. With a t -statistic of 3.38 and p of .001, the scores of conflict-mediating stress rated by the two groups of public and private university administrators reflected a significant difference at the .05 level ($p < .05$). The mean score on the conflict-mediating stress of public university administrators was 2.4375, and the mean score on the conflict-mediating stress of private university administrators was 2.0547. These show that public university administrators had more conflict-mediating stress than private university administrators. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in social-confidence stress between public and private university administrators.

The mean scores of the social-confidence stress of the two groups of public and private university administrators are compared in Table 5. There were 3 social-confidence stress questions.

Analysis of the t -test, reported in Table 5, indicates that there was no significant difference in social-confidence stress between public and private university administrators. With a t -statistic of .92 and p of .357, the scores of social-confidence stress rated by the two groups of public and private university administrators

TABLE 5

t-Test Analysis for Social-Confidence Stress Scores Rated by Public and Private University Administrators

Administrator Groups	<u>N</u>	Mean	SD	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
Public administrators	72	2.0926	.803	.92	.357
Private administrators	67	1.9701	.756		

failed to reflect a significant difference at the .05 level ($p > .05$). The null hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference in overall stress between vice rectors in public and private universities.

Hypothesis 7: There is no significant difference in overall stress between deans in public and private universities.

Hypothesis 8: There is no significant difference in overall stress in department chairpersons in public and private universities.

Hypothesis 9: There is no significant difference in overall stress between secretary officers in public and private universities.

For hypotheses 6 through 9, overall stress scores between vice rectors, deans, department chairpersons, and secretary officers in public universities and vice rectors, deans, department chairpersons, and secretary officers in

private universities are compared in Table 6. Twenty-nine stress questions were rated by 18 vice rectors, 17 deans, 20 department chairpersons, and 17 secretary officers in public universities and 12 vice rectors, 20 deans, 19 department chairpersons, and 16 secretary officers in private universities.

TABLE 6

Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Overall Stress Scores Rated by Public and Private University Administrators

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Variance Estimate	F	p
Universities (pub, pri)	0.600	1	0.600	2.279	0.134
Administrators (vice, deans, chairs, secret)	3.854	3	1.285	4.877	0.003
Interaction	0.342	3	0.114	0.433	0.730
Within groups	34.505	131	0.263		

Examination of two-way analysis of variance, reported in Table 6, indicates that there was no significant difference in overall stress between vice rectors in public and private universities ($p > .05$). Null hypothesis 6 was retained.

There was no significant difference in overall stress between deans in public and private universities ($p > .05$). Null hypothesis 7 was retained.

There was no significant difference in overall stress between department chairpersons in public and private universities ($p > .05$). Null hypothesis 8 was retained.

There was no significant difference in overall stress between secretary officers in public and private universities ($p > .05$). Null hypothesis 9 was retained.

There was no interaction among university administrators. The data show that there were no significant mean differences between public and private university administrators categorized by administrative positions. As shown in Table 6, however, there was a significant difference among administrative positions.

There was no significant difference between public and private university administrators in the same administrative positions. The difference in the stress scores rated by public and private university administrators when categorized by administrative positions are reported in Table 7. These four groups of administrative positions included vice rectors, deans, department chairpersons, and secretary officers in public and private universities.

Examination of the one-way analysis of variance reported in Table 7 indicates that there was a significant difference among administrative positions ($p < .05$). The

Statistic Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS/PC+) was used to compute the difference found between deans and department chairpersons, and deans and secretary officers. No significant difference was found between other groups.

TABLE 7

One-Way Analysis of Variance for Overall Stress Scores Rated by Public and Private University Administrators Categorized by Administrative Positions

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Variance Estimate	F	p
Between groups	3.8574	3	1.2853	4.8970	0.0029
Within groups	35.4474	135	0.2626		
Total	39.3049	138			

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A summary and the findings of this research study are presented in this chapter. Conclusions, implications, and recommendations are also presented.

Summary

The purposes of this study were to measure and compare stress between academic administrators in public and private universities in Thailand. Types of administrative stress included role-based stress, task-based stress, conflict-mediating stress, and social-confidence stress. Administrators were vice rectors, deans, department chairpersons, and secretary officers.

In order to accomplish these purposes, nine hypotheses were formulated. The University Administrative Concerns Questionnaire was used for this study. The sample for the study included 72 public and 67 private university administrators from 5 public and 5 private universities in Thailand. All respondents indicated their degree of concern for each questionnaire regarding stress on the self-reported survey instrument. Respondents' scores revealed whether

they were experiencing stress in their workplace as well as the level at which they were experiencing stress.

Data were analyzed statistically utilizing the t-test and analysis of variance statistics to measure and compare stress between public and private university administrators. The four administrative stress groups, which included role-based stress, task-based stress, conflict-mediating stress, and social-confidence stress, were compared between the two administrator groups. The administrative positions, which included vice-rectors, deans, department chairpersons, and secretary-officers, were also compared for overall stress. A level of .05 was set to determine statistical significance.

Findings

The findings of this study, as they relate to the nine hypotheses, are as follows:

1. There is no difference in overall stress between public university administrators and private university administrators.
2. There is no difference in role-based stress between public and private university administrators.
3. There is a difference in task-based stress between public and private university administrators.
4. There is a difference in conflict-mediating stress between public and private university administrators.

5. There is no difference in social-confidence stress between public and private university administrators.

6. There is no difference in overall stress between vice rectors in public and private universities.

7. There is no difference in overall stress between deans in public and private universities.

8. There is no difference in overall stress between department chairpersons in public and private universities.

9. There is no difference in overall stress between secretary officers in public and private universities.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the findings of this study.

1. Academic administrators in public and private universities in Thailand experience mild stress. The mean stress score of public university administrators was 2.2323, and the mean stress score of private university administrators was 2.1004 on the scale, where 2 was defined as rarely bothers me. Even though the mean stress score of public university administrators was a slightly higher, no statistically significant difference was found.

2. Public university administrators experience more task-based stress and conflict-mediating stress than private university administrators. However, their stress level is still mild, with a mean score on task-based stress of 2.4907 and a mean score on conflict-mediating stress of 2.4375,

where 2 in the scale of the instrument was defined as rarely bothers me and 3 was defined as occasionally bothers me.

3. From the comparisons of overall stress among administrative positions between public and private university administrators, no difference and no interaction were found. However, differences were found between deans and department chairpersons, and deans and secretary officers.

Implications

The results of the research conducted for this study indicate that academic administrators in public and private universities in Thailand experience mild stress. The two administrator groups surveyed were not significantly different in their levels of overall stress. Public university administrators experienced more task-based and conflict-mediating stress than private university administrators. Role-based stress, task-based stress, conflict-mediating stress, and social-confidence stress were perceived as fairly weak stressors by both groups. When the administrator positions (vice rectors, deans, department chairpersons, and secretary officers) were compared between public and private universities, a significant difference in overall stress was not found.

A possible explanation is that both public and private universities are under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of University Affairs and are under government supervision;

thus, their institutional missions and characteristics are the same. Most of the public and private university administrators surveyed reported that they were satisfied with their jobs. From responses to part 1 of the questionnaire, 159 public and private university administrators reported their job satisfaction as follows: 36 were very satisfied, 95 were satisfied, and 8 were not satisfied.

University administration is an attractive job for persons who are able to cope fairly easily with job stress. Most university administrators are transferred from faculty jobs; therefore, their work experience and number of years on the job may help them cope with stress. In Thailand, university administration is considered a privileged occupation and has good benefits in both the public and the private sectors.

A possible explanation of why private university administrators experienced less task-based and conflict-mediating stress may be that private universities may have more relaxed administrative procedures. The Ministry of University Affairs controls private universities with laws and regulations, but relaxations accorded by the Private University Act may create a more desirable working-climate which provides greater administrator satisfaction.

Culture is another aspect to consider. The review of literature for this study revealed that academic

administrators in the United States consider their work stressful. Some administrators surveyed reported that the task-based factor frequently bothered them. Role-based stress and task-based stress had the greatest impact on administrators at lower levels. Conflict-mediating stress and social-confidence stress were perceived to be weak stressors (Rasch et al., 1986, p. 429). A study of the cross-cultural aspects of stress and its manifestations between Israeli and American academic administrators revealed that Israelis experienced job related stress which, in many instances, was similar in the order of importance to that experienced by Americans. However, Americans generally tended to report a higher level of stress at work than did Israelis. Possible explanation of this phenomenon is that Americans are more open and are willing to reveal their feelings of stress. Israelis on the other hand, tend to deny their stress to others, and even to themselves (Perlberg & Keinan, 1986, p. 75).

In summary, there is reason to believe that the Thai culture may be conducive to creating an environment of less stress. However, other reasons that were mentioned are important as well.

Recommendations

Based on the results of this study, the following recommendations are made.

1. The chief executive officers in public and private universities should evaluate the work environment in their institutions each semester by using the University Administrative Concerns Questionnaire.
2. A study of stress in rectors, faculty, and students should be conducted in Thai public and private universities.
3. A study of stress in academic administrators and faculty in higher education institutions under the Ministry of Education should be conducted and compared with academic administrators and faculty in higher education institutions under the Ministry of University Affairs.
4. A similar study should include demographic data (age, sex) and work-related information such as number of years in an administrative position; average number of hours per week, including weekends, spent working; and number of hours per week, including weekends, spent in physical fitness activities by administrators.
5. A cross-cultural stress comparison should be conducted.

APPENDIX
QUESTIONNAIRE

THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATIVE CONCERNS QUESTIONNAIRE

Part 1: General Information

1. You are an administrator in a
 1. Public university
 2. Private university
2. How satisfied are you with your job?
 1. Very satisfied
 2. Satisfied
 3. Dissatisfied
 4. Very dissatisfied
3. Your administrative position is best described as
 1. Vice Rector (Vice President)
 2. Dean
 3. Department Chairperson
 4. Secretary Officer

PART 2: THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATIVE CONCERNS QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTION: Please respond to each statement according to the degree you feel about your job situations. Circle one number for each item.

- 1 = never bothers me
- 2 = rarely bothers me
- 3 = occasionally bothers me
- 4 = frequently bothers me
- 5 = usually bothers me

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Feeling staff members or colleagues do not understand my goals and expectations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Thinking that I will not be able to satisfy the conflicting demands of the person(s) who has the authority over me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Feeling not enough is expected of me by my superior(s). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. | Trying to resolve differences with my superior(s). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | Not knowing what my superior thinks of me or how he/she evaluates my performance. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | Feeling that I have too much responsibility delegated to me by my superior. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | Feeling that I have too little authority to carry out responsibilities assigned to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | Feeling that the progress on my job is not what it should or could be. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. | Being unclear about the scope and responsibilities of my job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. | Having to work with people who have more authority but are not as skillful or knowledgeable as I am. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. | Trying to influence my immediate superior's actions and decisions that affect me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. | Being interrupted frequently by telephone calls. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. | Having my work frequently interrupted by staff members who want to talk. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. | Imposing excessively high expectations on myself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. | Writing memos, letters, and other communication. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. | Feeling that much of the paperwork required by others is not utilized after I complete it. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. | Preparing budget proposals and allocating budget resources. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. | Feeling that I have too heavy a work load, one that I cannot possibly finish during the normal work day. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

19.	Feeling that meetings take up too much time.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Trying to complete reports and other paperwork on time.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Trying to resolve parent/institution conflicts.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Feeling I have to participate in university activities outside of the normal working hours at the expense of my personal time.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Complying with government and organizational rules and policies.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Trying to resolve differences between/among staff members and/or colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Trying to gain public approval and/or financial support for university programs.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Trying to satisfy concerns of constituent groups (alumni, the community, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Feeling that I am not fully qualified to handle my job.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Speaking in front of groups.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Attempting to meet social expectations.	1	2	3	4	5

แบบสอบถามเกี่ยวกับการบริหารงานมหาวิทยาลัย

ส่วนที่ 1 ข้อมูลทั่วไป (กรุณาเขียนวงกลมรอบตัวเลข)

1. ท่านเป็นผู้บริหารของมหาวิทยาลัย
 1. รัฐบาล
 2. เอกชน
2. ท่านมีความพอใจในงานของท่านระดับใด
 1. พอใจมาก
 2. พอใจ
 3. ไม่พอใจ
 4. ไม่พอใจเลย
3. ตำแหน่งงานบริหารของท่านในมหาวิทยาลัย
 1. รองอธิการบดี
 2. คณบดี
 3. เลขานุการคณะ
 4. หัวหน้าภาควิชา

ส่วนที่ 2 แบบสอบถามเกี่ยวกับการบริหารงานมหาวิทยาลัย

คำชี้แจง โปรดวงกลมรอบตัวเลขทางด้านขวามือของข้อความแต่ละข้อ กรุณาตอบคำถามตามความรู้สึกที่ท่านมีต่อการทำงานของท่าน

- ความหมายของตัวเลข**
- 1 หมายถึง ไม่เคยรบกวนความรู้สึกของข้าพเจ้าเลย
 - 2 หมายถึง รบกวนความรู้สึกของข้าพเจ้าน้อยมาก
 - 3 หมายถึง รบกวนความรู้สึกของข้าพเจ้าบางครั้งบางคราว
 - 4 หมายถึง รบกวนความรู้สึกของข้าพเจ้าบ่อย
 - 5 หมายถึง รบกวนความรู้สึกของข้าพเจ้าเป็นประจำและตลอดเวลา

<u>ข้อความ</u>	<u>ระดับความคิดเห็น</u>				
1. รู้สึกว่าผู้ร่วมงานหรือเพื่อนร่วมงานไม่เข้าใจจุดมุ่งหมายและความคาดหวังในเรื่องงานของข้าพเจ้า	1	2	3	4	5
2. คิดว่าข้าพเจ้าไม่สามารถปฏิบัติงานให้ตรงกับความต้องการในหลายๆ ด้านของผู้บังคับบัญชาได้	1	2	3	4	5
3. รู้สึกว่าผู้บังคับบัญชาประเมินความสามารถของข้าพเจ้าต่ำไป	1	2	3	4	5
4. การต้องปรับตัวให้เข้ากับผู้บังคับบัญชา	1	2	3	4	5
5. ไม่ทราบว่าคุณบังคับบัญชามีความรู้สึกต่อข้าพเจ้าอย่างไร และประเมินผลการทำงานของข้าพเจ้าอย่างไร	1	2	3	4	5

ข้อความ	ระดับความคิดเห็น				
6. รู้สึกว่าผู้บังคับบัญชามอบหมายงานและความรับผิดชอบให้ข้าพเจ้ามากเกินไป	1	2	3	4	5
7. รู้สึกว่าข้าพเจ้ามีอำนาจน้อยเกินไปที่จะดำเนินงานที่ได้รับมอบหมายและรับผิดชอบ	1	2	3	4	5
8. รู้สึกว่าความก้าวหน้าในหน้าที่การงานของข้าพเจ้ามีไม่มากเท่าที่ควรจะเป็นหรือสามารถจะเป็น	1	2	3	4	5
9. รู้สึกว่าขอบเขตของภาระหน้าที่และความรับผิดชอบในงานที่ข้าพเจ้าได้รับมอบหมายไม่ชัดเจน	1	2	3	4	5
10. ข้าพเจ้าต้องทำงานร่วมกับบุคคลซึ่งมีอำนาจเหนือกว่าแต่ด้อยกว่าทั้งความรู้และความเชี่ยวชาญ	1	2	3	4	5
11. การพยายามที่จะมีส่วนร่วมในการกระทำและการตัดสินใจของผู้บังคับบัญชาซึ่งจะมีผลกระทบต่อข้าพเจ้า	1	2	3	4	5
12. การถูกขัดจังหวะในระหว่างเวลาทำงานบ่อยๆ ด้วยการต้องรับโทรศัพท์	1	2	3	4	5
13. การถูกขัดจังหวะในระหว่างเวลาทำงานบ่อยๆ ด้วยการต้องพูดคุยกับผู้ร่วมงานที่เข้ามาขอพบ	1	2	3	4	5
14. การได้รับความคาดหวังในเรื่องการทำงานมากเกินไป	1	2	3	4	5
15. การเขียนบันทึกข้อความ จดหมาย และการติดต่อสื่อสารด้านต่างๆ	1	2	3	4	5
16. รู้สึกว่ามีเอกสารจำนวนมากที่ข้าพเจ้าได้ทำออกไปไม่ได้ถูกนำไปใช้ประโยชน์	1	2	3	4	5
17. การจัดเตรียมและจัดสรรงบประมาณ	1	2	3	4	5
18. รู้สึกว่าข้าพเจ้ามีงานที่จะต้องทำมากเกินไปในวันหนึ่งๆ และไม่สามารถจะทำให้เสร็จได้ในเวลาราชการ	1	2	3	4	5
19. รู้สึกว่าการประชุมต่างๆ นั้น เป็นการเสียเวลามากเกินไป	1	2	3	4	5
20. การพยายามที่จะทำรายงานและเอกสารต่างๆ ให้เสร็จทันเวลา	1	2	3	4	5
21. การพยายามแก้ปัญหาความขัดแย้งระหว่างผู้ปกครองกับสถาบัน	1	2	3	4	5
22. รู้สึกว่าข้าพเจ้าต้องร่วมกิจกรรมของมหาวิทยาลัยนอกเวลางานซึ่งเป็นเวลาส่วนตัว	1	2	3	4	5
23. การต้องปฏิบัติตามกฎระเบียบและนโยบายของหน่วยงานและของรัฐบาล	1	2	3	4	5
24. การพยายามที่จะทำให้ผู้ร่วมงานหรือเพื่อนร่วมงานปรับตัวเข้ากันได้	1	2	3	4	5
25. การพยายามที่จะสร้างความเชื่อถือและหาเงินสนับสนุนจากหน่วยงานภายนอกมหาวิทยาลัย เพื่อนำมาสนับสนุนกิจกรรมและโครงการต่างๆ ของมหาวิทยาลัย	1	2	3	4	5
26. การพยายามที่จะสร้างความพอใจและความประทับใจให้แก่กลุ่มบุคคลต่างๆ ซึ่งมีส่วนเกี่ยวข้องกับสถาบัน เช่น คิษย์เก่า ชุมชน เป็นต้น	1	2	3	4	5
27. รู้สึกว่าข้าพเจ้าไม่มีคุณสมบัติเพียงพอที่จะปฏิบัติงานในตำแหน่งหน้าที่	1	2	3	4	5
28. การพูดและปรากฏตัวต่อหน้ากลุ่มบุคคลต่างๆ ในชุมชน	1	2	3	4	5
29. การพยายามที่จะทำงานให้เป็นไปตามความคาดหวังของสังคมหรือชุมชน	1	2	3	4	5



University of North Texas

Department of Higher and Adult Education
College of Education

1 ตุลาคม 2533

เรื่อง ขออนุญาตเก็บรวบรวมข้อมูล

เรียน อธิการบดี

สิ่งที่ส่งมาด้วย แบบสอบถามจำนวน ชุด

ด้วยข้าพเจ้า นางสาวอัจฉรา กิตติกรณ์ นักศึกษาปริญญาเอกสาขาการบริหาร
อุดมศึกษา ของ University of North Texas ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา กำลังทำวิจัย
เพื่อเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษาในหัวข้อเรื่อง "การศึกษาเรื่องความเครียดของผู้บริหาร
การศึกษาในมหาวิทยาลัยของรัฐและเอกชนในประเทศไทย" กลุ่มตัวอย่างที่ใช้ในการวิจัย
ครั้งนี้คือ ผู้บริหารในมหาวิทยาลัย ตำแหน่ง รองอธิการบดี ผู้ช่วยรองอธิการบดี คณบดี
รองคณบดี หัวหน้าภาควิชา เลขาธิการคณะ หรือตำแหน่งอื่นๆ เทียบเท่าตำแหน่งต่างๆ
ดังกล่าว ซึ่งความคิดเห็นเหล่านี้จะถือเป็นความลับ โดยนำเสนอเป็นภาพรวมของความคิด
เห็นอันมีคุณค่า และจะเป็นประโยชน์อย่างยิ่งต่อการบริหารการศึกษาในมหาวิทยาลัยใน
ประเทศไทยต่อไปในอนาคต

จึงเรียนมาเพื่อโปรดพิจารณา และหากท่านพิจารณาแล้วอนุญาตให้ทำการเก็บ
รวบรวมข้อมูลได้ ขอได้โปรดแจกแบบสอบถามที่แนบมาด้วยให้แก่ผู้บริหารมหาวิทยาลัยใน
ตำแหน่งต่างๆ ดังกล่าวข้างต้นด้วยจักเป็นพระคุณยิ่ง

ขอแสดงความนับถือ

(นางสาวอัจฉรา กิตติกรณ์)





University of North Texas

Department of Higher and Adult Education
College of Education

1 ตุลาคม 2533

เรื่อง ขอความร่วมมือตอบแบบสอบถาม

เรียน

สิ่งที่ส่งมาด้วย แบบสอบถามจำนวน 1 ชุด

ด้วยข้าพเจ้า นางสาวอัจฉรา กิตติกรณ์ นักศึกษาปริญญาเอกสาขาการบริหาร
อุดมศึกษา ของ University of North Texas ประเทศสหรัฐอเมริกา กำลังทำวิจัย
เพื่อเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษาในหัวข้อเรื่อง "การศึกษาเรื่องความเครียดของผู้บริหาร
การศึกษาในมหาวิทยาลัยของรัฐและเอกชนในประเทศไทย" ในฐานะท่านเป็นผู้บริหารการ
ศึกษาในมหาวิทยาลัยท่านหนึ่ง ข้าพเจ้าใคร่ขอความร่วมมือในการตอบแบบสอบถามที่ได้แนบ
มาพร้อมนี้ คำตอบของท่านจะเป็นข้อมูลที่มีคุณค่า และเป็นประโยชน์อย่างยิ่งต่อการบริหาร
การศึกษาในมหาวิทยาลัยในประเทศไทยต่อไปในอนาคต

อนึ่ง ขอให้ท่านตอบแบบสอบถามนี้ตามสภาพความเป็นจริง ตามความคิดเห็นของ
ท่าน คำตอบของท่านจะถูกปิดเป็นความลับและจะนำมาใช้เพื่อประโยชน์ในการวิจัยเท่านั้น

จึงเรียนมาเพื่อขอความอนุเคราะห์ในการตอบแบบสอบถามนี้ **และโปรดส่งคืนภายในวันที่ 26 ตุลาคม 2533** โดยใช้แผ่นพับซึ่งได้จำหน่ายและติดแสตมป์มาเรียบร้อยแล้ว
หวังเป็นอย่างยิ่งว่าจะได้รับความร่วมมือจากท่านเป็นอย่างดี ขอขอบพระคุณเป็นอย่างยิ่งมา
ณ โอกาสนี้ด้วย

ขอแสดงความนับถือ

(นางสาวอัจฉรา กิตติกรณ์)



REFERENCES

- Austin, A. E., & Gamson, Z. F. (1983). Academic workplace: New demands, heightened tensions. (ASHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 10). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Blackburn, R. T., Horowitz, S. M., Edington, D. W., & Klos, D. M. (1986). University faculty and administrator responses to job strains. Research in Higher Education, 25(1), 31-41.
- Brown, W. D. (1983). Welcome stress! Minnesota: CompCare.
- Carroll, A. B. (1976). The role conflict phenomenon: Implications for department chairmen and academic faculty. Improving College and University Teaching, 24, 245-246.
- Cooper, C. L., & Marshall, J. (1977). Understanding executive stress. New York: PBI Books.
- Cooper, C. L., & Marshall, J. (1978). Sources of managerial and white collar stress. In C. L. Cooper & R. Payne (Eds.), Stress at work (pp. 81-107). New York: John Wiley.
- Erickson, J., Pugh, W. M., & Gunderson, E. K. (1972). Status incongruency as a predictor of job satisfaction and life stress. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56, 523-525.
- French, J. R. P., & Caplan, R. D. (1973). Organizational stress and individual strain. In E. Marrow (Ed.), The Failure of Success (pp. 30-66). New York: AMACOM.
- French, J. R. P., Cobb, S., Caplan, R. D., Harrison, R. V., & Penneau, S. R. (1976, September). Job demands and worker health. A Symposium presented at the 84th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association.
- Giammatteo, M. C., & Giammatteo, D. M. (1980). Executive wellbeing: Stress and administrators. Reston: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Gould, J. W. (1964). The academic deanship. New York: Teacher College Press.

- Indik, B., Seashore, S. E., & Slesinger, J. (1964). Demographic correlates of psychological strain. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, *69*(1), 26-28.
- International Association of Universities. (1989). International handbook of universities and their institutions in higher education. New York: Stockton Press.
- Ivancevich, J. M., & Matteson, M. T. (1980). Stress and work. Illinois: Scott/Foresman.
- Ivancevich, J. M., & Matteson, M. T. (1982). Managing job stress and health. New York: The Free Press.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Ketudat, S. (1972). Higher education in Thailand. Bulletin of the UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia, *7*(1), 125-135.
- Margolis, B. L., Kores, W. H., & Guinn, R. P. (1974). Job stress: An unlisted occupational hazard. Journal of Occupational Medicine, *16*, 654-661.
- Maslach, C. (1982). Burnout: The cost of caring. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- McGrath, J. E. (1976). Stress and behavior in organizations. In M. D. Dunneik (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (pp. 1351-1396). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Meeth, L. R. (1971). Administration and leadership. In H. L. Hodgkinson & L. R. Meeth (Eds.), Power and authority: Transformation of campus government (pp. 39-53). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Melendez, W. A., & Guzman, R. M. (1983). Burnout: The new academic disease (ASHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report, No.9). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Miles, R. H. (1980). Bounding roles. In C. L. Cooper & R. Payne (Eds.), Current Concerns in Occupational Stress (pp. 61-96). New York: John Wiley.
- Ministry of University Affairs. (1989a). Annual report of the Ministry of University Affairs of A.D. 2532. Bangkok, Thailand.

- Ministry of University Affairs. (1989b). Private university act of A.D. 2522. Bangkok, Thailand.
- Moore, K. M. (1983). Examining the myths of administrative careers. AAHE Bulletin, 35, 3-6.
- Noel, J. L. (1987). Long-term stress management. In P. Seldin (Ed.), Coping with faculty stress, new directions for teaching and learning, No. 29, 65-74. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Okun, K. A. (1981). Deans' perceptions of their ability to promote change in schools of education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Michigan.
- Orpen, C., & King, G. (1986, December). Relationship between perceived job stress and physical and psychological strain among university administrators. Perceptual and Motor Skills, pp. 1137-1138.
- Perlberg, A. & Keinan, G. (1986). Sources of stress in academe--The Israeli case. Higher Education, 15(1-2), 73-88.
- Pierce, G. (1988). Developing managers to prevent staff burnout. In V. C. Marsick (Ed.), New directions for continuing education: No. 38. Enhancing staff development in diverse settings (pp. 77-86). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Quick, J. C., & Quick, J. D. (1984). Organizational stress and preventive management. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rasch, C., Hutchison, J., & Tollefson, N. (1986). Sources of stress among administrators at research Universities. Review of Higher Education, 99(4), 419-434.
- Saleh, M. A., & Kashmeeri, M. O. (1987). School administration: Factors associated with distress and dissatisfaction. Education, 108(1), 93-101.
- Scott, R. A. (1979). Robots or reinsmen: Job opportunities and professional standing for collegiate administrators in the 1980s. Current Issues in Higher Education No.7. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Seldin, P. (1987). New directions for teaching and learning: No. 29. Coping with faculty stress. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Selye, H. (1965). The stress of life. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Selye, H. (1978, October-November). Dr. Hans Selye's stress theory. Modern Maturity, 21(5), 31-32.
- Selye, H. (1982). History and present status of the stress concept. In L. Goldberger & S. Breznitz (Eds.), Handbook of stress: Theoretical and clinical aspects (pp. 7-17). New York: The Free Press.
- Sri Nakharinwirot University at Bangsaen. (1989). Annual report of the faculty of nursing school. Bangsaen, Thailand: Sri Nakharinwirot University at Bangsaen Press.
- Srisa-an, W. (1983). Thailand. Bulletin of the UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia and the Pacific, 24, 86-94.
- Tung, R., & Koch, J. (1980). School administrators: Sources of stress and ways of coping with it. In C. Cooper & J. Marshall (Eds.), White collar and professional stress (pp. 63-87). New York: John Wiley.
- Wiggins, T. (1988). Stress and administrative role in educational organizations. Journal of Educational Research, 82(2), 120-125.
- Wisniewski, R. (1977, March). The dean of education and the looking-glass self. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Society of Professors of Education, Chicago, Illinois.