

Creating Supportive Organizational Climates for Women Educators: An Analysis of Stress and Well-Being

¹ S. Narayane; ² T. Kumuthavalli

¹ Research Scholar, Bharathidasan university, Khajamalai Campus, Tiruchirappalli

² Associate professor and Head, Department of Lifelong Learning, Bharathidasan university, Khajamalai Campus, Tiruchirappalli

Corresponding Author: **S. Narayane**

Abstract: This current literature work aims to understand and analyze the stress factors and impacting factors among the working women in educational institution. In this process authors identify a more supportive and productive environment, the organization should address key structural and relational stressors by improving the physical work setting, strengthening interpersonal climate (through conflict resolution training and team building), and optimizing time management via workload sharing and flexible scheduling. Institutional support can be enhanced by introducing wellness initiatives, regular feedback forums, and explicit work-life balance policies, alongside clear career pathways that include transparent promotion criteria and structured mentoring. These strategies are particularly important because, although respondents report being broadly satisfied with their jobs and acknowledge meaningful growth opportunities, the analysis indicates gaps in institutional support and employee engagement that continue to undermine overall well being.

Keywords: Work life Balance, Stress management, family life, Occupational stress, Family support, Job satisfaction, ANOVA, Cronbach's Alpha Value, Multiple Regression model, Correlation

Introduction

Stress has emerged as one of the most critical experiences of modern work life, cutting across sectors, regions, and occupational hierarchies. Knowledge-intensive arenas like education, healthcare, and professional services, resources are likely to bring steadily moderate to high performance. In a rapidly shifting expectations, technological disruptions, and intricate interpersonal demands. In an exclusive underline of the challenges and pushing environment, women professionals, undergoing these pressures are often incrusted on top of importunate gendered expectations around caregiving, household responsibilities. Creating an intense grid of stressors that control simultaneously at work, at home, and in the wider social environment.

Understanding job stress, a holistic perspective that does not view work in isolation, but instead examines how the work environment, career-development demands, and social environment interact to shape everyday experiences of strain, fatigue, and well-being (4). Pre-pandemic work-family conflict was driven mainly by traditional stressors (workload, time), the post-pandemic period is characterized by boundary management and emotional resilience against new forms of strain introduced by technology and remote work (3).

The job spots are profound and most instance arena for stress prone. When the in excessive Workloads goes beyond reasonable limits, time pressure, role conflict, inadequate resources, and poor health conditions can cause chronic stress. This led to erode motivation and psychological health issues over period. Study among teacher's revels, the impact of higher strength in classes, administrative workloads, behavioral issues, and accountability pressures contribute to feelings of emotional exhaustion and fatigue. On the other hand, comparing other side in an organisation, their structures and leadership styles strongly effect whether employees experience these demands as manageable challenges or as overwhelming threats. Compassionate supervision with clear communication, participatory decision-making, and fair procedures can transform the similar goals will share workload into a more tolerable experience. This enables employees with a sense of control, recognition, and shared purpose. Contrarywise, controlling management, illogical decisions, and unsupportive colleagues can increase even modest demands into significant sources of stress (2).

In a day-to-day working environments are central spots, job stress is closely linked to how individuals feel their career trajectories and prospects for growth within the organization. Career development incorporates elevation prospects, access to training, the alignment between job roles and long-term professional goals, and the perceived fairness of advancement criteria. When employees see clear, achievable routes for progression, reinforced by mentoring and skill-development opportunities with clear mode of interpret, for their future, which can ease the adverse impact of stress. When career growth is slower than expected, or seems uncertain, it can become a huge stressor. This is especially true in academic settings, where pressure to publish and meet performance benchmarks can lead to anxiety, work overload, and conflict between work and family life. The thing is, this stress doesn't always translate to better job performance or satisfaction. Instead, employees are left with a double whammy - the immediate stress of their job demands, and the long-term uncertainty of their career progression. It's like being stuck in limbo, unsure of when or if things will get better (8).

The social environment covering family, friends, coworkers, managers, and community around are part of the other vital arena to pinpoint the relative elements for job stress. Social relationships can function both as sources of stress and as

powerful cushions against it. On the one hand, interpersonal conflicts at work, contrary colleagues, and lack of acknowledgment for one's efforts can intensify stress responses and contribute to feelings of isolation. Equally, evidence shows that social support is a vital resource, emotional boost, practical assistance, and empathetic listening from supervisors, coworkers, and family members can substantially reduce the perceived burden of job demands. For women employees in particular, studies indicate that support from partner, extended family, and the company plays a significant role in shaping how they cope with substantial workloads and competing role expectations. When family shares domestic responsibilities, with institutions supports flexible arrangements, and finally peers create a sense of mutual help, job stress is less likely to crystallize into burnout or health problems (7).

Looking at work environment, career development, and social environment together gives us a more complete picture of job stress. The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model shows us that high job demands, like workload and emotional labor, can lead to strain. On the other hand, resources like social support, autonomy, and opportunities for growth can boost motivation and help buffer against those demands.

- Work Environment: Defines job demands (workload, emotional labor, etc.)
- Career Development: Shapes growth-related resources and future prospects
- Social Environment: Provides emotional and practical resources that can either help or worsen stress

By considering these three areas together, we can better understand job stress and identify ways to reduce it. In an example, an educator fronting heavy administrative work and firm performance system of measurement may experience high stress if elevation principles are unclear and family support is limited, but the same demands may be more manageable if there are structured mentoring programs, clear progressive pathways, and a strong reciprocal support system (10).

The interaction between work environment, career development, and social environment is particularly relevant when looking at job stress among women in teaching professions. Women in these roles often face high expectations around caring and relational aspects of their job, leading to higher stress levels compared to their male colleagues. They typically juggle heavy teaching schedules, admin tasks, and emotional support for students, alongside domestic responsibilities and social expectations. When any one of these areas is lacking - like crowded classrooms, limited promotion opportunities, or lack of family support - it can snowball into increased job stress and decreased wellbeing. On the flip side, targeted improvements across these areas can make a real difference. Think supportive leadership, career advancement programs, and recognition of work-life balance needs. Job stress isn't just an individual issue, it's a multidimensional phenomenon shaped by work

environment, career pressures, and social context. By looking at how these factors intersect, we can identify ways to make teaching a healthier, more sustainable profession which benefits not just women, but organizations, students, and society as a whole (1,5).

Literature Review

In today's fast-paced world, work-life balance has become crucial, particularly for female professionals who balance work and family obligations. The purpose of this study is to investigate the work-life balance of female teachers working in Chennai's private schools. Despite being regarded as a noble and flexible career, teaching frequently requires emotional work, long hours, and multitasking, all of which can negatively impact both personal and professional fulfillment. The study looks into things including workload, organizational support, family obligations, and time management that affect work-life balance. It also looks at the difficulties these teachers encounter and the coping strategies they use. A sample of female instructors from different private schools in Chennai will be given structured questionnaires to complete in order to gather primary data. The findings will help identify the key areas needing attention and suggest strategies for schools to enhance support for their female staff, thereby promoting a healthier and more productive work environment (4).

Using the New Brief Job Stress Questionnaire, a comprehensive job stress questionnaire, this study examined teachers' occupational stress while taking gender differences into account. The survey included 1,825 primary and junior high school instructors. The findings showed that compared to male instructors, female teachers substantially showed more physical and psychological stress reactions as well as a worse perception of job resource availability. Furthermore, compared to male instructors, female teachers' mental health outcomes were more strongly correlated with assistance from friends and family, according to multiple regression models. Male and female teachers also experienced different effects from marital status. Teachers' psychological and physical stress reactions were closely linked to job demands. In contrast to job demands, job resources were more closely linked to favorable workplace outcomes including social capital and workplace engagement. In addition to its gender-specific impact, administrators should take into account the unique characteristics of teachers' occupational stress. To promote teachers' work engagement and build a cohesive school workplace, organizational support measures such as protecting teachers' autonomy, promoting their career growth, and recognizing diversity should be taken into consideration (10).

This study highlights the critical role that female educators play in the educational system by examining the elements that affect their job satisfaction in India. A healthy learning environment and the wellbeing of educators depend on job satisfaction.

Work-life balance, professional growth, encouraging leadership, equitable pay, and social perceptions of gender roles are important variables. Significant gaps, regional differences, and particular difficulties faced by female instructors are identified by study. The results highlight the need for a supportive and rewarding work environment and advocate for focused interventions and policies to improve job satisfaction. The general efficacy and quality of education in India depend on increasing the job happiness of female instructors. In order to empower female educators and ultimately strengthen the educational system, the study ends with suggestions for workable tactics and solutions to increase workplace happiness (8).

Due to time constraints, many teachers endure high levels of work-related stress, which over time can result in a number of health issues, including emotional weariness. There is mounting evidence, nevertheless, that this might have a reciprocal effect. Furthermore, it is well recognized that the detrimental impacts of stress, such time constraints, on health outcomes can be mitigated by perceived social support. The buffering effects of received social support are less well understood. The current study investigated the reciprocal relationship between teachers' perceived time pressure and emotional exhaustion, as well as whether receiving social support from the school principal mitigates this relationship, using longitudinal data of $n = 1071$. Swiss primary and secondary school teachers over the course of one academic year. Teachers' reported time pressure and emotional weariness are strongly correlated at the between-person level, but there are no impacts at the within-person level, according to the results of a random intercept cross-lagged panel model. Additionally, there was a direct correlation between receiving social support and feeling reduced time pressure and emotional tiredness. The findings did not indicate either a buffering impact of social support from the school administration or reciprocal effects between perceived time pressure and emotional tiredness. In conclusion, current research work shows that the teachers' experiences of time pressure and emotional weariness are positively correlated with receiving social support from the principal of the school (6).

Aim and Scope of the research work

- To identify and analyze the stress factors affecting working women in educational institutions.
- To examine the impact of structural and relational workplace conditions (such as physical work setting, interpersonal climate, and workload management) on employee wellbeing.
- To evaluate the level of institutional support and employee engagement among women employees in educational institutions.
- To assess the relationship between job satisfaction, growth opportunities, and institutional support in influencing the overall wellbeing of working women.

Research Methodology

a) Research Design

The study employed a descriptive and analytical research design to identify and examine the major stress factors influencing working women in educational institutions. The design facilitated the exploration of relationships among organizational structure, interpersonal climate, time management practices, and institutional support mechanisms.

b) Population and Sample

The population of the study comprised working women employed in various educational institutions, including schools, colleges, and universities within a selected region. A stratified random sampling technique was used to ensure proportional representation of respondents from different types of institutions and positions (teaching and non-teaching staff). A total of 150–200 respondents were targeted, depending on response rate and accessibility. 218 responses have been taken for study.

c) Data Collection

Primary data were gathered through a structured questionnaire, developed based on literature review and expert consultation. The instrument consisted of three sections: Demographic Profile (age, designation, years of experience, marital status, etc.) Stress Factors (workload, work-life balance, physical environment, interpersonal relationships)

Institutional Support (career growth, wellness policies, feedback mechanisms, and mentoring opportunities)

Responses were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." Secondary data were obtained from journal articles, government reports, and institutional documents to support the contextual analysis.

d) Data Analysis

Collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency distribution) to identify key stress factors, and inferential analysis (ANOVA, correlation, and regression techniques) to examine the relationship between stressors and institutional support mechanisms. The statistical analysis was conducted using SPSS or equivalent software.

e) Reliability and Validity

The questionnaire's reliability was confirmed through Cronbach's alpha, ensuring internal consistency of the measurement items. Content validity was established by subject experts in the fields of HRM and organizational psychology before administering the survey.

Results and Discussions

Cronbach's Alpha to Check Internal Consistency of Scales

Picture – 1

Cronbach's APH

$$\alpha = \frac{\kappa}{\kappa - 1} \left[1 - \frac{\sum vi}{vt} \right]$$

α = Cronbach's alpha coefficient

κ = Number of items in the scale

$\sum vi$ = sum of the variances of each individual item

Vt = variance of the total scale (sum of all items)

Always high score of Cronbach's alpha is good, this signifying that a test or scale has high reliability and that its items are measuring the same core construct. Normally, a value of 0.70 or higher is measured as acceptable, but the it depending on the context.

Cronbach's alpha Acceptance Range

Table - 1

Cronbach's Alpha Value	Interpretation
>0.90	Excellent
0.80-0.89	Good
0.70-0.79	Acceptable
0.60-0.69	Questionable
0.50-0.59	Poor
<0.50	Unacceptable

Vital Considerations

- **Context matters:** Any survey on general topic/ purpose, a lower value could be acceptable, but same time questionnaire for a high-stakes profession would require much higher alpha value.
- **Extraordinary outcomes can be bad:** with a beyond excellent might also leads to poor outcome (e.g., >0.95) like plotting similar question with different phrases may fall in this category.
- **It measures reliability, not validity:** the indication are not outcomes; this provides the consistency of data collected and some extent the validity of questionnaire.

$K / (K-1) \rightarrow 1.00462963$
 $\Sigma V_i \rightarrow 0.771495609$
 $\Sigma V_t \rightarrow 0.775067348$
 $\alpha = 217 / 217 - 1 (1 - (0.771495609 \cdot 0.775067348))$
 $\alpha = 0.775067348$

Descriptive statistics – Percentage Analysis

Table - 2

Categories	Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
WORK ENVIRONMENT	There is a suitable environment for both the teachers and students regarding lighting, noise, temperature, humidity, air circulation and pollution	19%	23%	19%	16%	23%
	Every class rooms are cleaned and maintained regularly	52%	32%	10%	3%	3%
	Every class room has the required number of students and are not over crowded	61%	16%	19%	3%	0%
	There is harmony within my institution	35%	23%	29%	13%	0%
	In our institution, we have lots of bickering over who should do what job	13%	32%	35%	10%	10%
	There are clashes between subgroups within my institution	16%	26%	39%	13%	6%
	There are disputes between different subject teachers	13%	26%	32%	23%	6%
	The relationship between my subject and other subject teachers regarding the student's overall	10%	39%	39%	10%	3%

	performance is harmonious				
	There are personality clashes between the teachers of my institution	3%	32%	39%	19%
	There are limited periods to cover the syllabus	10%	29%	32%	23%
	It is hard to complete the required portion for the students for a particular term	6%	23%	32%	29%
	It is difficult to implement any practical or case studies other than theory to the students due to time constraint even if it is required	16%	29%	39%	16%
	There are other academic work load due to which there is a slowdown in the completion of the portions	19%	32%	29%	13%
	There are problems in involving yourself in activities outside work like workshops, conferences, etc.	13%	32%	19%	29%
CAREER DEVELOPMENT	There is a good future career picture for my job	42%	35%	19%	3%
	There are opportunities for promotion and advancement existing for the next few years	42%	35%	13%	10%
	My job skills will be of great use and value for next five years	48%	42%	10%	0%
	It will be easy to find a same job with another	35%	35%	16%	10%

SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT	employer				
	There are number of available jobs with all types of employers, for a person with my qualification	35%	32%	26%	3%
	There are possibilities to work with creativity in my job	48%	35%	10%	6%
	There are possibilities to teach life skills to the students along with the academic portions	48%	35%	13%	0%
	All in all, I am highly satisfied in my job	45%	35%	6%	10%
	My institution go out of way to make my work life easier	26%	26%	39%	10%
	My spouse, friends and relatives go out of way to make my work life easier	26%	35%	32%	3%
	It is very easy to talk with or approach my institution	23%	29%	23%	16%
	My spouse, friends and relatives has a great level of contribution for me at home	19%	42%	26%	3%
	My institution is very much willing to listen to my personal problems	13%	29%	35%	13%
	My co-workers are very much willing to listen to my problems	13%	35%	39%	3%
	My spouse, friends and relatives are very much willing to listen to my problems	19%	35%	29%	6%
	The child care duty in my home fully depends on me	32%	26%	29%	13%

	The primary responsibilities of household duties rely on me	26%	35%	29%	3%	6%
	I have to take care of a dependent on a regular basis (elder or disabled person)	19%	39%	13%	23%	6%

The table provided contains survey data grouped under three categories are discussed below

Work Environment - Positives

A majority (84%) agree or strongly agree that classrooms are cleansed and kept regularly, indicating institutional efforts toward cleanliness. 77% report that classrooms are effectively occupied and same time not overcrowded, supporting better teaching conditions.

Work Environment - Challenges

This has mixed reactions, with only 42% reporting satisfaction, thus needing attention to improve comfort in areas like (i) Interpersonal dynamics focus alarms, (ii) Moderate institutional harmony with 58%, (iii) Significant pressure reflected in subgroup rattles says almost half of them 45% and disagreements between teachers agreed about 39% respondents. These responses imply time restrictions pointedly influence teaching value and practical application, with 45% facing challenges and hard to incorporate practical elements in syllabus.

Career Development – Strengths

Witnessed a great deal of positivity in the career opportunities category 77%-90% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that promotion paths, job skills utility, and creativity in teaching are present within their role. Employment prospects are favorable 70% find ease in transitioning to similar roles if required.

Career Development - Areas for Concern

Insecurity occurs on jobs for their qualifications, indicating a need for broader career visibility or skill diversification.

Social Environment – Positives

External relationships, including support from relatives and spouses, rank positively 61% admits their family supports their career. Along with peer willingness to listen 48% suggests moderate workplace companionship.

Social Environment - Institutional defects

Only about 52% feel their workplace builds ease work life, with nearly half expressing dissatisfaction or neutrality regarding the institution's willingness to address personal problems.

Full hypothesis-testing output over correlations, regression, and ANOVA analysis

H01 and H02: Correlation results

1. Work Environment (Work Env) and Stress:

Sample Size (N): 218; The sample size is fairly strong and supporting the consistency of the statistical interpretation.

Table - 3

Predictor	Outcome	r	p-value	N	Decision ($\alpha = 0.05$)
Work Env	Stress	0.1462	0.031	218	Reject H01
Social Env	Stress	0.1093	0.1075	218	Retain H02

Correlation Coefficient (r): 0.1462 - This implies a weak positive correlation between "Work Env" and "Stress", signifying that as factors related to the work environment more challenging, noticed level of stress cultivate to intensification to an extent.

p-value: 0.031 - p-value is less than set α 0.05, observed its statistically significant. Thus, the null hypothesis (H01). "There is no correlation between Work Environment and Stress" this is rejected. This outcome shows the relationship between Work Env and Stress is improbable proper to random chance.

2. Social Environment (Social Env) and Stress:

Correlation Coefficient (r): 0.1093 - reflects a very weak, but again positive correlation, indicating that while there are some kinds of relation, but there is not strong evidence to underscore these.

p-value: 0.1075 - is greater than α 0.05, relationship is not statistically significant; result, the null hypothesis (H02). There is no correlation between Social Environment and Stress is retained. This suggests observed association between Social Env and Stress chance of random results rather than an underlying consistent relationship.

H03: Multiple regression (Work + Social → Stress)

Regression model: Stress = $B_0 + B_1$ (Work Env) + B_2 (Social Env).

Table - 4

Parameter	B	SE	t	p-value
Intercept	2.9617	0.3249	9.1165	<0.001
Work Env	0.1589	0.1025	1.5502	0.1226
Social Env	0.045	0.0782	0.576	0.5652

1. Intercept

B: 2.9617 - This indicates the expected value of the dependent variable when all predictors (WorkEnv and SocialEnv) are set to 0. It exemplifies the standard point. SE 0.3249 - small value indicates a high level of precision in the estimate of the intercept.

t-value: 9.1165 - a very large value, indicating that the intercept is significantly different from zero. At the same time p-value indicates <0.001, significant p-value indicate the intercept is highly statistically significant. This means the baseline value of the dependent variable is unlikely to be zero due to random variation.

2. Work Environment (Work Env)

B: 0.1589 - positive coefficient, but it's a weak positive relationship between WorkEnv and the dependent variable. This suggests, need for better work environment and predicts a slight increase in the dependent outcome. SE 0.1025 - comparatively high SE compared to the coefficient indicates some inexactitude in the estimate. Will result from sample variability, measurement errors, or insufficient explanatory power of this variable.

t-value: 1.5502 - a moderate value proposes evidences of the predictor's effect, but it is not sufficiently strong to rule out random noise.

p-value: 0.1226 - The p-value exceeds the conventional significance threshold $\alpha = 0.05$. WorkEnv is not statistically significant, relationship between WorkEnv and the dependent variable may be due to chance or influenced by limitless features.

3. Social Environment (Social Env)

B: 0.045 - This coefficient explains very weak positive association between SocialEnv and the dependent variable, implying negligible practical impact. SE 0.0782 - is almost doubled the magnitude of the coefficient, reflecting a low precision in the estimate and moderate fit.

t-value: 0.576 - low t-value suggests marginal evidence on a meaningful impact in the model. **p-value:** 0.5652 - value far exceeds 0.05, confirming that SocialEnv is not statistically significant. The observation proved, effect on the dependent variable is likely due to random variation.

Ho4: ANOVA for stress by marital status

One-way ANOVA with Stress as the dependent variable and Marital Status as the factor:

Table - 5

Effect	F	p-value	df_between	df_within
Marital Status	0.4473	0.815	5	211

Effect Size indicates the small F-value of 0.4473 and higher p-value 0.815 put together indicate that marital status explains little to no variance in the dependent variable. The lack of statistical impact advises that marital status may not play a significant role in describing differences in the dependent variable. The sample size of 217 survey data, appears adequate for analyzing the ANOVA, suggesting the results are unlikely due to insufficient statistical power.

Null Hypothesis (Ho): The means of the dependent variable are equal across the marital status groups.

Alternative Hypothesis (HA): At least one group mean differs from the others.

Decision: the p-value ($p = 0.815$) is greater than 0.05, fail to reject the null hypothesis. This means there is no evidence to suggest that marital status has a significant effect on the dependent variable in this study.

Conclusion

The organization's got its hands full of challenges, like environmental issues and interpersonal conflicts getting in the way of teamwork. Workload management's a big pain point, with time constraints and heavy workloads causing stress. And let's be real, social-emotional support's lacking employees are getting more support outside the office than from their own institution. The analysis reveals a significant correlation between Work Environment stress ($r = 0.1462$, $p = 0.031$), indicating that work environment contributes to stress levels. In contrast, SocialEnv shows a weak, non-significant correlation ($r = 0.1093$, $p = 0.1075$). The regression analysis found only the intercept to be statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), with WorkEnv ($p = 0.1226$) and SocialEnv ($p = 0.5652$) showing limited explanatory power. The findings suggest that enhanced study designs, improved variable measurements, and expanded methodologies are needed to better understand these relationships. Additionally, the analysis found no significant relationship between marital status and the dependent variable, highlighting the need for future research to consider other factors or refine variables.

To gain a deeper understanding, it's vital to understand and explore other factors that leads to influencing the analysis:

- Demographic factors: age, education level, job type, or income range
- Psychological factors: personality traits, job satisfaction, and stress levels

References

1. A.A. Usoro, L. U. Akah, I. U. Etuk, December 2023; Career Development Demands Related Stress and Academic Employees' Effectiveness in two Nigerian Federal Universities; Available at: www.openaccessglobal.com.
2. Brian Heshizer, Debra Erdos Knapp, October 2016; Revisiting the Buffering Hypothesis: Social Support, Work Stressors, Stress Related Symptoms, and Negative Affectivity in a Sample of Public School Teachers; Available at: www.scirp.org.
3. Brindha Natarajan., Soundarya, S., Umamaheswari, B., & Kavyashree, K. (2025). Factors influencing work-family conflict: A meta-analysis review. International Journal of Research in Human Resource Management, 7(2), 559–568. Available at: www.humanresourcejournal.com.
4. Dr. R. Rethina Bai., Head, Mrs. K. Hemalatha, 2025; A Study On Work Life Balance Of Women School Teacher's Working In Private Schools In Chennai; International Journal of Environmental Sciences Vol. 11 No. 24s; Available at: www.theaspd.com.
5. Kaviya M, Mohana Priya R, 2025; A Study on Work Life Balance of Women School Teacher's Working in Private Schools; Available at: www.eelet.org.uk.
6. Maas J, Schoch S, Scholz U, Rackow P, Schüler J, Wegner M, Keller R., Mar 2021; Teachers' perceived time pressure, emotional exhaustion and the role of social support from the school principal. Soc Psychol Educ. 2021;24(2):441-464.
7. Ms. Khushali Patel, Dr. Rasikbhai I Prajapati, May 2021; A Study of Job Stress Among Women School Teachers in Ahmedabad District; Available at: www.jetir.org.
8. Ngunlin Wangsu, Dr. Jerina Begum, February 2025; Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction Among Female Educators In India; IJCRT Volume 13, Issue 2;
9. Nirmala Dorasamy, Mpho Kenneth Letooane, 23 December 2015; Job and career satisfaction in higher education institutions: a case study of university "A" in South Africa; Available at: www.businessperspectives.org.
10. Tsubono K, Oba K, Fudetani Y, Ikeda C, Sakamoto J, 2024 Feb 9; Multidimensional analysis of schoolteachers' occupational stress by the New Brief Job Stress Questionnaire: focusing on gender differences; Ind Health.; 62(1):39-55.
11. Xieping Chen & Qian Xie, 01 July 2025; The relationship between job stress, resilience, emotional intelligence, and job satisfaction among college teachers.