



IMPACTS OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON CAUSES AND OUTCOMES OF OCCUPATIONAL STRESS: CASE OF JUDICIARY IN KPK PAKISTAN

Tehseen Ahmad^{1*}, Qamar Afaq Qureshi¹

¹ Department of Public Administration, Institute of Political and Administrative Studies, Gomal University
DIKhan, KP., PAKISTAN.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 24 October 2019
Received in revised form 02
March 2020
Accepted 31 March 2020
Available online 09 April
2020

Keywords:

Demographics stress; Job
stress; Experience stress;
Individual stressors;
Collective Stressors;
Outcomes of stress;
Judges' stress; III-Health;
Advocates' stress.

ABSTRACT

Everyone experiences stressful situations, though people react to them in different ways. The concept of stress has been identified as being a major protagonist of ill health and poor senses of wellbeing amongst all age groups. Several stress factors have been determined to affect both Judges and advocates. However, relevant literature does not adequately explore the effect of demographic variables on the stress factors. This study aimed to examine the differences between demographic characteristics and occupational stress. Data was collected through questionnaires by using 285 samples from all the twenty-five districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa per population size to include respondents from all over the province. A simple random sampling was used to determine the participants in the study. Seven (Age, Gender, Designation, Experience, Qualification, Residence, and Marital status) demographic attributes of the judges and advocates were taken from the literature to identify any mean differences between different groups of the respondents on demographic diversities. Data was analysed through t-test and One-way ANOVA. Results revealed that the questions regarding demographic relations were significantly contributed to revealing that opinion has changed due to six of seven variables.

Disciplinary: Public Administration & Management Sciences.

©2020 INT TRANS J ENG MANAG SCI TECH.

1. INTRODUCTION

The advocates and judges enjoy a high level of respect in society but at the same time they have huge responsibilities on their shoulders. Due to the psychologically demanding nature of the job they face occupational stress which leads to adverse health. The judges preside the courtrooms and after examining the evidence they have to make the judgments, similarly prosecutor help in an investigation on legal points and present the case in the court, Therefore due to immense nature of

the job, non-cooperating behaviour of the culprits, life threats from the accused, work overload, etc their job is very stressful (Freedy and Hobfoll, 2017).

By evaluating the relevant material on the specific topic the researchers refer to various stress factors, types of stress, which affect the turnover, performance, or burnout, except its demographic determinants (Eswi et al. 2013). However, numerous studies analysed the group means differences between the sources of stress, outcomes of stress and the demographic variables, specifically for advocates and judicial employees. The importance of this research can be examined from the fact that in Pakistan there are not enough studies or literature on occupational stress of judicial employees and secondly there is no mechanism to control or reduce the causes of stress. So the impact of demographic variables on occupational stress always remains poorly understood (Beheshtifar et al. 2011). Therefore, this research project's basic goal is to investigate the differences between the demographic variables and job stress factors for judges and advocates.

This study's hypotheses are

H#1 Respondents with a qualification of LLM have job stress score higher than LLB.

H#2 Judges have job stress score higher than the advocates.

H#3 Respondents having 21 plus years' experience have job stress score higher than the rest of the groups.

H#4 Females have job stress score higher than males.

H#5 Rural respondents have job stress score higher than urban.

H#6 Age change response on all research variables.

H#7 Married respondents have job stress score higher than unmarried ones.

H#3 and H#6 test with ANOVA, while the rest uses tests of significance.

Table 1: List of Demographic Variables

	Demographic Variables	Codes	Explanation
1	Age	AGE	Age of the respondent
2	Gender	GDR	Male and female
3	Experience	EXP	Years of experience
4	Status	STS	Judge and advocate
5	Residency	RES	Urban, Rural
6	Qualification	QUA	Bachelor of Law (LLB), Master of Law (LLM)
7	Marital status	MRS	Single, Married

Table 1 lists all the research demographic variables.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Occupational stress is a physical or psychological pressure that appears when there will be a conflict between resources and job demands (Malik, 2011). Term job stress is utilised alternatively with occupational stress and work stress in the context of organisation (Kannan et al., 2015). It is generally caused when an imbalance occurs between the employees' abilities and work demands, a combination that can eventually lead to job burnout. Occupational stress is a general term that is defined as a temporary adaptation process causing psychological strain (Rasti and Salajeghe, 2019).

According to Malik (2011), occupational stress is one of the leading issues for today's employees and it appears from their reactions to their working situations and environment which threatened them (Kishori and Vinothini, 2016).

Job Stress can affect an organization with employee's intension to leave, absenteeism, poor performance and interpersonal difficulties (Freedy and Hobfoll, 2017). Job dissatisfaction is a common cause of occupational stress. (Golbasi et al., 2008) show a positive relationship between voluntary turnover, employee burnout, intention, and shows a negative relationship with organisational productivity and employee performance (Fox and Tang, 2017).

2.1 CAUSES OF STRESS

Stress is a physical and emotional strain caused due to our response to pressure. This is a response by the body to a stimulus that distracts regular functioning (Parveen and Inayat, 2017). The most observed sources of stress were uncertainty about the future, fear of failure, lack of confidence, nervousness, sadness, discomfort, depression, lack of confidence, lethargy, negative attitudes, fatigue and low temper, poor satisfaction with performance and decrees sleep. Identification of sources of stress will bring a positive change in performance and attitude (Kishori and Vinothini, 2016).

2.2 OUTCOMES OF STRESS

Anxiety, Depression, and trauma are the most commonly diagnosed psychological problems (Samartha and Begum, 2014). Numerous studies revealed that anxiety, stress and depression produce several negative outcomes at jobs such as dissatisfaction and decreased performance (Malik, 2011).




Figure 1: The study framework.

Figure 1, the proposed model showing the Impact of Demographic variables on causes of stress and their outcome.

2.3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data is collected through a standardized questionnaire. it is most feasible to collect data from big populations in less time and cost. Data collected from all the 25 districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Judges and advocates are the target population. Simple random sampling is used to collect the data. Initially, a pilot study was conducted to ensure the reliability and validity of the scales. A pilot study was carried by utilizing a specimen of 75 respondents. The scholar himself went and regulated the questionnaire among these respondents. Toal 285 questionnaires were floated and 252 were received back with a response rate of 88%. Seven demographic variables covering all the related characteristics, which are expected to influence their reactions, are included in the instrument on a seven-point Likert scale.

3. ANALYSED RESULTS

a. Mean Differences on Qualification Groups

In Table 2, the role of qualification is tested through a t-test. Due to qualification, the views of the respondents have been changed on two out of three variables. The views of the respondents have been changed on Collective Stressors and outcomes of stress, While no significant mean differences in the Individual stressors. Cohen (1998), stated about the level of effect size as small ($d= 0.20$), medium ($d=0.50$) & large ($d= 0.80$). Cohen d was computed to measure the effect size. The value of ($d= 0.22$) for Individual stressors, ($d= 0.51$) for Collective stressors, ($d= 0.63$) for outcomes. The magnitude of the difference in the means was small. Here the response rate is $2/3=66\%$, Two variables changed while one is insignificant. Thus, hypothesis H#1 is partially accepted.

Table 2: Independent Samples Test for groups based on Qualification [H#1]

Test		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Cohen's D
Individual stressors	EVA	0.13	0.71	0.08	252	0.93	0.22
	EVNA			0.08	17.17	0.93	
Collective Stressors	EVA	8.74	<0.01	-2.03	252	0.04	0.51
	EVNA			-1.40	15.87	0.01	
Outcomes	EVA	1.49	0.22	3.42	252	<0.01	0.63
	EVNA			3.39	179.04	<0.01	

Key: Equal variance assumed (EVA); Equal variance not assumed (EVNA)

b. Mean Differences on Designation

In Table 3, the difference of opinion occurs between advocates and Judges on collective stressors (independent variable) and outcomes of stress (dependent variable). Cohen d was calculated to measure the effect size and the value of ($d= 0.30$) for Individual stressors, ($d= 0.42$) for Collective stressors, ($d=0.25$) for outcomes. Here the response rate is $2/3=66\%$, therefore; hypothesis H#2 is partially accepted.

Table 3: Independent Samples Test for Designation [H#2]

		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Cohen's D
Individual stressors	EVA	35.12	<0.01	-2.42	252	0.30	0.30
	EVNA			-2.30	176.23		
Collective Stressors	EVA	0.09	0.75	-0.20	252	0.02	0.42
	EVNA			-0.20	243.55		
Outcomes	EVA	21.74	<0.01	-1.89	252	0.03	0.25
	EVNA			-1.83	202.13		

c. Mean Differences on Experience

In Table 4 One-way ANOVA was applied to check the group means difference. The results show the significant classification of the respondents because the hypothesis that the respondents having above 20 years' experience have job stress score higher than the rest of the groups, it stands true on all of the three variable i.e (individual stressors, Collective stressors, Outcomes). Therefore, hypothesis H#3 is accepted. Eta Square was calculated to measure the effect size and the value of ($d=0.00$) for Individual stressors, ($d= 0.06$) for Collective stressors, ($d= 0.09$) for outcomes.

Table 4: ANOVA for Experience-based mean differences (H#3).

Test		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Eta square
Individual stressor	Between Groups	0.08	2	48.76	33.01	<0.01	0.00
	Within Groups	51.52	250	1.47			
	Total	51.60	252				
Collective Stressors	Between Groups	0.08	2	15.44	2.64	0.05	0.06
	Within Groups	55.47	250	5.83			
	Total	55.55	252				
Outcomes	Between Groups	0.46	2	29.44	21.98	<0.01	0.09
	Within Groups	216.74	250	1.33			
	Total	217.21	252				

d. Mean Differences on Gender

In Table 5, a t-test was applied to check the group's means difference. The results show the significant classification of the respondents because the hypothesis was that females have job stress score higher than males. It stands true on three variables i.e (individual stressors, Collective stressors, Outcomes). Cohen d was calculated to measure the effect size and the value of (d = 0.53) for Individual stressors, (d= 0.60) for Collective stressors, (d = 0.73) for outcomes. Here the response rate is 3/3=100% Therefore the H#4 is accepted as true and substantiated.

Table 5: Independent Samples Test for Gender (H#4).

Test		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Cohen's D
Individual stressors	EVA	0.15	0.69	3.56	252	0.00	0.53
	EVNA			3.47	167.92	0.00	
Collective Stressors	EVA	1.49	0.22	3.42	252	0.00	0.60
	EVNA			3.39	179.04	0.00	
Outcomes	EVA	36.61	0.00	4.68	252	0.00	0.73
	EVNA			4.00	103.25	0.00	

e. Mean Differences on Residence

Table 6 shows an insignificant relationship among all the three variables because p-values fall beyond the required critical value of 0.05. The respondents either living in urban or rural areas have no difference of opinion. They have the same views. Thus, H#5 is rejected.

Table 6: Independent Samples Test for Residence (H#5)

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Cohen's D
		F	Sig.				
Individual stressors	EVA	0.87	0.34	0.48	250	0.632	0.6
	EVNA			0.46	162.91	0.641	
Collective Stressors	EVA	0.52	0.47	-0.33	250	0.741	0.4
	EVNA			-0.32	165.09	0.746	
Outcomes	EVA	0.93	0.33	-0.49	250	0.621	0.6
	EVNA			-0.48	167.13	0.627	

f. Mean Differences on Age

In Table 7, one-way ANOVA was applied to check the group means difference. The results show the significant classification of the respondents on individual stressors with a p-value of 0.05. While collective stressors and outcomes show insignificant results therefore, H#6 is partially substantiated (1/3). The effect size for the ANOVA was calculated through Eta square, which shows that the effect is statistically significant, low for organisational strategies and strong for the rest of the variables.

Table 7: Analysis of variances (ANOVA) Applications on Age Groups

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Eta-square
Individual stressors	Between Groups	1.24	2	0.62	3.03	0.05	0.04
	Within Groups	26.45	250	0.20			
	Total	27.69	252				
Collective Stressors	Between Groups	1.79	2	0.89	1.39	0.25	0.02
	Within Groups	82.88	250	0.64			
	Total	84.67	252				
Outcomes	Between Groups	0.90	2	0.45	0.95	0.38	0.01
	Within Groups	60.64	250	0.47			
	Total	61.54	252				

g. Mean Differences on Marital Status

In Table 8, the marital status has changed the views. Married people have job stress scores higher than the unmarried. This hypothesis stands true on all variables. Cohen d was calculated to measure the effect size and the value of (d= 0.50) for Individual stressors, (d= 0.33) for Collective stressors, (d= 0.79) for outcomes, (d=0.12) for Personal Strategies, (d= 0.09) for Organisational Strategies. The H#7 is therefore accepted as (3/3).

Table 8: Independent Samples Test for Marital status (H#7).

		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Cohen's D
Individual stressors	EVA	13.64	0.00	-4.13	105	0.00	0.50
	EVNA			-3.73	59.79	0.00	
Collective Stressors	EVA	9.78	0.00	-2.70	105	0.00	0.33
	EVNA			-2.84	104.66	0.00	
Outcomes	EVA	0.15	0.69	3.56	219	0.00	0.79
	EVNA			3.47	167.92	0.00	

Table 9: Summary Table Demographic Impacts

	QUA	DES	EXP	GDR	RES	AGE	MRS
Individual stressors	0.93	0.3	0.00	0.00	0.64	0.05	0.00
Collective stressors	0.04	0.02	0.05	0.00	0.74	0.25	0.00
Outcomes	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.38	0.00

Table 9 gives a summary of the overall results. The overall result is 86%. Six hypotheses out of seven stand true and only one hypothesis is rejected. The residency does not change the opinions of the respondents.

4. CONCLUSION

This study finds the group-mean differences due to demographic classification which provides the real nature of the issue and thus solution models will be developed accordingly. Almost all the demographic variables have affected the view of respondents on every research variable including causes and outcomes of occupational stress. The visible trend is that seniority in different aspects is creating differences of opinion. For example, respondents with a higher qualification, greater experiences and age are scoring higher. Likewise, females are also showing mean differences on all the variables as compared to their counterparts. It shows that all have similar mean job stress scores about the role of organizational practices to manage employees' occupational stress. The role of these factors is critical and significant in the contemporary environment of the judicial sector in KPK. While there is no difference of opinion of the respondents either living in urban or rural areas. They have the same views. The results verify the documented studies claiming the possible role of

demographic attributes in changing the viewpoint of respondents. Thus, keeping in view this research analysis the government and related organization should take the proper steps to reduce the level of stress among the employees.

5. DATA AND MATERIAL AVAILABILITY

Information regarding this study is available by contacting the corresponding author.

6. REFERENCES

- Beheshtifar, M., Hoseinifar, H., & Moghadam, M. (2011). Effect procrastination on work-related stress. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 38, 59-64.
- Eswi, A. S., Radi, S., & Youssri, H. (2013). Stress/stressors as perceived by baccalaureate Saudi nursing students. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 14(2), 193-202.
- Fox, J., & Tang, W. Y. (2017). Women's experiences with general and sexual harassment in online video games: Rumination, organizational responsiveness, withdrawal, and coping strategies. *New Media & Society*, 19(8), 1290-1307.
- Freedy, J., & Hobfoll, S. E. (2017). Conservation of resources: A general stress theory applied to burnout *Professional burnout* (pp. 115-129): Routledge.
- Kannan, P., & Suma, U. (2015). Managing Stress among Co-Operative Bank Employees in Palakkad district. *International Journal of Scientific Engineering and Applied Science*, 1(7), 22-24.
- Rasti, A., Salajeghe, S. (2019). Impacts of occupational stress and employee empowerment on employee alienation. *International Transaction Journal of Engineering, Management, & Applied Sciences & Technologies*. 10(7), 977-986.
- Malik, N. (2011). A study on occupational stress experienced by private and public banks employees in Quetta City. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(8), 3063-3070.
- Manjunatha, M., & Renukamurthy, T. (2017). Stress among Banking Employee-A Literature Review. *Int. J. Res. Granthaalayah*, 5, 207-213.
- Parveen, A., & Inayat, S. (2017). Evaluation of factors of stress among Nursing Students. *Advanced Practices in Nursing*, 2(2), 1000136.
- Samartha, V., & Begum, M. (2014). A comparative analysis of occupational stress among the employees in public and private sector banks in dakshina kannad district. *Bank management*, 2(2).



TehseenAhmad is a Ph.D. scholar at Dept. of Public Administration, Gomal University, D.I. Khan, KPK, Pakistan. He completed his M Phil from Qurtaba University . His research is in areas of Stress Management, Islamic Banking etc.



Dr. Qamar Afaq Qureshi is an Assistant Professor at Dept. of Public Administration, Gomal University, D.I. Khan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. He got his MPA & MPhil Degrees from DPA, GU, and Ph.D. from the Department of Management Sciences, Hazara University, Hazara. His research is focused on E-Health and HRM.