



Work Related Stress and its Causes among Selected Built Environment Academics in Nigerian Tertiary Institutions

Obalola, T.F. and Amuda-Yusuf, G.

Abstract: Work related stress has negative effect on productivity and satisfaction among workers in various field. An important barrier to understanding how work-related stress affects individual academics in the built environment is scarcity of empirical studies in the area. As a result, this study aims at examining the main causes of stress and the level of risks associated with the stress among academics in the built environment. Questionnaires were administered to academics in the built environment faculties, schools and institutes offering courses such as Architecture, Building, Estate Management, Quantity surveying, Surveying and Geoinformatics and Urban and Regional Planning in the South West and North Central geopolitical zones of Nigeria. A systematic sampling technique was adopted to administer the questionnaire to respondents. The results show that work related stress among built environment academics is high (>60% on work related stress grading scale) and causes were classified into organizational factors, job demand and job role. The most important risk factors were also identified as problem with office accommodation inadequate temperature control, lack of privacy (physical factors), poor communication, lack of career progression and job insecurity (organizational and job role factors). Due to the high level of work-related stress among academics in the built environment, their performance in discharging duties in terms of research and teaching have been affected. Management of higher institutions should provide incentives and enabling environment to individual lecturer to address those factors identified in other to improve their overall performance.

Keywords: Academics; Built environment; Productivity; Performance; Work-Related Stress

I. Introduction

Work plays a central role in life and subsequent health, well-being and happiness, but it is also a potential source of stress. According to [1] nearly every work is a source of stress to the work holder. Stress threatens the mental and physical health of individual and also decreases levels of job satisfaction and productivity [2]. [3]opined that work stress impact negatively on productivity and job satisfaction among workers

in different profession. It is also believed to be a major contributor to absenteeism, low employee morale, high accident and turnover rates as well as increasing medical expenses of many organizations. Academics in the built environment face a multitude of stressor in their work places. They work in a highly stressful circumstance and this contributes to an excessive level of work-related stress. This has implications not only for the individual lecturer but also for their employers and the society at large. Also, due to the demanding nature of the construction work, construction lecturers are doing their jobs as a construction professional and at the same time fulfilling the academic excellence as academics ignoring the stressor which influences their life. The interface between these two demands poses a serious stress on them.

Obalola, T.F. (Department of Quantity Surveying, Federal Polytechnic, Offa, P.M.B 420, Offa, Kwara State, Nigeria)

Amuda-Yusuf.G (Department of Quantity Surveying, University of Ilorin, P.M.B 1515, Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria)

Corresponding author: amuda.g@unilorin.edu.ng

Phone Number: +2348034507354.

Submitted: 16-01-2022

Accepted: 26-03-2022

According to [4] stress is not limited to any particular profession. However, the study of work related stress has been pursued within a number of occupations, including teaching [5], project managers [6], construction professionals [7], estimators [8]) and nursing [3]. The Nigerian tertiary institutions are characterized by massive expansion and high rate of student's enrollment; as a result, there are increased pressure, conflicting demands and high degree of uncertainty [1]. There is a dearth of research relating to the effects of work related stress as it affects the academics in the built environment of Nigerian higher institutions. This study focused on identifying the source of stress and the associated risks to academics in the built environment.

Stress is described as the harmful physical and emotional responses that can result from conflicts between job demands on the employee and the amount of control an employee has over meeting these demands [10]. According to [11] stress is described as (a) characteristics of external environment that acts on an individual (b) the individual's responses (psychological, physiological and behavioural to environmental demands, threat, and challenges, or the interaction of (a and b). [11] explained that environmental factors that triggers these processes are commonly referred to as stressors, while the individuals responses are generally called strains. According to [12] stress is a process by which workplace psychological experiences and demands (stressors) produce both short-term (strains) and long-term changes in mental and physical health. The study go further to state that, stress events includes lack of job security, layoffs, downsizing, organisational readjustment, changes in duties and responsibilities, changes in hours of work, changes in working conditions. People with

higher job insecurity have a higher risk of mental disorder as the anticipation of job loss has greater negative impact on mental health than actual loss [2].

Leung, [13] studied critical stressors influencing construction estimators in Hong Kong and indicated that workload; role conflict, job ambiguity and working environment are the most critical stressors influencing construction estimators in Hong Kong. [6] carried an exploratory study aimed at identifying the sources of stress, coping strategies and outcomes that are relevant to IT project managers in a large ICT organization and reported that stressors faced by project managers are similar to those being faced by other managers. [14] investigated the main causes of workplace stress within the construction industry and reported that the majority of respondents had suffered from stress, anxiety or depression as a direct result of working in the construction industry. Iben, [7] identified the key stress factors among professionals in the building construction industry in Nigeria and found that the principal sources of stress were high volume of work, uncomfortable site offices, lack of feedback on previous and ongoing building projects. Researchers such as [15, 11, 9, 2] have studied coping behaviours in relation to job induced stress for different occupation such as managers, engineers, nurses, pharmacists, teachers and supervisors. [15] investigated whether coping influence psychological adjustment among project managers and demonstrated that specific work related characteristics such as work experience, project size, age and level of education influenced the psychological adjustment of the project managers. [2] investigated the coping behavior of construction professionals in their working

environment and reported that rational problem solving was found to be used most frequently. The findings of the above studies have all pointed out many factors that can influence stress at work place and several coping mechanisms have also reported on how to cope with them.

The organizational stress theory stated that stress is not a single event, but a process involving appraisal, response, and attempts to cope with and manage stressors in order to meet goals [3]. It was further explained that strains is the adverse and potentially harmful reactions to stressful work from attempting to function effectively in the face of too many challenges such as counterproductive work behaviour, absenteeism, voluntary turnover, smoking excessive, eating and drinking [16].

The Job Demands-Control (JDC) model highlights the impact of work characteristics on stress, health, and occupational well-being [4]. Karasek asserts that the focus of JDC model is that highly demanding jobs that allow little control over work are most likely to lead to reduction in well-being and to induce strain. This model considered that such conditions would lead to individual continually dedicating high amounts of cognitive resources to meeting demands and if the work demands are sustained, it would lead to individual's body beginning to run out of resources, followed by impairment of physical functioning and psychological well-being. The resources refers to many things, such as objects, energy, personal characteristics and conditions that enable employee to accomplish task assigned in an organisations [5]. The Karasek JDC model also posits that demanding work can engender positive outcomes when accompanied by high levels of control, such job is termed as "active job". This kind of job according to [19] will

engender greater levels of productivity and goal achievement than when control is low. Such employee will not experience job-related anxiety, health complaints, exhaustion and dissatisfaction because they can decide themselves how to meet their job demands [20]. On the other hand, jobs characterised by low demands and low control are termed as passive jobs because workers usually experience a level of strain as a result of boredom and inability to control their works. The low strain jobs are described as jobs that are characterised by low demands but high levels of control. Under this job conditions, workers would have the autonomy to adopt high levels of skill without the pressure of high demands [4, 6].

The JDC theory was further extended to account for workplace social support as a third predictor of well-being and strain. The extended model is known as as the Job Demand-Control-Support model(JDCS). Job demands refers to physical, social or organisational aspects of the job that required physical or mental effort; Job control relates to individuals ability to effects a desired change on their work environment. The ability of a worker to intervene and change work processes may reduce inherently stressful conditions of having insufficient resources to complete tasks [10]. The JDCS model is further illustrated in Figure 1, using job demand and control.

Job demand encompasses various element at work that individual subjectivity experienced. Such as work overload, time pressure, unexpected task, job related personal conflict and role ambiguity [6]. The workplace social support refers to helpful relationships of work regarding job-related matters generally encountered with supervisors and coworkers. This is an aspect of employees social capital which is the extent to which relationships of

work are valuable to the employee in terms of acquiring task information or assistance [17, 19].

Resources	High	Low strain High motivation	Average strain High motivation
	Low	Low strain Average motivation	Average strain Low motivation
		Low	High
		Demands	

Figure 1: Job-demand-control support model
(Adapted from [20])

According to [15] job demands to mean those physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that involve constant physical and/or psychological (cognitive and emotional) effort and are therefore connected with certain physiological and/or psychological costs. Examples are a high work pressure, role overload, poor environmental conditions and problems related to reorganization. While job resources are those physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that are either/or [7]:

- functional in achieving work goals;
- reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs;
- stimulate personal growth and development.

Job resources according to [15] are often found at the top management level of an organization, for example pay, career opportunities, job security and at the interpersonal level (e.g., supervisor and co-worker support, team climate), at the level of the organization of work (e.g., role clarity, participation in decision-making), and at the task level (e.g. performance

feedback, skill variety, task significance, task identity, autonomy. This may in its turn lead to withdrawal from work, and reduced motivation or commitment [8]. When the external environment lacks resources, individuals cannot reduce the potentially negative influence of high job demands and they cannot achieve their work goals. In such a situation, reducing commitment can be an important self-protection mechanism that may prevent the future frustration of not obtaining work-related goals [22, 23, 20].

The study is set to answer the following questions: What are the main factors causing stress; are there stress factors related to the organizational environment and; what is the level of risk associated with the stress factors. It is on this note that the present study set out to examine work related stress and factors that assist in coping with stress among academics in the built environment.

II. Materials and Method

Twenty (20) variables of work-related stress **factors** adopted from the studies by [6, 14] respectively were used in assessing respondent's perception on stress. The variables were grouped into four factors: physical, organizational, job demand and job role. The study targeted some academics in the built environment such as architects, quantity surveyors, builders, planners, estate valuers and surveyors in the Federal Universities and Polytechnics located within southwest and north central part of Nigeria. These groups of respondents were chosen because they are of interest in the built environment and responsible for teaching construction related courses. The institutions include three Federal Universities (Akure, Ife & Ilorin) and three Federal Polytechnics (Bida, Offa & Ede). These

institutions were chosen because they have faculty/school of environmental studies that offer built environment related courses. Systematic sampling technique was used in selecting respondents. A total of 150 emails containing the questionnaires were sent out to participants. However, only 125 responded representing a response rate of 83%.

Systematic sampling technique was adopted; this according to [24] minimizes bias. Frequency and percentage scores were adopted for the descriptive statistics, while cross tabulation and Chi-Square tests were conducted to examine association between some selected socio-demographic attributes of respondents and their overall perception of work-related stress factors.

A. Scoring

The assessment of the work related risk factors was graded based on respondent's perception. There are six questions on physical factors, nine questions for organizational factors, eight questions for job demand factors and six questions for job role factors. A 5-point Likert Scale ranging from strongly disagree (SD) 1, disagree (D) 2, Neutral (N) 3, agree (A) 4, to strongly agree (SA) 5 was used. Percentage scores was computed as ratio of respondent's total score to maximum score obtainable. Thus, the overall perception of respondents for each of the four scales (physical, organizational, job demand and role) was calculated based on this.

Risk factor was graded as low if < 40%, as Mild if 40 – 59% and as High if > 60%

III. Results and Discussion

A. Demographic Information

About 72 (57.6%) of the respondents sampled are lecturing in the Polytechnic while the rest (42.4%) are from the University.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Demographic Profile of respondents (N=125)	Frequency	Percentage
Professional background		
Quantity Surveyor	51	40.8
Architect	14	11.2
Builder	17	13.6
Estate Valuer	19	15.2
Planner	12	9.6
Surveyor	12	9.6
Respondents Age		
20-30	6	4.8
31-40	38	30.4
41-50	33	26.4
51-60	42	33.6
> 60	6	4.8
Academic Qualifications		
HND	15	12.0
B.Tech/ B.Sc.	15	12.0
PGD	9	7.2
M.Sc./ M.Tech	53	42.4
PhD	33	26.4
Academic Cadre		
Professor	4	3.2
Reader	5	4.0
Chief Lecturer	2	1.6
Principal Lecturer	8	6.4
Senior Lecturer	27	21.6
Lecturer 1	23	18.4
Others	56	44.8
Number of years in service		
<5 years	30	24.0
6-10years	43	34.4
11-15years	8	6.4
16-20years	29	23.2
>20 years	15	12.0

Results in Table 1 shows that 40.8% of the respondents sampled are Quantity Surveyors, 15.2% Estate Valuer, 13.6% Builder, 11.2% Architect, 9.6% Planner and Surveyor. In terms of age distribution, 33.6% are in the age bracket of 51-60, 30.4% in the bracket of 31-40, 26.4% in the bracket of 41-50, 4.8% respectively for age bracket of 20-30 and >60. About 42.4%

had M.Sc./ M.Tech, 26.4% PhD, 12% respectively had HND and B.Tech/ B.Sc. and 7.2% Post-Graduate Diploma (PGD). In terms of academic cadre, 21.6% are Senior Lecturer, 18.4% Lecturer 1, 6.4 Principal Lecturer, 4% Reader (Associate Professor), 3.2% Professor, 1.6% Chief Lecturer and 44.8% other cadres. About 34.4% of respondents have spent between 6-10 years in service, 24% <5 years, 23.2% between 16-20 years, 12% >20years and 6.4% between 11 -15 years.

B. Work Related Stress Factors

The results in Table 2 show that more than half (50%) of respondents strongly agree or agree that work related stress due to physical environment is one of the major challenges they are facing in discharge of their duties. For instance, 40% and 17.8% agree and strongly agree respectively that there is inadequate ventilation in their offices and lecture rooms. Similarly, 38.4% and 32.8% agree and strongly agree respectively that they are having problem with office accommodation. Results equally show that lack of privacy, poor lighting, inadequate temperature control and noise level follow a similar pattern. In general, the overall results on respondents' perception on work related stress due to physical factors reveal that 73.6% rated it to be high while 23.2% rated it moderate and 3.2% low.

C. Association between Socio-Demographic Profile and Perception on Work Related Risk Factor (Physical)

The main thrust of this section is to examine the relationship that exists between some-demographic attributes of respondents and work-related stress due to physical environment condition. Thus, a cross-tabulation Chi-square test was conducted. Results (Table 2) reveal that there is no statistical association at 0.05

level of significance between age of respondents and their overall perception of work related stress due to physical environment ($\chi^2 = 11.767$, $p > 0.05$). What this suggest is that based on age category, the respondents do not differ much in their perception on work related stress due to physical environment. For example, in all the age groups, less than 7% rated the work related risk factor low while more than 40% high for each of the age categories.

related stress due to physical environment to be high. No significant relationship exists between academic cadre and work related stress ($\chi^2 = .449$, $p > 0.05$). Meaning that respondents, based on their academic cadre do not differ much in their overall perception of work related stress with respect to physical environment factors.

For work related stress due to organizational factor (Table 3), results reveal that majority of the respondents agree or strongly agree that inadequate staffing (69.6%), poor communication (61.4%), poor planning (67.2%), insufficient training (52.8%), poor relation with superior (56%) and crisis management (52.8%) are some of the major causes of worked related stress associated with their organization.

The next socio-demographic variable considered was academic qualification, results reveal that there is a statistical significant association between academic qualification of respondents and their overall perception of work related stress due to physical environment ($\chi^2 = 27.547$, $p < 0.05$). In other words, academic qualification influenced the perception of the respondents about work related stress. For example, 26.7% of respondents with HND certificates perceived the stress level to be high compared to those with B.Tech/ B.Sc. (80%),

Table 4: Work Related Stress (Organizational)

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
Inadequate staffing	8 (6.4%)	22 (17.6%)	8 (6.4%)	32 (25.6%)	55 (44.0%)	125 (100%)
Poor communication	8(6.4%)	16 (12.8%)	24 (19.2%)	49 (39.2%)	28 (22.4%)	125 (100%)
Poor planning	1 (0.8%)	17 (13.6%)	23 (18.4%)	56 (44.8%)	28 (22.4%)	125(100%)
Insufficient training	6 (4.8%)	32 (25.6%)	21 (16.8%)	49 (39.2%)	17 (13.6%)	125 (100%)
Lack of feedbacks	4 (3.2%)	25 (20.0%)	34 (27.2%)	51 (40.8%)	11 (8.8%)	125 (100%)
Interpersonal conflicts	11(8.8%)	32 (25.6%)	25 (20.0%)	39 (31.2%)	18 (14.4%)	125 (100%)
Poor relation with superior	13 (10.4%)	24 (19.2%)	18 (14.4%)	49 (39.2%)	21 (16.8%)	125 (100%)
Bulling	32 (25.6%)	25 (20.0%)	35 (28.0%)	18 (14.4%)	15 (12.0%)	125 (100%)
Crisis management	13 (10.4%)	21 (16.8%)	25 (20.0%)	50 (40.0%)	16 (12.8%)	125 (100%)
Overall perception of respondents on work related stress (Organizational factors) (N=125)						
Low	Moderate		High			
4 (3.2%)	34 (27.2%)		87 (69.6%)			

Table 5: Association between Socio-demographic Profile and Overall Perception on Risk Factor (Organizational)

Age	Risk factors (Organizational)			Total	Statistics χ^2	P value
	Low	Mild	High			
20-30	1 (16.7)	4 (66.6%)	1 (16.7%)	6 (100%)	19.038	.015**
31-40	0 (0.0%)	10 (26.3%)	28 (73.8%)	38 (100%)		
41-50	3 (9.1%)	11 (33.3%)	19 (57.6%)	33 (100%)		
51-60	0 (0.0%)	8 (19.0%)	34 (81.0%)	42 (100%)		
above 60	0 (0.0%)	1 (16.7%)	5 (83.7%)	6 (100%)		
Academic qualification						
HND	2 (13.3%)	6 (40.0%)	7 (46.7%)	15 (100%)		
B.Tech/ B.Sc.	0 (0.0%)	7 (46.7%)	8 (53.3%)	15 (100%)		
PGD	0 (0.0%)	2 (22.2%)	7 (77.8%)	9 (100%)		
M.Sc./ M.Tech	2 (3.8%)	13 (24.5%)	38 (71.7%)	53 (100%)		
PhD	0 (0.0%)	6 (18.2%)	27 (81.8%)	33 (100%)		
Academic Cadre					9.237	.042**
Professor	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)	3 (75.0%)	4 (100%)		
Reader	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	4 (80.0%)	5 (100%)		
Chief Lecturer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)		
Principal Lecturer	0 (0.0%)	2 (25.0%)	6 (75.0%)	8 (100%)		
Senior Lecturer	1 (3.7%)	4 (14.8%)	22 (81.5%)	27 (100%)		
Lecturer 1	0 (0.0%)	5 (21.7%)	18 (78.3%)	23 (100%)		
Others (Non-teaching Staff	3 (5.4%)	21 (37.5%)	32 (57.1%)	56 (100%)		

Statistics is significant at 0.05**

PGD (100%), M.Sc./ Mtech (77.4%) and PhD (78.8%). Based on the breakdown of results, it could be said that majority of respondents with higher educational qualification perceived work. However, the respondents do not perceive bulling to be a problem with respect to work

related stress. Based on the variables, the results for their overall perception on work related stress revealed that 69.6% perceived work-related stress due to organizational factor to be high while 27.2% perceived it to be moderate and 3.2% low.

Table 6: Work Related Stress (Job Demand)

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
Too much work	7 (5.6%)	10 (8.0%)	7 (5.6%)	38 (30.4%)	63 (50.4%)	125 (100%)
Too little work	41(32.8%)	50 (40.0%)	15 (12.0%)	16 (12.8%)	3 (2.4%)	125 (100%)
Hours' work	4 (3.2%)	18 (14.4%)	19 (15.2%)	54 (43.2%)	30 (24.0%)	125(100%)
Lack of participation in decision making	10 (8.0%)	30 (24.0%)	28 (22.4%)	45 (36.0%)	12 (9.6%)	125 (100%)
Pressure	3 (2.4%)	11 (8.8%)	24 (19.2%)	48 (38.4%)	39 (31.2%)	125 (100%)
Ambitious deadlines	8 (6.4%)	13 (10.4%)	21 (16.8%)	53 (42.4%)	30 (24.0%)	125 (100%)
Insufficiently skilled for job	12 (9.6%)	40 (32.0%)	23 (18.4%)	37 (29.6%)	13 (10.4%)	125 (100%)
Working in isolation	18 (14.4%)	36 (28.8%)	26 (20.8%)	35 (28.0%)	10 (8.0%)	125 (100%)
Overall perception of respondents on work related stress (Job Demand factors) (N=125)						
Low	Moderate		High			
5 (4.0%)	24 (19.2%)		96 (76.8%)			

Table 7: Association between Socio-Demographic Profile and Overall Perception on Risk Factor (Job Demand)

Age	Risk factors (Job Demand)			Total	Statistics χ^2	P value
	Low	Mild	High			
20-30	0 (0.0%)	3 (50.0%)	3 (50.0%)	6 (100%)	7.256	.188
31-40	0 (0.0%)	10 (26.3%)	28 (73.7%)	38 (100%)		
41-50	3 (9.1%)	5 (15.2%)	25 (75.8%)	33 (100%)		
51-60	2 (4.8%)	6 (14.3%)	34 (81.0%)	42 (100%)		
above 60	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (100%)	6 (100%)		
Academic qualification					15.858	.041**
HND	1 (6.6%)	7 (46.7%)	7 (46.7%)	15 (100%)		
B.Tech/ B.Sc.	0 (0.0%)	4 (26.7%)	11 (73.3%)	15 (100%)		
PGD	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (100%)	9 (100%)		
M.Sc./ M.Tech	4 (7.5%)	7 (13.2%)	42 (79.2%)	53 (100%)		
PhD	0 (0.0%)	6 (18.2%)	27 (81.8%)	33 (100%)		
Academic Cadre					9.597	.184
Professor	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)		
Reader	0 (0.0%)	2 (40.0%)	3 (60.0%)	5 (100%)		
Chief Lecturer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)		
Principal Lecturer	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	6 (75.0%)	8 (100%)		
Senior Lecturer	1 (3.7%)	4 (14.8%)	22 (81.5%)	27 (100%)		
Lecturer 1	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.3%)	22 (95.7%)	23 (100%)		
Others (Non-teaching Staff)	3 (5.4%)	16 (28.6%)	37 (76.8%)	56 (100%)		

Statistics is significant at 0.05**

The results in Table 5 show that there is a significant statistical association between age of respondents and perception of work related stress from the organization factor ($\chi^2 = 19.038$, $p < 0.05$). Similarly, a significant relationship also exists between academic qualification of respondents and perception of work related

stress ($\chi^2 = 13.424$, $p < 0.05$), and academic cadre and work related stress ($\chi^2 = 9.237$, $p < 0.05$).

For last factor, (job role) results in Table 8 show that more than 40% of respondents agree that lack of clarity about responsibility, conflicting demands, and inadequate management support are some of the job role

Table 8: Work Related Stress (Job Role)

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
Lack of clarity about responsibility	11 (8.8%)	24 (19.2%)	27 (21.6%)	50 (40.0%)	13 (10.4%)	125 (100%)
Conflicting demands	18 (6.4%)	22 (17.6%)	29 (23.2%)	51 (40.8%)	15 (12.0%)	125 (100%)
Inadequate management support	5 (4.0%)	15 (12.0%)	19 (15.2%)	54 (43.2%)	32 (25.6%)	125(100%)
Lack of career progression	19 (15.2%)	32 (25.6%)	19 (15.2%)	36 (28.8%)	19 (15.2%)	125 (100%)
Job insecurity	38 (30.4%)	26 (20.8%)	17 (13.6%)	30 (24.0%)	14 (11.2%)	125 (100%)
Poor remuneration	9 (7.2%)	13 (10.4%)	13 (10.4%)	36 (28.8%)	54 (43.2%)	125 (100%)
Overall perception of respondents on work related stress (Job Role factors) (N=125)						
Low	Moderate		High			
6 (4.8%)	34 (27.2%)		85 (68.0%)			

Table 9: Association between Socio-demographic Profile and all Perception on Risk Factor (Job Role)

Age	Risk factors (Job Role)			Total	Statistics χ^2	P value
	Low	Mild	High			
20-30	1 (16.7%)	3 (50.0%)	2 (33.3%)	6 (100%)	7.521	.482
31-40	1 (2.6%)	9 (23.7%)	28 (73.7%)	38 (100%)		
41-50	3 (9.1%)	7 (21.2%)	23 (69.7%)	33 (100%)		
51-60	1 (2.4%)	13 (31.0%)	28 (66.7%)	42 (100%)		
above 60	0 (0.0%)	2 (33.3%)	4 (66.7%)	6 (100%)		
Academic qualification					16.752	.031**
HND	1 (6.7%)	8 (53.3%)	6 (40.0%)	15 (100%)	7.926	.779
B.Tech/ B.Sc.	1 (6.7%)	2 (13.3%)	12 (80.0%)	15 (100%)		
PGD	0 (0.0%)	1 (11.1%)	8 (88.9%)	9 (100%)		
M.Sc./ M.Tech	4 (7.5%)	10 (18.9%)	39 (73.6%)	53 (100%)		
PhD	0 (0.0%)	13 (39.4%)	20 (60.6%)	33 (100%)		
Academic Cadre						
Professor	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)	3 (75.0%)	4 (100%)	7.926	.779
Reader	0 (0.0%)	2 (40.0%)	3 (60.0%)	5 (100%)		
Chief Lecturer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)		
Principal Lecturer	0 (0.0%)	3 (37.5%)	5 (62.5%)	8 (100%)		
Senior Lecturer	2 (7.4%)	10 (37.0%)	15 (55.6%)	27 (100%)		
Lecturer 1	0 (0.0%)	4 (17.4%)	19 (82.6%)	23 (100%)		
Others (Non-teaching Staff)	4 (7.1%)	14 (25.0%)	38 (67.9%)	56 (100%)		

Statistics is significant at 0.05**

factors that bring about work related stress. Also more than 20% agree that lack of career progression, job insecurity and poor remuneration are some other factors responsible for work related stress. In terms of their overall perception on work related stress due to job role based on the six variables considered, results reveal that 68% perceived stress level to be high while 27.2 % said is moderate and 4.8% low.

The results (Table 9) show that age does not have a statistical significant association with work related stress due to job role ($\chi^2 = 7.521$, $p > 0.05$). In other words, the respondent's perception on work related stress tended to be the same. Looking closely at the results, with the exception of age category 20-30, the percentage that perceived work related stress as being high was above 60% for all the other age categories.

For academic qualification, results reveal that a significant relationship exist between it and work related stress due to job role ($\chi^2 = 16.752, p < 0.05$). What this result suggests is that higher academic qualification is associated with work related stress due to job role. A closer look at the breakdown of the results show that majority of respondents (>60%) with Bachelor's degree and above perceived work related stress due to job role to be high compared to those with HND (40%). Academic cadre as shown by results in Table 9 does not have statistically significant association with work related stress due to job role ($\chi^2 = 7.926, p > 0.05$).

IV. Conclusion

This study has identified the causes of work-related stress among selected built environment academics in some Nigerian higher institutions. A comprehensive literature review was conducted to identify 20 work related stress which was classified into four. The four factors are physical, organizational, job demand and job role. In order to obtain information on the perspective of the respondents regarding the factors, their responses were graded through scoring. Findings from the study reveal that the most important risk factors were: problem with office accommodation, inadequate temperature control, lack of privacy, poor communication, lack of career progression and job insecurity. The Chi-square tests show that there are no statistical associations between age and academic qualifications of the respondents and work related stress due to physical environment ($p > 0.05$). However, there is a significant association between academic qualification of respondents and their overall perception of work related stress due to physical environment ($\chi^2 = 27.547, p < 0.05$).

Academic qualification as revealed from the results influenced the perception of the respondents about work related stress as those with higher qualification (PGD, M.Sc., Ph.D.) perceived work related stress due to physical environment high in comparison to those with HND. In terms of organizational factors, the study found that work related stress is considered to be high. Also job demand and job role stress factors and associated risk are high. The chi square results revealed that significant relationship exists between academic qualification and perception on work rated stress due to job demand and job role ($p < 0.05$). In view of the findings from the study, it could be said therefore that job related stress is high among the concerned academics in Nigeria higher institutions. Management of higher institutions should provide incentives and enabling environment to individual lecturer to address those factors identified in other to improve their overall performance. Also, academics in built environment should be assisted in managing their stress by providing them with resource support so as to work at a pace that they find more manageable. Additional staff should be recruited to reduce workload on the lecturers in order to enhance performance and there should be a reduction in the number of students admitted into various programme in the institutions.

References

- [1] Kirkcaldy, B. and Furnham, A. "Stress Coping Styles Among German Managers", *Journal of Workplace Learning*, vol. 11, no. 2, 1999, pp. 22-26.
- [2] Yip, B. and Rowlinson, S. "Coping Strategies Among Construction Professionals: Cognitive and Behavioural Efforts to Manage Job

- Stressors”, *Journal for Education in the Built Environment*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2006, pp. 70-79.
- [3] McVicar, A. “Workplace Stress in Nursing: A Literature Review”, *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol. 6, no. 6, 2003, pp. 633- 642.
- [4] Leung, M.Y., Olomolaiye, P., Chong, A. and Lam, C.C.Y. “Impacts of Stress on Estimation Performance in Hong Kong”, *Construction Management and Economics*, vol. 23, 2005, pp. 891-903.
- [5] Tsai, E., Fung, L. and Chow, L. “Sources and Manifestations of Stress in Female Kindergarten Teachers”, *International Education Journal*, vol. 7, no. 3, 2006, pp. 364-370.
- [6] Richmond, A. and Skitmore, M. “Stress and Coping: A Study of Project Managers in a Large ICT Organization”, *Project Management Journal*, vol. 37, no. 5, 2006, pp. 5-16.
- [7] Ibem, O.E., Anosike, N.M., Azuh, D.A. and Mosaku, T.O. “Work Stress Among Professionals in the Building Construction Industry in Nigeria”, *Australasian Journal of Construction Economic and Building*, vol. 11, no. 33, 2011, pp. 45-55, 2011.
- [8] Leung, M.Y., Ng, S.T., Skitmore, M. and Cheung, S.O. “Critical Stressors Influencing Estimators in Hong Kong”, *Construction Management and Economics*, vol. 23, 2005, pp. 33-43.
- [9] Osinbanjo, A., Salau, O. and Oyewunmi, A. “Workplace Stress: Implications for Organisational Performance in a Nigerian Public University”, *Business: Theory and Practice*, vol. 17, no. 3, 2016, pp. 261-269.
- [10] Cooper, L. and Payne, R. “Causes, Coping and Consequences of Stress at Work”, *New York: Wiley*, 2008
- [11] Ganster, D. and Rosen, C. “Work Stress and Employee Health: A Multidisciplinary Review”, *Journal of Management*, vol. 39, no. 5, 2013, pp. 1085-1122.
- [12] Bamba, M. “Stress Management and Job Performance in the Industries Sector of Mali”, *Journal of Service Science and Management*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2016, pp. 189-194.
- [13] Leung, M.Y. Ng, S.T., Skitmore, M. and Cheung, S.O. “Critical Stressors Influencing Construction Estimators in Hong Kong”, *Construction Management and Economics*, vol. 23, 2005, pp. 33-43.
- [14] Campbell, N.S., Perry, S.J., Maertz, C.P., Allen, D.G. and Griffeth, R.W. “All You Need is Resources: The Effects of Justice and Support on Burnout and Turnover”, *Human Relations*, vol. 66, no. 6, 2013, pp. 759-782.
- [15] Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Nachreiner, F. and Schaufeli, W.B. “The Job Demands–Resources Model of Burnout”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, no. 86, 2001, pp. 499-512, 2001.
- [16] Kahn, R.L. and Byosiere, P. “Stress in Organizations”, in *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Palo Alto, Consulting Psychologists Press., 1992, pp. 571-650.
- [17] Griffin, M. and Clarke, S. “Stress and Well-being at Work”, in *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, vol. 3, 2011, pp. 359-397.
- [18] Karasek, R. “Job Demand, Job Decision Latitude and Mental Strain: Implications for Job Redesign”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 2, 1979, pp. 285-306.
- [19] Fila, M. “The Job Demands, Control, Support Model: Where Are We Now?”, *International Journal for Research in Management*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2016, pp. 15-44, 2016.
- [20] Baker, A. and Demerouti, E. “The Job Demands-Resource Models: State of the Art”, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 22, no. 3, 2007, pp. 309-328.
- [21] Pinto, J.K., Dawood, S. and Pinto, M. “Project Management and Burnout: Implication of the Demand-Control-Support Model on Project-

based work”, *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 32, 2014, pp. 378-589.

[22] Baker, A.B., Demerouti, E., Taris, T., Schaufeli, W. and Schreus, P. “Job Demands and Job Resources as Predictors of Absence Duration and Frequency”, *Journal of Vocational behaviour*, vol. 62, 2003a, pp. 341-356.

[23] Baker, A., Demerouti, E., Taris, T., Schaufeli, W. and Schreus, P. “A Multi-group

Analysis of the Job Demands-Resources Model in Four Home Care Organisations”, *International Journal of Stress Management*, vol. 10, 2003b, pp. 16-38.

[24] Aibinu, A.A. and Jagboro, G. “The Effects of Construction Delays on Project Delivery in Nigerian construction industry”, *International Journal of Project Management*, 20, , vol. 20, 2002, pp. 593-599., 2002.