

AN INVESTIGATION INTO HARDINESS AND STRESS OF STAFF MEMBERS FROM UNIVERSITY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL RACES OF THE UNION

Myint San Oo¹

Abstract

The main aim of this study was to investigate hardiness and stress of staff members from University for the Development of the National Races of the Union (UDNR), Sagaing in 2021-2022 Academic Year. Survey research design and quantitative method were used in this study. The sample comprised 262 (Male = 80 and Female = 182) staff members from UDNR. The staff members' hardiness was measured by using Hardiness Scale (HS) (Bartone, Ursano, Wright & Ingraham, 1989) slightly modified version of a scale originally developed by Kobasa et al. (1981, 1982, cited in Bartone et al., 1989) and their stress was measured by using Perceived Stress Questionnaire (PSQ) developed by Levenstein et al. (1993). In order to investigate the differences in hardiness and stress by gender, age and work experience, descriptive statistics, independent samples *t*-test, One-Way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Pearson's Product-Moment correlation were used. The results of independent samples *t*-test showed that there were no statistically significant differences in hardiness and stress of staff members by gender. Again, One-Way ANOVA results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in hardiness and stress of staff members by age and work experience. Pearson's Product-Moment correlation revealed that staff members' hardiness was negatively and very weakly correlated with stress ($r = -0.108$).

Keyword: hardiness, stress, staff members

Introduction

Significance of the Study

Sun and Fu (2016, as cited in Chen & Tu, 2019) believed that hardiness is seen as an important factor in promoting individual's better adaptation to society. Hardiness was found to mediate in the stress-illness relationship and it was found that hardiness was an especially important personality characteristic in times of extreme stress (Kobasa, Maddi, & Kahn, 1982, as cited in Warka, 1996). Hardiness as suggested by Kobasa (1979, as cited in Grover, 2015) is a personality trait which helps an individual to perform well in spite of stressful environment. Lately, Maddi (2004, 2008) has characterized hardiness as a combination of three attitudes (commitment, control, and challenge) that together provide the courage and motivation needed to turn stressful circumstances from potential calamities into opportunities for personal growth (as cited in Grover, 2015).

Bogden (2011) stated that stress is a fact of life, regardless of one's vocation. Harvey et al. (2006) mentioned that stress is an important intermediary phase in the stress process which can be short or long in duration, depending on the nature of the stressor experienced. Stress, is to some degree, determined by one's perception or appraisal of its importance. Selye (1956, as cited in Lonser, 2016) stated that "stress is essentially the rate of all the wear and tear caused by life". Stress appraisal requires mobilization of coping efforts (Gass & Chang, 1989, as cited in Judkins, 2001). Bala and Kaur (2017) explained that work related stress generally occurs when there is a poor match between work related demands and attitudes, abilities, skills and needs of the worker.

¹ Educational Psychology Department, University for the Development of the National Races of the Union (UDNR)

Maddi (1999, as cited in Hasel, Abdolhoseini & Ganji, 2011) described that the personality construct hardiness has emerged as an important factor in buffering, or offering resistance toward the effects of stress.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to investigate hardiness and stress of staff members from University for the Development of the National Races of the Union (UDNR).

The specific objectives of this study are:

- To examine hardiness level of staff members,
- To explore the differences in hardiness of staff members by gender, age and work experience,
- To examine stress level of staff members,
- To measure the differences in stress of staff members by gender, age and work experience, and
- To find out the relationship between hardiness and stress of staff members.

Scope of the Study

Participants of this study were selected from staff members in University for the Development of the National Races of the Union during 2021-2022 Academic Year. And this study was limited to investigate hardiness and stress of staff members.

Definition of Key Terms

Hardiness : Hardiness is defined as an ability to adapt easily to unexpected changes combined with a sense of purpose in daily life and of personal control over what occurs in one's life (VandenBos, 2015).

Stress : Stress is defined as the physiological or psychological response to internal or external stressors (VandenBos, 2015).

Operational Definition of Staff Members : All staff those who have been working in the University for the Development of the National Races of the Union are considered here as staff members.

Review of Related Literature

Kobasa's Hardiness Theory

The term "personality hardiness" has been used to describe persons who have a kind of personal and world view that underlies the positive capacity to cope with and mediate stress (Kobasa, 1979, as cited in Morelock, 1994). This personality structure "hardiness" was defined as a constellation of commitment, control, and challenge that serves as a "resistance resource" in encounters with stress (Kobasa, Maddi, & Kahn, 1982, as cited in Morelock, 1994). The resistance resource theory formed the foundation of Kobasa's proposed concept that individuals who are exposed to high levels of stress who do not become ill, may have characteristics that come under the rubric "personal hardiness" (Kobasa, 1979, as cited in Morelock, 1994). Kobasa (as cited in Morelock, 1994) explained that these hardy individuals choose commitment rather than alienation, control rather than powerlessness, and challenge rather than threat. These three

personality characteristics remain the basis of her continuous research on personal hardiness (Morelock, 1994).

Commitment: Kobasa (1982, as cited in Morelock, 1994) stated that commitment involves activity and curiosity, not passiveness and alienation. It entails belief in the value for “what one is and what one is doing, as well as a tendency to involve oneself fully and vigorously in life.” The committed individual finds life in general, and works in particular, meaningful and worth engaging, thereby lessening the threat perceived in situations and circumstances.

Control: Kobasa (1982, as cited in Morelock, 1994) explained that control is the tendency to believe and act as if one is influential (rather than helpless) in the course of events in one’s life. Individuals who have control strive to understand the reasons for things that occur with particular reference to their own sphere of responsibility. Control involves developing a repertoire of options and actions that transforms events into a continuing life plan (Holt, Fine, & Tollefson, 1987, as cited in Morelock, 1994).

Challenge: Kobasa (1982) and Kobasa, Maddi and Kahn (1982) as cited in Morelock (1994) described that challenge, the third dimension of the hardiness constellation, involves the belief that one should expect and accept change, not stability, as the normal pattern of life. The anticipation of change is positive, rather than threatening and change is viewed as an incentive to growth. The individual with this characteristic emphasizes growing and changing, rather than conserving and protecting the status quo (Holt, Fine, & Tollefson, 1987, as cited in Morelock, 1994).

Theories of Stress

Theories that focus on the specific relationship between external demands (stressors) and bodily processes (stress) can be grouped in two different categories: approaches to ‘systemic stress’ based in physiology and psychobiology (among others, Selye 1976, as cited in Krohne, 2002) and approaches to ‘psychological stress’ developed within the field of cognitive psychology (Lazarus 1966, 1991, Lazarus & Folkman 1984, McGrath 1982, as cited in Krohne, 2002).

Systemic Stress: Selye’s Theory. The popularity of the stress concept in science and mass media stems largely from the work of the endocrinologist Hans Selye (as cited in Krohne, 2002). According to Selye, these nonspecifically caused changes constitute the stereotypical, i.e., specific response pattern of systemic stress (as cited in Krohne, 2002). Selye (1976, as cited in Krohne, 2002) defines this stress as ‘a state manifested by a syndrome which consists of all the nonspecifically induced changes in a biologic system.’

In addition, Selye does not take into account coping mechanisms as important mediators of the stress–outcome relationship (as cited in Krohne, 2002). Krohne (2002) mentioned that both topics are central to psychological stress theories as, for example, elaborated by the Lazarus group. A derivative of the systemic approach is the research on critical life events. They assumed that critical life events, regardless of their specific (e.g., positive or negative) quality, stimulate change that produces challenge to the organism.

Psychological Stress: The Lazarus Theory. Two concepts are central to any psychological stress theory: appraisal, i.e., individuals’ evaluation of the significance of what is

happening for their well-being, and coping, i.e., individuals' efforts in thought and action to manage specific demands (Lazarus, 1993, as cited in Krohne, 2002).

Since its first presentation as a comprehensive theory (Lazarus 1966), the Lazarus stress theory has undergone several essential revisions (Lazarus 1991, Lazarus & Folkman 1984, Lazarus & Launier 1978) (as cited in Krohne, 2002). In the latest version (Lazarus 1991) stress is regarded as a relational concept, i.e., stress is not defined as a specific kind of external stimulation nor a specific pattern of physiological, behavioral, or subjective reactions (as cited in Krohne, 2002). Instead, stress is viewed as a relationship ('transaction') between individuals and their environment (Krohne, 2002). 'Psychological stress refers to a relationship with the environment that the person appraises as significant for his or her well-being and in which the demands tax or exceed available coping resources' (Lazarus & Folkman 1986, as cited in Krohne, 2002). This definition points to two processes as central mediators within the person–environment transaction: cognitive appraisal and coping (Krohne, 2002).

Stress occurs in situations appraised as taxing or exceeding one's resources and endangering one's well-being (Cohen et al., 1983; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; McDonald & Korabik, 1991, as cited in Judkins, 2001). Additionally, many things can cause stress. People might feel stressed because of one big event or situation in their life. Or it might be a build-up of lots of smaller things. This might make it harder for them to identify what's making them feel stressed, or to explain it to other people. People may experience stress if they feel under lots of pressure, face big changes in their life, are worried about something, don't have much or any control over the outcome of a situation, have responsibilities that they find overwhelming, don't have enough work, activities or change in their life, experience discrimination, hate or abuse, and are going through a period of uncertainty (National Association for Mental Health, 2022).

Levenstein et al. (1993) developed that the Perceived Stress Questionnaire, which emphasizes cognitive perceptions more than emotional states or specific life events, has high internal consistency, high reliability, and demonstrated construct validity, and proved superior to alternative measures for predicting selected healthy outcomes. The Perceived Stress Questionnaire consists of seven dimensions: harassment, overload, irritability, lack of joy, fatigue, worries and tension. The following are seven dimensions of perceived stress described separately with explanation and clarification.

Harassment: VandenBos (2015) stated that harassment is defined as somebody to annoy or worry somebody by putting pressure on them or saying or doing unpleasant things to them.

Overload: VandenBos (2015) stated that overload is defined as a psychological condition in which situations and experiences are so cognitively, perceptually, and emotionally stimulating that they tax or even exceed the individual's capacity to process incoming information.

Irritability: VandenBos (2015) stated that irritability is defined as a state of excessive, easily provoked anger, annoyance, or impatience.

Lack of joy: VandenBos (2015) stated that lack of joy or sadness is defined as an emotional state of unhappiness, ranging in intensity from mild to extreme and usually aroused by the loss something that is highly value.

Fatigue: VandenBos (2015) stated that fatigue is defined as a state of tiredness and diminished functioning.

Worries: VandenBos (2015) stated that worries are defined as a state of mental distress or agitation due to concern about an impending or anticipated event, threat, or danger.

Tension: VandenBos (2015) stated that tension is defined as a feeling of physical and psychological strain accompanied by discomfort, uneasiness, and pressure to seek relief through talk or action.

Method

Sampling

Table 1 Number of Participants from University for the Development of the National Races of the Union

Staff Members	Male	Female	Total
Teachers	18	109	127
Administrative staff	62	73	135
Total	80	182	262

Instrumentation

The instruments, Hardiness Scale (45) items and Perceived Stress Questionnaire (30) items were used in this study. The participants’ demographic information such as gender, age and work experience was also collected for this study. In this study, the Hardiness Scale (HS) (Bartone, Ursano, Wright & Ingraham, 1989) slightly modified version of a scale originally developed by Kobasa et al. (1981, 1982, as cited in Bartone et al., 1989) was used to measure staff members’ hardiness and staff members’ stress was measured by using Perceived Stress Questionnaire (PSQ) developed by Levenstein et al. (1993). Response to the items was based on a four-point Likert scale ranging from not at all true, a little true, quite true and completely true for hardiness scale. Besides, Response to the items was based on a four-point Likert scale ranging from never, sometimes, often and always for Perceived Stress Questionnaire (PSQ).

Data Analysis and Findings

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics for Hardiness of Staff Members

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Hardiness	262	100	140	124.99	6.508

Table 2 shows that the observed mean score is 124.99 and the standard deviation is 6.508. As the results mentioned above, staff members had moderate level in hardiness.

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics for Hardiness Subscales of Staff Members

Variables	N	No. of Items	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Commitment	262	15	33	47	41.63	2.252
Control	262	15	33	47	41.64	2.213
Challenge	262	15	34	46	41.73	2.214

According to Table 3, challenge subscale had the highest mean score and the commitment subscale had the lowest mean score among three subscales of hardiness.

Table 4 The Results of Independent Samples *t*-test for Hardiness and Its Subscales of Staff Members by Gender

Variables	Gender	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Commitment	Male	80	41.96	2.688	1.426	260	0.156
	Female	182	41.48	2.021			
Control	Male	80	41.96	2.641	1.418	260	0.159
	Female	182	41.49	1.988			
Challenge	Male	80	42.08	2.723	1.480	260	0.142
	Female	182	41.58	1.939			
Hardiness	Male	80	125.99	7.931	1.462	260	0.146
	Female	182	124.55	5.743			

The result of *t* test from Table 4 shows that there are no statistically significant differences in hardiness and its subscales by gender.

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics for Hardiness of Staff Members by Age

Variable	Age Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Hardiness	Below 30	52	124.48	5.665
	30-39	71	125.94	6.000
	40-49	75	125.64	6.630
	Above 49	64	123.58	7.352

According to Table 5, the staff members in the 30-39 age group had the highest mean score and the staff members in the above 49 age group had the lowest mean score among four age groups in staff members' hardiness.

Table 6 The Results of One-Way ANOVA for Hardiness of Staff Members by Age

Variable		Sum of Square	<i>df</i>	Mean of Square	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Hardiness	Between Group	237.321	3	79.107	1.887	.132
	Within Group	10815.645	258	41.921		
	Total	11052.966	261			

The One-Way ANOVA results showed that there was no statistically significant difference in hardiness according to age group.

Table 7 Descriptive Statistics for Hardiness Subscales of Staff Members by Age

Variables	Age	N	Mean	SD
Commitment	Below 30	52	41.56	1.955
	30-39	71	41.93	2.133
	40-49	75	41.81	2.288
	Above 49	64	41.14	2.531
Control	Below 30	52	41.46	2.014
	30-39	71	41.94	2.056
	40-49	75	41.83	2.238
	Above 49	64	41.22	2.465
Challenge	Below 30	52	41.50	1.894
	30-39	71	42.06	2.035
	40-49	75	41.97	2.301
	Above 49	64	41.27	2.477

Table 8 The Results of One-Way ANOVA for Hardiness Subscales of Staff Members by Age

Variables		Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	p
Commitment	Between Groups	24.492	3	8.164	1.622	0.185
	Within Groups	1298.596	258	5.033		
	Total	1323.088	261			
Control	Between Groups	22.172	3	7.391	1.518	0.210
	Within Groups	1256.382	258	4.870		
	Total	1278.553	261			
Challenge	Between Groups	28.554	3	9.518	1.963	0.120
	Within Groups	1251.206	258	4.850		
	Total	1279.760	261			

The One-Way ANOVA results showed that there were no statistically significant differences in hardiness subscales according to age.

Table 9 Descriptive Statistics for Hardiness of Staff Members by Work Experience

Variable	Years of Work Experience	N	Mean	SD
Hardiness	Below 6	62	124.89	5.769
	6-10	44	126.23	6.433
	11-15	22	126.23	4.830
	16-20	47	124.47	5.583
	Above 20	87	124.40	7.757

According to Table 9, the staff members in 6-10 years of work experience and the staff members in 11-15 years of work experience had the highest mean score (126.23) and the staff members in above 20 years of work experience had the lowest mean score (124.40) in hardiness.

Table 10 The Results of One-Way ANOVA for Hardiness of Staff Members by Work Experience

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Hardiness	Between Groups	144.543	4	36.136	0.851	.494
	Within Groups	10908.422	257	25.89342.445		
	Total	11052.966	261			

According to Table 10, a statistically significant difference was not found in hardiness of staff members by work experience.

Table 11 Descriptive Statistics for Hardiness Subscales of Staff Members by Work Experience

Variables	Work Experience	N	Mean	SD
Commitment	Below 6	62	41.69	2.005
	6-10	44	42.00	2.146
	11-15	22	42.23	1.631
	16-20	47	41.43	2.030
	Above 20	87	41.36	2.668
Control	Below 6	62	41.60	2.052
	6-10	44	41.98	2.096
	11-15	22	42.05	1.704
	16-20	47	41.55	1.932
	Above 20	87	41.44	2.613
Challenge	Below 6	62	41.61	1.876

Variables	Work Experience	N	Mean	SD
	6-10	44	42.27	2.326
	11-15	22	42.00	1.773
	16-20	47	41.45	1.851
	Above 20	87	41.62	2.616

Table 12 The Results of One-Way ANOVA for Hardiness Subscales of Staff Members by Work Experience

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Commitment	Between Groups	22.603	4	5.651	1.117	.349
	Within Groups	1300.484	257	5.060		
	Total	1323.088	261			
Control	Between Groups	12.683	4	3.171	.644	.632
	Within Groups	1265.870	257	4.926		
	Total	1278.553	261			
Challenge	Between Groups	20.223	4	5.056	1.032	.391
	Within Groups	1259.537	257	4.901		
	Total	1279.760	261			

The One-Way ANOVA results showed that there were no statistically significant differences in commitment, control and challenge subscales.

Table 13 Descriptive Statistics for Stress of Staff Members

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Stress	262	68	84	76.26	2.90

Table 13 shows that the mean score is 76.26 and the standard deviation is 2.90. As the results mentioned above, staff members had moderate level in stress.

Table 14 Descriptive Statistics for Stress Subscales of Staff Members

Variables	N	No. of Items	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Mean %	SD
Harassment	262	4	10	12	11.05	92.08%	.610
Overload	262	4	10	12	11.06	92.18%	.616
Irritability	262	2	3	6	4.77	79.52%	.439

Variables	<i>N</i>	No. of Items	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Mean %	<i>SD</i>
Lack of Joy	262	7	15	19	16.25	85.54%	1.113
Fatigue	262	4	10	12	10.98	90.76%	.570
Worries	262	5	9	13	11.16	85.85%	.572
Tension	262	4	9	13	10.99	84.53%	.628

Since the number of items included in each subscale of stress questionnaire was not the same, the scores were calculated to the corresponding mean percentages. According to Table 14, the mean percentage of overload (92.18%) was the highest and the mean percentage of the irritability (79.52%) was the lowest among the percentages of the seven subscales.

Table 15 The Results of Independent Samples *t*-test for Stress and Its Subscales of Staff Members by Gender

Variables	Gender	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Harrassement	Male	80	11.08	.612	.378	260	.705
	Female	182	11.04	.611			
Overload	Male	80	11.09	.620	.460	260	.646
	Female	182	11.05	.615			
Irritability	Male	80	4.76	.428	-.210	260	.834
	Female	182	4.77	.445			
Lack of Joy	Male	80	16.43	1.220	1.584	260	.095
	Female	182	16.18	1.057			
Fatigue	Male	80	10.98	.527	-.111	260	.912
	Female	182	10.98	.589			
Worries	Male	80	11.20	.537	.745	260	.457
	Female	182	11.14	.587			
Tension	Male	80	11.00	.712	.195	260	.845
	Female	182	10.98	.590			
Stress	Male	80	76.51	2.765	0.934	260	0.351
	Female	182	76.15	2.965			

The results of *t*-test from Table 15 showed that there were no statistically significant differences in stress and its subscales by gender.

Table 16 Descriptive Statistics for Stress of Staff Members by Age

Variable	Age Group	N	Mean	SD
Stress	Below 30	52	75.62	3.408
	30-39	71	76.20	2.660
	40-49	75	76.65	2.633
	Above 49	64	76.39	3.001

According to Table 16, the staff members in the 40-49 age group had the highest mean score and the staff members in the below 30 age group had the lowest mean score among four age groups in staff members' stress.

Table 17 The Results of One-Way ANOVA for Stress of Staff Members by Age

Variable		Sum of Square	df	Mean of Square	F	p
Stress	Between Group	34.583	3	11.528	1.372	.252
	Within Group	2167.768	258	8.402		
	Total	2202.351	261			

The One-Way ANOVA results showed that there was no statistically significant difference in stress of staff members according to age group.

Table 18 Descriptive Statistics for Stress Subscales of Staff Members by Age

Variables	Age	N	Mean	SD
Harassment	Below30	52	10.94	.698
	30-39	71	11.09	.596
	40-49	75	11.12	.592
	Above 49	64	11.08	.572
Overload	Below30	52	10.96	.713
	30-39	71	11.06	.607
	40-49	75	11.12	.569
	Above 49	64	11.08	.599
Irritability	Below30	52	4.63	.486
	30-39	71	4.82	.425
	40-49	75	4.83	.415
	Above 49	64	4.77	.427
Lack of Joy	Below30	52	16.31	1.058
	30-39	71	16.10	1.123
	40-49	75	16.35	1.133
	Above 49	64	16.27	1.130

Variables	Age	N	Mean	SD
Fatigue	Below30	52	10.85	.638
	30-39	71	10.97	.560
	40-49	75	11.05	.543
	Above 49	64	11.02	.549
Worries	Below30	52	11.10	.603
	30-39	71	11.20	.576
	40-49	75	11.15	.538
	Above 49	64	11.19	.588
Tension	Below30	52	10.83	.678
	30-39	71	11.03	.632
	40-49	75	11.04	.625
	Above 49	64	11.02	.577

Table 19 The Results of One-Way ANOVA for Stress Subscales of Staff Members by Age

Variables		Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	p
Harassment	Between Groups	1.022	3	.341	.914	.435
	Within Groups	96.230	258	.373		
	Total	97.252	261			
Overload	Between Groups	.796	3	.265	.697	.555
	Within Groups	98.227	258	.381		
	Total	99.023	261			
Irritability	Between Groups	1.351	3	.450	2.376	.071
	Within Groups	48.908	258	.190		
	Total	50.260	261			
Lack of Joy	Between Groups	2.516	3	.839	.674	.568
	Within Groups	320.858	258	1.244		
	Total	323.374	261			
Fatigue	Between Groups	1.421	3	.474	1.463	.225
	Within Groups	83.484	258	.324		
	Total	84.905	261			
Worries	Between Groups	.372	3	.124	.377	.770
	Within Groups	84.895	258	.329		
	Total	85.267	261			
Tension	Between Groups	1.715	3	.572	1.457	.227
	Within Groups	101.250	258	.392		
	Total	102.966	261			

The result of One-Way ANOVA showed that there were no statistically significant differences in stress subscales of staff members according to age.

Table 20 Descriptive Statistics for Stress of Staff Members by Work Experience

Variable	Years of Work Experience	N	Mean	SD
Stress	Below 6	62	75.97	3.289
	6-10	44	76.25	2.780
	11-15	22	76.64	3.125
	16-20	47	76.06	2.877
	Above 20	87	76.48	2.663

According to Table 20, the staff members in 11-15 years of work experience had the highest mean score and the staff members in below 6 years of work experience had the lowest mean score in stress.

Table 21 The Results of One-Way ANOVA for Stress of Staff Members by Work Experience

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Stress	Between Groups	14.542	4	3.636	.427	.789
	Within Groups	2187.809	257	8.513		
	Total	2202.351	261			

The One-Way ANOVA results showed that there was no statistically significant difference in stress according to work experience.

Table 22 Descriptive Statistics for Stress Subscales of Staff Members by Work Experience

Variables	Work Experience	N	Mean	SD
Harassment	Below 6	62	11.03	.677
	6-10	44	11.05	.608
	11-15	22	11.05	.785
	16-20	47	11.04	.588
	Above 20	87	11.08	.533
Overload	Below 6	62	11.05	.688
	6-10	44	11.05	.608
	11-15	22	11.09	.811
	16-20	47	11.06	.567
	Above 20	87	11.07	.545
Irritability	Below 6	62	4.71	.458
	6-10	44	4.77	.424
	11-15	22	4.91	.426
	16-20	47	4.70	.462

Variables	Work Experience	N	Mean	SD
	Above 20	87	4.82	.418
Lack of Joy	Below 6	62	16.11	1.057
	6-10	44	16.34	1.098
	11-15	22	16.41	1.098
	16-20	47	16.17	1.129
	Above 20	87	16.31	1.165
Fatigue	Below 6	62	10.95	.638
	6-10	44	10.98	.549
	11-15	22	10.86	.710
	16-20	47	10.94	.567
	Above 20	87	11.06	.491
Worries	Below 6	62	11.18	.615
	6-10	44	11.16	.568
	11-15	22	11.36	.581
	16-20	47	11.09	.654
	Above 20	87	11.14	.486
Tension	Below 6	62	10.94	.674
	6-10	44	10.91	.520
	11-15	22	10.95	.999
	16-20	47	11.09	.583
	Above 20	87	11.02	.549

Table 23 The Results of One-Way ANOVA for Stress Subscales of Staff Members by Work Experience

Variables		Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	p
Harassment	Between Groups	.101	4	.025	.067	.992
	Within Groups	97.151	257	.378		
	Total	97.252	261			
Overload	Between Groups	.046	4	.012	.030	.998
	Within Groups	98.977	257	.385		
	Total	99.023	261			

Variables		Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	p
Irritability	Between Groups	1.053	4	.263	1.374	.243
	Within Groups	49.207	257	.191		
	Total	50.260	261			
Lack of Joy	Between Groups	2.701	4	.675	.541	.706
	Within Groups	320.673	257	1.248		
	Total	323.374	261			
Fatigue	Between Groups	.960	4	.240	.735	.569
	Within Groups	83.944	257	.327		
	Total	84.905	261			
Worries	Between Groups	1.237	4	.309	.946	.438
	Within Groups	84.030	257	.327		
	Total	85.267	261			
Tension	Between Groups	1.019	4	.255	.642	.633
	Within Groups	101.946	257	46.397		
	Total	102.966	261			

The One-Way ANOVA results showed that there were no statistically significant differences in staff members' stress subscales according to work experience.

Table 24 Inter-correlation among Stress, Hardiness and Its Subscales

Variables	Hardiness	Stress	Commitment	Control	Challenge
Hardiness	1	- 0.108	0.977***	0.985***	0.964***
Stress		1	- 0.104	- 0.131*	- 0.080
Commitment			1	0.965***	0.902***
Control				1	0.919***

Variables	Hardiness	Stress	Commitment	Control	Challenge
Challenge					1

Note: *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

***Correlation is significant at the 0.001 level (2-tailed).

According to Table 24, the result showed that there was no significant correlation between hardiness and stress of staff members from UDNR. As the results, hardiness was very weakly and negatively correlated with stress of staff members ($r = -0.108$). The results indicated that subscales of hardiness were negatively correlated with stress. Particularly, the control subscale of hardiness was negatively and significantly correlated with stress of staff members at the 0.05 level.

Conclusion and Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to investigate hardiness and stress of staff members from University for the Development of the National Races of the Union (UDNR). It was found that there were no statistically significant differences in hardiness and its subscales between male and female staff members. Therefore, it can be concluded that male and female staff members from UDNR may have almost equal hardiness. The possible reason may be due to performance in equal effort and responsibility in UDNR for male and female staff members.

And then, it was found that there were no statistically significant differences in staff members' hardiness and its subscales among four age groups. It can be assumed that all staff members in UDNR may have almost similar hardiness to serve their duties since all staff members possess efficient services in their work place respectively.

Besides, the results showed that there were no statistically significant differences in staff members' hardiness and its subscales by work experience. So, it can be said that all staff members may have almost similar hardiness in their own abilities to perform their works since University is supportive all staff members for safe keeping in work place.

Again, the results showed that there were no statistically significant differences in stress and its subscales of staff members by gender. Therefore, it can be concluded that male and female staff members from UDNR may have almost equal stress. The reason may be that both male and female staff members had almost same overload in their workplace without gender differences in doing working activities.

Moreover, the results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in stress and its subscales by age group. It can be concluded that all staff members in UDNR may have almost similar stress since all staff members have almost equal anxiety about Covid-19 pandemic.

In addition, it was also found that there were no statistically significant differences in stress and its subscales by work experience. Therefore, it can be assumed that the staff members may possess almost similar stress by work experience since all staff members have sometimes the stresses in calm compass due to performing much duty.

Additionally, Pearson's Product-Moment correlation was applied to study the relationship between hardiness and stress of staff members. It was found that hardiness was negatively correlated with stress of staff members. The strength of correlation was very weak. It can be said that staff members who possess high hardiness will have low stress. And then, inter-correlation

for the subscales of hardiness and stress was also explored. The results indicated that subscales of hardiness were negatively correlated with stress. Finally, this study determined that as the hardiness levels of staff members increase, their stress levels also decrease.

In conclusion, it is expected that this study can help educational planners and administrators to contribute to staff members to become hardy persons and to be able to reduce their stress by providing the training programmes and workshops concerning hardiness and stress.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to offer all my respect and gratitude to U Aung Thiak Tun (Rector), U Kyaw Kyaw Tun (Pro-Rector, Administration) and Dr. Moe Moe (Pro-Rector, Academic) from the University for the Development of the National Races of the Union (UDNR) for granting me to do this study and never-ending support throughout this study. I would like to express my special gratitude to Dr. Yin Yin Myint (Retired Professor and Part-time Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, UDNR) for her generous help, invaluable guidance, patience, priceless advice, supportive encouragement, motivation and insightful comments throughout the preparation of my study. I would like to express my respectful thanks to the external examiner, Dr. Myo Ko Aung (Professor and Head of Department, Department of Educational Psychology, Sagaing University of Education) for his kind guidance and good will in assessing my research study and invaluable comments and suggestions. My sincere gratitude also goes to Daw Nant Phwar Soe Lay (Professor and Head of Department, Department of Educational Psychology, UDNR) for her suggestions and generous help. Special acknowledgement goes to my supervisor, Daw Nant San San Yi (Associate Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, UDNR) for her kind guidance, precious advice and effective suggestions whenever I felt frustrated in my writing. I would like to offer special thanks to all teachers in the Department of Educational Psychology from UDNR for their encouragement throughout the study. Thanks also go to the participants who willingly responded to the questionnaires of this study to get reliable and valid data. I would like to thank to all people who gave me the advantageous help throughout my research. Finally, I would like to express special thanks to my beloved parents and family members for their kindly help, supports and continuous encouragement to complete my thesis and to overcome my difficulties.

References

- Bala, R., & Kaur, R. (2017). Personality hardiness of secondary school teachers in relation to work related stress. *Educational Quest: An Int. J. of Education and Applied Social Science*: 8 (1), 151-155. Retrieved from <http://ndpublisher.in/admin/>
- Bartone, P.T., Ursano, R. J., Wright, K. M., & Ingraham, L. H. (1989). The impact of a Military Air Disaster on the Health of Assistance Workers. *The Journal of nervous and mental disease*, 177 (6), 317-328. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/>
- Bogden, J. J. (2011). *Hardiness as a predictor of success for marine corps first responders in training* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University, Minnesota). Retrived From <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/view>
- Chen, J-Y., & Tu, C-C. (2019). A Study on teacher support and learning adaptation among Six-year Normal University Freshmen: The moderating effect of the hardiness. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 15(12), 1-10. Retrieved from <https://www.ejmste.com/>
- Grover, V. K. (2015). Cognitive resilience as related to hardiness across social value orientation among adolescents. *International Journal of Research in Economics and Social Sciences*, 5 (5), 230-238. Retrieved from <https://euroasiapub.org/>
- Harvey, S., Courcy, F., Petit, A., Hudon, J., Teed, M., Loisel, O., & Morin, A. (2006). *Organizational Interventions and Mental Health in the Workplace: A Synthesis of International Approaches*. Institut de recherche RobertSauvé en santé et en sécurité du travail (IRSST). Retrieved from <https://www.irsst.qc.ca/media/doc>
- Hasel, K. M., Abdolhoseini, A., & Ganji, P. (2011). Hardiness training and perceived stress among college students. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30 (2011), 1354-1358. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/down>

- Judkins, S. K. (2001). *Hardiness, stress, and coping strategies among mid-level nurse managers: Implications for continuing higher education* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas). Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu>
- Krohne, H. W. (2002). *Stress and Coping Theories*. Retrieved from <https://userpage.fu-berl>
- Levenstein, S., Prantera, C., Varvo, V., Scribano, M. L., Berto, E., Luzi, C., & Andreoli, A. (1993). Development of the perceived stress questionnaire: A new tool for psychosomatic research. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 37(1), 19-32. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/>
- Lonser, V. M. (2016). *Faculty and staff perceptions of stress, efficacy, personality and health practices during implementation of comprehensive educational change at one secondary school* (Doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, Andrews, Scotland). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/cgi/view>
- [Morelock](#), D. F. (1994). *A correlational study of hardiness, health, and burnout among teachers in the sullivan county school system* (Doctoral dissertation, [East Tennessee State University](#), Johnson City, [Tennessee](#)). Retrieved from [https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/](https://dc.etsu.edu/cgi/viewNational Association for Mental Health. (2022). What causes stress? Retried from https://www.mind.org.uk/VandenBos, G. R. (Ed.). (2015). APA Dictionary of Psychology (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.</p><p>Warka, J. L. (1996). <i>Family environment and the development of hardiness</i> (Master's thesis, California State University, San Bernardino, California). Retrieved from <a href=)