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Abstract

The strength of any organization largely depends on her workforce but work load related stress can affect the effectiveness of such organizational workforce. As an apex institution of knowledge, the Nigerian university system has a lot to contribute towards the nation’s manpower development, however studies have shown that there is a high level of workload related stress among university lecturers in Nigeria. Against this backdrop therefore, this study was articulated to determine the extent to which such work load related stress influences job effectiveness among university lecturers in Akwa Ibom and Cross River States, Nigeria. The Job demand control theory of Karasek and Theorell (1990) provided the theoretical framework for the study, while the cross sectional survey research was deployed as the study design. Samples were drawn from the two Federal Government owned universities in the states under study, namely: University of Uyo and University of Calabar. Data were obtained through structured six (6) point Likert scale questionnaires, while the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized to test the study hypothesis. The results showed that, workload related stress significantly influence the job effectiveness of lecturers in terms of publication, community service and teaching effectiveness. Appropriate recommendations are also made for improvement.

Keywords: Workload, Stress, Job effectiveness, Organization, Lecturers, Job demand, University.

Contents
1. Introduction .................................................................................................................................................................................. 35
2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework .......................................................................................................................... 35
3. Research Methodology ................................................................................................................................................................. 38
4. Results and Discussion ............................................................................................................................................................... 39
5. Conclusion and Recommendations ........................................................................................................................................... 40
References ..................................................................................................................................................................................... 41

DOI: 10.20448/journal.500/2016.3.1/500.1.34-41
ISSN(E): 2313-7401
ISSN(P): 2518-0066
Licensed: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License.
Funding: This study received no specific financial support.
Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.
Transparency: The authors confirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study was reported; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.
Ethical: This study follows all ethical practices during writing.
History: Received: 27 May 2015/ Revised: 5 August 2015/ Accepted: 18 September 2015/ Published: 2 October 2015
Publisher: Asian Online Journal Publishing Group
1. Introduction

The world is in an era known as the information age, when almost everything is driven by the need to generate information or acquire knowledge. Universities belong to this knowledge sector, and are in fact the apex institutions in the knowledge sector. This makes it imperative for universities to excel especially if the quest for information and knowledge must be serviced.

Given the dynamism of knowledge, and knowledge needs, current knowledge quickly becomes obsolete. There is constant need to update existing knowledge and also to acquire new ones. Consequently, new courses are constantly floated in universities being the principal institutions in the area of information and knowledge acquisition. Besides, Nigeria, a nation of over 160 million has a large youth population who view education in tertiary institutions generally and in universities in particular as the ticket to a good job and bright future. Unfortunately, the rate at which teaching staff are recruited by universities does not appear to measure up with the work load created by this voracious search for knowledge via university education. The implication has been that of inadequate man power, and excess work load for those available.

The strength of every organization lies primarily in her workers. This is acknowledged by Elton Mayo’s Hawthorne studies of the scientific management school. However, issues relating to excess work load can generate occupational stress for workers, and this will certainly tell negatively on the entire organization. Clearly, high level of work load stress is present among university lecturers in Nigeria, as identified by Ofuegbu and Nwadiani (2006). Thus, the need to determine the extent to which this work load stress influences their job effectiveness provided the impetus for this study.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1. The Concept, Nature and Process of Stress

Numerous scholars have attempted to define stress from different points of view. Work-related stress as defined currently by World Health Organization (WHO) is “the response people may have when presented with work demands and pressures that are not matched to their knowledge and abilities and which challenge their ability to cope,” Melgosa (2004) views stress as a combination of physiological and psychological reaction of the body when it is subjected to heavy demands. Based on the aforementioned definitions, this study views work-related stress as a phenomenon that is subjective, multi-faceted and occurs when workers’ physical, emotional and attitudinal attributes do not match with the job demands, constraints and/or opportunities.

According to Fevre et al. (2003) there are two types of stress namely eustress (good stress) and distress (bad stress). Eustress helps workers experiencing moderate or low stress level to increase positive work life. On the contrary, distressed workers have experienced high stress level and are not able to fulfill job demand since distress rather makes them to decrease quality of work life (Leka et al., 2004; Millward, 2005). There is need therefore to strike the proper balance if job effectiveness is not to be compromised or the health of the worker sacrificed. Workload is the amount of work an individual has to do. It is observable that stress is cumulative, it builds up gradually with telltale symptoms that all is not well. While examining the nature of stress Agulanna (2007) enumerated the following as the features of stress: It is universal, inevitable (unavoidable) and transferable. It is contradictory in presentation in person to person. For instance, some people under stress lose their appetite while some eat more, some become depressed while others become hyperactive. Stress distorts the person’s self-concept or self-esteem. Stress changes human behaviour. Stress modifies the person’s pattern of thinking from divergent (consideration of many alternatives) to convergent (consideration of only one solution). Stress causes physical, social and psychological changes. It is a cause and effect reinforcing and reciprocal phenomenon. Stress can replicate itself. Stress intensity differs from person to person.

Features of the nature of stress though ubiquitous, differ from person to person. It is observable that stress is subjective, it builds up gradually with telltale symptoms that all is not well. While examining the nature of stress Agulanna (2007) enumerated the following as the features of stress: It is universal, inevitable (unavoidable) and transferable. It is contradictory in presentation in person to person. For instance, some people under stress lose their appetite while some eat more, some become depressed while others become hyperactive. Stress distorts the person’s self-concept or self-esteem. Stress changes human behaviour. Stress modifies the person’s pattern of thinking from divergent (consideration of many alternatives) to convergent (consideration of only one solution). Stress causes physical, social and psychological changes. It is a cause and effect reinforcing and reciprocal phenomenon. Stress can replicate itself. Stress intensity differs from person to person.

These researchers add that stress is not physiological in that we are not born with it but rather it is sociological and subjective because it comes as a result of the need to meet societal expectations and differ from person to person. Stress could also be infectious. Melgosa (2004) illustrated the three stages of the stress process as encapsulated in the General Adaptation Syndrome of Selye in Fig. 1. In the first stage which is the alarm stage, physical reactions are the first to warn the worker that there is need to be on guard. If at this stage measures are taken to resolve the problem(s), then stress will not materialize. However, by the time an unresolved stressful situation becomes overwhelming the worker may be classified as being in the alarm stage of stress. Agulanna (2007) states that in the second stage called the Resistance stage the worker involved tries to resist the stress by either a mental adjustment or a coping technique. At this stage the worker begins to adjust to the presence of a persistent stressor. If this worker fails in the attempt to adapt, he then enters into the final stage of stress. This last stage as elucidated by Melgosa (2004) is characterized by fatigue, anxiety and depression which may occur sequentially or concurrently. At the exhaustion phase productivity of the worker will be low.
2.2. Elements of Job Effectiveness of Lecturers

From the terms of employment of lecturers, a lecturer can be said to be job effective if he/she can: effectively impart knowledge; be proficient in research and contribute to society. Aregbeyen (2010) in a study on students’ perceptions of effective teaching and effective lecturer characteristics at the University of Ibadan, Nigeria, ranked the first ten rated elements of effective teaching out of the thirty-five he listed. The order of ranking was: clear explanations, showing interest and concern in quality of teaching, knowing if the class is understanding or not, coming well prepared to class, having an interesting style of presentation, discussing recent developments in the field, respect for students as persons, identification of what is considered important in lectures, being careful and precise in answering questions and laying emphasis on conceptual understanding. Aregbeyen (2010) in conclusion opined that teaching effectively depends on a lecturer properly balancing teaching methodology with his personality traits. Colker (2008) observed that the four characteristics of an effective lecturer, from the point of view of teachers, consists of a good grasp of subject matter, being personally interested in every student, establishing cordial or caring atmosphere, as well as showing students enthusiasm. From the other side of the coin Colker (2008) also reported twelve characteristics students believe to be fundamental to teaching effectively as: “passion, perseverance, willingness to take risks, pragmatism, patience, flexibility, respect, creativity, authenticity, love of learning, high energy and sense of humour” pp71.

Proficiency in research is the second job effectiveness requirement of academics. Research, the end result of which is often publication, is the major criteria used in assessing lecturers for the purpose of career upliftment. The lecturer is appraised based on the number of published research and the quality of such publications. It takes a lot of time, energy as well as material and financial resources to complete a research work and have it published. This is a substantial part of a lecturer’s work load.

The university lecturer like other members of society is expected to be socially responsible. This is especially the case for lecturers because their raw materials consist of the crème de la crème of the youths and brains of society. This leads us to the third occupational function of lecturers, which is community service. Service workload includes service to various university associations, the community and to the larger society. In the view of Joshua (2012) socially, a university is expected to serve its immediate and adjoining communities in areas such as public enlightenment through public lectures, seminars, debates. Joshua expanded further that the academic staff can be involved as an individual, or as a staff of the relevant unit of the university providing the service. Joshua stated further that in times of national assignments where expert knowledge and skills and high levels of responsibilities and integrity are required, like national elections supervision and monitoring of national examinations etc., university academics are usually relied on to provide such community services. The current trend in developed nations is service learning in which community service is built into the university curriculum.

2.3. Theoretical Framework

This study is underpinned by the Job demand control theory of Karasek and Theorell (1990) who argued that stress emanate from effects of work demands (stressors) jointly with effects of environmental stress moderators. Especially stressful according to Karasek and Theorell is extent to which the worker facing work demands has freedom to make decision that is has control. Job demand control theory views environmental factors as the trigger, but the theory does not strictly proffer that personal factors are not important (Karasek and Theorell, 1990). In the Job demand control model, workers in highly strenuous jobs (such as service based jobs like lecturing) experience the highest level of stress. They said further that despite popular suggestions high status workers do not belong to the high strain group. This might be because high status workers through control could moderate demands of high levels (Karasek and Theorell, 1990). They postulated that productivity will increase when jobs combine high control and high demands. Karasek and Theorell’s model however, failed to address important personality and mediating variables which may hide the relationship between high demand (work load) and stress.
Job Demand Control Theory is important in understanding this study because it indicates that there exists a relationship between the productivity of workers (job effectiveness) and stressors. Also the theory is suitable for service based jobs, a categorization to which lecturing belongs.

2.4. Workload and Job Effectiveness

The sources and causes of work related stress are hydra headed, interwoven and overlapping. Therefore, it is the view in this study that there is need to know these causes and their effects on job performance if stress is to be managed or prevented in individuals and organizations. Some of the stress sources are intrinsic to work, while some are extrinsic to the job.

Robbins (1998) identified the three potential categories of sources of stress as environmental, organizational and individual. Nelson and Quick (2003) classified stressors into Work Demands and Non-work Demands. Okwuagwu (2010) listed organizational factors that can induce stress to include task demands, role demands, organizational leadership, the organization’s life style, physical conditions, processes, participation, intra and inter group relationships, organizational goal setting, organization politics, organizational culture, feedback system, career development and downsizing. Common in all these classification of stressors is the identification of workload as a source of stress or what can be called task related stress.

Nelson and Quick (2003) considered that task caused stress has direct bearing on the particular features of the job in question. Task caused stress may have to do with change, new technologies, career progress, work overload or underload, absence of meaningful participative or insufficient control as well as job insecurity among others. According to Denga and Ekpo (1994) work related stress can emanate from physical exertion, too much mental activity or administrative overload such as the management of a myriad of visitors and phone calls. It is relevant to note here that one major job demand on a lecturer is a constant stream of drop in students, who require attention in one form or another. An extreme form of work related stress common in professions that focus on people is called burnout. According to Schaufeli and Marek (1993) as cited in Schaufeli, (1993) studies on burnout generally revealed that job factors are more strongly indicated in burnout more than personal or biographical factors. Robbins (1998) observed that burnout seems to occur most often among professionals whose jobs require them to deal with other people, these people according to him are: accountants, lawyers, managers, nurses, police officers and teachers. In Onoh (2009) view, stress from work overload may involve unusual long hours of work, loss of sleep and relaxation. According to McQuillan (2008) initially pressures from demands on a person will yield an increase in performance up to a point. After the optimal point of performance however, additional demand pressures will bring a decline in that person’s performance. This performance-demand relationship is illustrated by McQuillan (2008) as captured in Fig. 2.

An extreme form of work overload ‘Karoushi’ is a Japanese word that means ‘sudden death from overwork’. However according to Hellriegel et al. (1995) contemporary view is that Karoushi is not just ‘death from overwork’ but probably, it can be best described as death from intense feelings of depression and helplessness combined with overwork. On the other hand, work underload or job underutilization can be as stressful as work overload. Work underload may take the form of inactive hours on the job or boring repetitive routine and uncreative functions. Baron (1986) argued that under load or under-utilization leads to monotony and boredom which could be unpleasant and stressful. Again work underload may arise as a result of job mismatch. There is job mismatch when an employee does not have the skill required on a job which leads to job incompetence and subsequently stress.

Another potent work related stress factor is change. Globalisation is generating drastic work changes and producing job pressures and stresses (Friedman, 2000). Technological innovation and technology can render obsolete an employee’s experience and skills. Thus lecturers may need further education, training, and skills. Although, actually meant to ease work life, the paradoxical effect of information technology is that if one is not adept at its usage it may be a stress-inducer rather than being a stress-reliever. Lack of control is another major source of stress.

Figure-2. Human performance curve

(Source: McQuillan (2008))
Baron (1986) concluded that there is a direct link between lack of participative decision making and job related stress.

Agulanna (2007) noted that behavioural symptoms of work related stress are high incidence of accident, declined performance, alcoholism and other substance abuses, absenteeism, high turnover rates, erratic behaviour and communication difficulties. The effects of occupational stress are not borne by stressed individuals alone but rather they spill over to affect the performance of the organizations where these individuals earn their living. Nelson and Quick (2003) classified the organizational effects of occupational stress into three, consisting of participation problems, performance decrements, and compensation awards. Problems of participation are: absence at work, slowing of activities, turnover, refusal to work and disruptions. Losses that emanate from low quality of production or poor quality, grievances and unplanned reduction in machine activity are the performance decrements. Organizational expenses arising from court cases due to distress from the job make up compensation awards. Heller and Hindle (2000) analyzed the cost implications of stress on an organization as: Low quality service, high staff turnover, poor reputation, poor organization image and dissatisfied staff.

Jaja (2003) noted that overtime reduces family and social time out thus reducing the favourable social interactions which help to buffer from stress. It also creates tension at home which compounds the problems caused by job stress. In the bid to be self-accounting, many tertiary institutions have floated part time programmes which have to be taught by academics. This has a similar effect as overtime by increasing workload and decreasing the number of hours available for recreation or relaxation or family life.

Furthermore the respondents in the survey stated that more administrative work and increase in number of students per lecturer contributed to the increase in workload. The situation in Nigerian universities replicates the findings of the above survey as evidenced by the findings of the study done by Ofuegbu and Nwadiani (2006). The result is stress at a high level within the academic and this can engender poor job effectiveness. It may be important to note that most available studies done as reviewed were done outside Nigeria and the ones done within Nigeria merely assessed the level of stress experienced by lecturers. This study is therefore an endeavour to establish the influence of stress from workload on the job effectiveness of lecturers in federal universities in Cross River and Akwa Ibom states.

3. Research Methodology

The Cross sectional survey research design was adopted in this study. The study area was Akwa Ibom and Cross River States. Akwa Ibom and Cross River States were once a single state, Cross River state. Universities in these states were the focus of this study. In Cross River State these are two universities namely: University of Calabar (owned by the federal government) and Cross River State University of Technology (owned by the state government). Also two universities are functional in Akwa Ibom State and they are: University of Uyo (Federally owned) and Akwa Ibom State University (State owned).

Population of this study consists of the lecturers of the two Federal Government owned universities in Akwa Ibom and Cross River States. The population figure was derived from lecturers on the payroll of these universities as at the time of the survey and the breakdown for each university is illustrated in Table 3.1. The choice of tertiary institutions is to capture academics from Federal Government owned universities in both states studied, which are fully functional, accredited and recognized by the regulatory body; National Universities Commission (NUC). From Table 1 it can be seen that at the time of the survey, a total of one thousand and two (1,002) lecturers were employees of University of Calabar, while University of Uyo’s population of academic staff was one thousand one hundred and sixty six lecturers (1,166). The total population of lecturers for the two institutions was two thousand one hundred and sixty eight (2,168) lecturers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University Of Calabar</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University Of Uyo</td>
<td>1166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other to obtain a sample that properly represents the population; a stratified random sampling technique was used to select the lecturers involved. Faculties of each institution were regarded as the strata. University of Uyo had twelve faculties while University of Calabar had ten faculties. Given that the population under study is finite, the Taro-Yamen formula was used in determining the sample size. The sample size for University of Calabar is two hundred and eighty six lecturers while University of Uyo’s sample size used for the study is two hundred and sixty eight. The total sample for the study was five hundred and eighty four lecturers drawn using stratified random sampling technique.

The research instrument employed in this study was Workload Stress Scale (WSS) and Job Effectiveness Questionnaires (JEQ). The Occupation Stress and Job Effectiveness Scale is divided into four sections A to D. Section A, elicited for demographic information of the lecturers with regards to sex, age, educational qualification, marital status, work experience, rank and publication statistics. Section B was a six (6) item Likert type scale, designed to assess stress intensity experienced by lecturers in tertiary institutions. Each item had four options: Very Stressful, Stressful, Mildly stressful and Not Stressful. Section C was a twelve item Likert type scale designed to measure the job effectiveness of lecturers in terms of research proficiency and community service. Each item had four options: Always, Often, Sometimes and Never. Section D was constructed to measure the teaching prowess of lecturers using two indices: teaching competence and teachers’ competences. Each index comprised of six items. Each item on the questionnaire had four options: Very good, Good, Fair and Poor.
Thereafter, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used in the analyzing the data and to test hypothesis using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

4. Results and Discussion

The hypothesis for the study is stated as:

$H_0$: Stress arising from workload does not significantly influence the job effectiveness of university lecturers.

$H_A$: Stress arising from workload has a significant influence on the job effectiveness of university lecturers.

The hypothesis was to test if there is no significant influence of workload related stress on job effectiveness of university lecturers in terms of publication, community service and teaching effectiveness. The independent variable was workload related stress while the dependent variable was job effectiveness of university lecturers in terms of publication, community service and teaching effectiveness. The workload related stress was categorized into low, average and high based on the lecturers mean response score. Lecturers who scored below the mean in their response were classified as low, those who scored within the mean range were classified as average and those who scored above the mean level were classified as assessing workload related stress as high. Based on this the influence of workload related stress on job effectiveness in terms of publication, community service and teaching effectiveness was calculated using the one Way Analysis Of Variance. The analysis results are shown in Table 2 and 3.

Examination of Table 3 shows that there is significant influence of work load related stress on job effectiveness of universities lecturers in terms of publication (F=19.39, P<.05), community service (F=6.28, P<.05), and teaching effectiveness (F=12.78, P<.05). The null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis accepted as the calculated F-ratios of 19.39, 6.28, and 12.78 were greater than the critical F-ratio of 3.14 at 0.05 significance level. Since the F-ratios were significant a post hoc analysis using the Fishers Least Significant Difference (LSD) multiple comparison test was done. The LSD result is shown in Table 4.

The result displayed in Table 4 indicates that in terms of the influence of workload related stress on job effectiveness in terms of publication, lecturers who perceived workload as high had significant higher mean score for publication than those who perceived it as low (t=12.88) low and average (t=7.88). Similarly those who perceived influence of workload stress on publication as average had a significant higher mean score than lecturers who perceived it as low (t=4.76). This result means that lecturers who perceived workload stress as high faced difficulty in publication than lecturers who perceived it as average or low. Lecturers who perceived the influence of workload stress on job effectiveness in terms of publication as average also faced difficulty in publishing more than those who perceived it as low.

### Table 2. Descriptive statistics of influence of workload related stress on job effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job effectiveness</th>
<th>Workload related stress</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>16.96</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>16.93</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. One-way ANOVA of influence of workload related stress on job effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>563.84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>281.92</td>
<td>19.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>8083.43</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8647.27</td>
<td>558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>217.98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>108.99</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>9652.92</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9870.9</td>
<td>558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>387.47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>193.74</td>
<td>12.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>8428.85</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8816.32</td>
<td>558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level (critical F<sub>3,556</sub>=3.14); Source: Researcher’s SPSS computation, 2012

### Table 4. Fishers LSD multiple comparison test analysis of influence of workload related stress on job effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload related stress</th>
<th>Low (n=132)</th>
<th>Average (n=163)</th>
<th>High (n=264)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>-2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>-4.76*</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>-12.88*</td>
<td>-7.88*</td>
<td>18.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level (critical F<sub>2,556</sub>=3.14); Source: Researcher’s SPSS computation, 2012.
With regards to job effectiveness in terms community service lecturers who perceived workload related stress as high had significant higher mean score than lecturers who perceived it as low (t=−10.54) or average (t=−3.54). Likewise, lecturers who perceived influence of workload related stress as average had a significant higher mean score than lecturers who perceived it as low (t=−2.09). This result means that lecturers who perceived the workload related stress as high faced more problems in performing their community service than those who perceived it as average or low lecturers who perceived the influence of workload related stress as average also faced more problems in facing their community service function than those who perceived it as low.

With reference to the influence of workload related stress on job effectiveness in terms of teaching effectiveness, lecturers who perceived the workload related stress as high had significant higher mean score for teaching effectiveness than lecturers who perceived it as low (t=−10.32). On the other hand lecturers who perceived workload related stress as average had a significant higher mean score than lecturers who perceived it as low (t=−3.49).

The analysis result indicates that workload related stress significantly influence the job effectiveness of lecturers in terms of publication, community service and teaching effectiveness. This is in consonance with the findings of Agulanna (2007) and Deng and Ekpo (1994). This finding is also affirmed by Jega (2002); Nelson and Quick (2003) and Tiji (2000) that stress from workload adversely affects job performance. However, this result negates the finding of Amalu (2004) that teachers are not affected by workload.

A number of explanations may account for the present finding. First is the fact that lecturing – learning process involves a lot of energy sapping activities. Given the Nigerian situation in which lecturers do not have time for holidays to rest and relax the inability to recoup lost vigour and strength dissipates job effectiveness. Another explanation is the fact that most of the tasks of a lecturer cannot be delegated; this therefore makes the workload almost entirely his/her responsibility. Secondly the Nigerian situation is compounded by the incessant deadlines and time pressures. With regards to job effectiveness in terms of publication, community service and teaching effectiveness. This is in consonance with the findings of Agulanna (2007) and Deng and Ekpo (1994). This finding is also affirmed by Jega (2002); Nelson and Quick (2003) and Tiji (2000) that stress from workload adversely affects job performance. However, this result negates the finding of Amalu (2004) that teachers are not affected by workload.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The following conclusion was reached from the research findings: Stress arising from workload does affect the job effectiveness of university lecturers. In other words university lecturers’ job effectiveness in teaching, publication and community service is affected by the stress from workload.

Given the result of this study these recommendations were made:

i. NUC should ensure that internationally acceptable student- lecturer ratio is adhered to. Additionally there should be a limit to the number of universities a lecturer can act as part time or adjunct lecturer.

ii. Universities that have a sink or swim approach to employees will have high labour turnover. However, effective recruitment of faculty, new hire orientation, mentoring and relevant training and retraining will produce employees that are well suited and prepared for their jobs. Employees should also be encouraged to share experiences and support one another.

iii. Lecturers should learn to monitor their stress symptoms. Effective self-monitoring will aid the imitation of combative behaviours at the early stage of the stress cycle.

iv. Periodic mandatory medical check-up should be initiated. Health talks and relevant on the spot check-ups will also help in reducing stress.

v. The management of universities should also provide recreational facilities in their staff quarters and not just open fields that have no recreation equipment. Corporate bodies can be approached to finance such projects and these projects named after them.

vi. Annual leave should be made mandatory for all lecturers and the school calendar planned to make this possible. Holiday packages subsidized or negotiated by the school should be made available to so as to encourage lecturers to enjoy going on holidays.

vii. New lecturers must go through orientation and mentoring so that they will have adequate and reliable information about the demands of the work. This will help them to prepare well to meet the expected job situations and face the work stress.

viii. Management of universities should devise a method of obtaining feedback from their workers regarding the work situation so as to be able to redesign jobs to enhance job performance effectiveness.

ix. Very importantly management should reduce the work load of academic staff by reassigning administrative tasks back to the non-academic staff who were ab initio employed to carry out these tasks.

x. ASUU should also always bear in mind the after effects of lengthy strikes on lecturers and make compromises quickly where necessary.
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