WAIMS© World Academy of Informatics and Management Sciences, Vol1 Issue 2, April-May 2012
ISSN (online):2278-1315
www.waims.co.in

OCCUPATIONAL STRESS & LIBRARY PROFESSIONAL IN DIGITAL ENVIRONMENT

Somvir [1] & Sudha Kaushik [2]

[1]*Librarian, CBS Group of Institutions, Jhajjar (Haryana)-Indian*

[2]*Librarian, P.D.M. College of Engineering, Bahadurgarh (Haryana)-India*

ABSTRACT

In today's corporate as well as institutional world, the most important concept is Job stress. Occupational stress is also called as burnout. Library Professional in academic libraries now appears to suffer from occupational stress. In present era the library professionals are faces with constant challenges in their working environments. In term of documents, infrastructure facilities, information etc., user's expectations always seems to exceed library's capacity in this digital environment. Stress study amongst library professionals is topical and challenging due to stress prevalence on the larger society affects library professionals. The study will focus on the significance of difference and association between mean Stress scores of library professionals and independent variables in private engineering & management colleges of Haryana State. The T-test and ANOVA test are used for this purpose. A structured questionnaire was constructed in two parts: General Data Sheet and Quality of Work life was used to collect the primary data.

Keywords: Stress, Digital Environment, Occupational Stress, Library Professionals

I. INTRODUCTION

Stress is a term that has been linked to varied concepts and operations. For some researchers it is stimulus, for others it is an inferred inner state and for still others it is an observable response to stimulus or situation. Thus the use of this term is somewhat hazardous because of the lack of consensus that prevails in stress research (Dohrenwend & Dohrenwend, 1974). [1] Some other researchers prefer to use the term stressor to refer to events that can cause stress, the organism's biological and behavioral response to the stressor (Davison & Neale, 1994). [1] According to Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary stress is "pressure or worry caused by the problems in someone's life." Physical, mental and financial consequences may be occurring due to the stress on the job for employers as well as employees. Stressful working conditions are associated with increased absenteeism, tardiness and turn over, all of which, have a negative effect on a organization's success. The effects of workplace stress costs employers a huge amount in lost productivity, medical costs, absenteeism and accidents. The effects on employees result in a myriad of negative effects such as health hazards and lowered work efficiency. It is important to manage stress without undergoing physical or psychological damage. Generally stress is the changes, which our bodies experience as one, adjust to the continually changing environment. The library environment has changed drastically over the past few decades. With the development & application of information technologies, the library environment has shifted form the traditional library to computerized library, then automated library and more recently digital library. With such changes, the structure and nature of library & information science professionals has also changed in a dynamic way. The library & Information Science professionals experience stress as they readjust their lives with the changing library environment, job rotation, job promotion etc, in the adjusting to such changing library job environment, stress will help or hinder us depending on how we react to it. [2] A wide range of physical and psychological health problems can be occurred due to unmanaged stress.

II. TYPES OF STRESS

There are common perceptions among people that stress is always bad. But there is good stress also. Today's world is very competitive and to survive and progress in this age, a little stress is necessary. Thus, the stress classified into two groups the good stress or 'eustress' or the bad stress or 'distress'. Eustress is the good stress which helps us to improve our performance. Another stress is Distress known as The Bad Stress. The bad stress makes us vulnerable to fatigue and illness. In digital

environment the stresses can be divided into technological Stress, Job Security Stress and Physical Stress, which affects the library professionals.

III. EFFECTS OF STRESS

Events producing Stress affect a person through FOUR areas of human functioning:

1. **Physical effects of stress**: Mainly through the neuro-endocrino-immunological pathway: Changes in the heart rate, blood pressure, respiration, gastric acidity, muscular tensing, intestinal motility etc.
2. **Emotional effects of stress:** Through hypothalamus and endocrinal release; mainly responsible for the so called psychosomatic disorders.
3. **Mental effects of stress:** The psychological effects of the above.
4. **Behavioural effects of stress**: The behavioural effects of stresscoping problems caused by stress.

IV. LITERATURE REVIEW

Haridasan and Sultan (2002), in their survey examines the extend of Occupational Stress felt by the library staff of the Gorakhpur University. The main objectives of the study were to identify the role of different dimensions of stress experienced by the library staff working in different levels in the organization, to study the personal factors causing the burnout among library staff etc. Data were collected by sending questionnaire to library staff of the university. 62 staff were investigated for ascertaining their stress experience. A few of the findings are, the librarians are under stress as they are affected by role overload, role conflict, unreasonable group and political pressure and under participation, the librarian also experience high burn out on the emotional exhaustion dimension. Junior professional assistants also experienced high degree of burnout on the emotional exhaustion etc. **Sornam and Sudha** (2003) attempts to study the level of Occupational Role Stress (ORS) among women library professionals working in Bharathidasan University in Tamil Nadu. Objectives of the study were to identify the influence of age, experience, marital status on ORS and to find out the extend of association between selected socio demographic variables and ORS. The scoring pattern was done in a five point mode ranging from 0-4 and the Median, Chi-Square test, Karl Pearson's Co-efficient of Correlation and Students t-test were used as statistical Tools. The study identified that age, experience and marital status have significant association with ORS. The study undertook by **Togia** (2005) mainly includes to measure the levels of burnout among Greek Academic librarians and to assess its relation with certain background characteristics. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) was administered to 136 academic librarians across Greece. The study suggested that respondents experienced low levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization and moderate levels of personal accomplishment. Of the background characteristics, age, number of years as a librarian and participation in decision-making were found to be independent of the burnout experienced. **Routray and Satpathy** (2007) described the types of stress in digital library environment and broadly divided them into: Technological, Physical, Mental and Situational. Technological stress was described as the stress due to the development and application of information technologies among the library and information professionals. Due to rapid change in computer hardware and software, obsolescence of existing hardware and software is a common phenomenon in almost all libraries. Thus there is the necessity to keep pace with the changing technologies which due to financial, time or technological constraints, it is difficult to do. **Mahalakshmi K and Sornam S** (2011) studies on the effect of technology on library professionals of engineering colleges of Anna University, Coimbatore, by examing the dimensions of: 1) Demographical details 2) Perceptions of technology, which includes emotional reactions to technology and replacement of people by technology.

V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This part of the analysis was taken up to compare the mean OS scores of the relevant subsamples categorized on the basis of the following characteristics: Gender, Urban/Rural, Marital status, Educational background, Professional Qualification, Age Group, Designation, Nature of Job, Involvement in IT applications, Salary range, Experience, No of children they have. For this analysis, the total sample (N = 100) was divided into relevant subsamples. The OS scores obtained by the respondents of the different groups in each case were used to construct separate frequency tables. The means and standard deviations of each group were also calculated. The difference in means of each relevant pairs of groups was subjected to statistical test of significance for difference between means for independent samples. To compare the means of two groups, a t-test was employed with 0.05

level of significance. To compare the means of more than two groups, One- way Analysis of Variance (One-way ANOVA) was used. F-probability of appropriate significance level was considered to determine the significance of the test. The obtained data were processed for the computation of Mean, Std. Error of Mean, Median, Mode, Std. Deviation, Variance, Skewness, Std. Error of Skewness, Kurtosis, Std. Error of Kurtosis, Range, Minimum and Maximum. All the Statistical Analysis was performed with the help of SPSS.

VI. DATA INTERPRETATION & ANALYSIS

In respondents 57% are male and 43% are female, 39% are married and 61% are unmarried. 63% respondents have supervisory designation and 37% have non supervisory designation. 91% library professionals are involved in IT but 9% are not involved. In respondents 71% library professionals belongs to Urban and 29% belong to Rural. As educational qualification 61% respondents are graduates, 21% are post graduate and 6% are M.Phil. As professional qualification 18% library professionals have diploma, 9% have graduation degree in library science, 51% have post graduate degree in library science and 16% are researcher and other 6% have other qualification (certificate). 28% library professionals are below 25 years, 44 % are between 25 to 30 years and 28% are above 30 years. 30% respondents are librarian, 25% respondents are Assistant Librarians, 30% are library assistant and 15% are library attendants. 41% respondents have salary less than 10k, 24% have 10k to 15k, 23% have 15k to 20k and other 12% have above 20k. 58% library professionals have less than 5 year experience and other 42% have more than 5 years. 54% respondents don't have any child, 34% have only single child and other 12 have more than one child.

The measures of central tendency and dispersion of the Occupational Stress scores were computed. The statistics are given in Table 1

Table 1

Statistical constants for the distribution of OS scores for the total sample

N	Valid	100
	Missing	0
Mean		189.6200
Std. Error of Mean		2.32082
Median		189.0000
Mode		193.00
Std. Deviation		23.20823
Variance		538.622
Skewness		.879
Std. Error of Skewness		.241
Kurtosis		.925
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.478
Range		103.00
Min		153.00
Max		256.00
Max Possible		300
Min Possible		60

Details and results of the comparisons of the mean OS scores of relevant subsamples with respect to each characteristic of categorization are presented in the following subsections.

T-Test for the significance of difference between mean OS scores of male and female Library Professionals

Hypotheses:

H_0 There is no significance difference between Male and Female about Occupational Stress factors.

H_1 There is significance difference between Male and Female about Occupational Stress factors.

Table 2

Group Statistics					
	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
OS	Male	57	190.4737	24.12919	3.19599
	Female	43	188.4884	22.15892	3.37920

Table 3

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
OS	Equal variances assumed	.145	.705	**.422**	98	.674	1.98531	4.70740	-7.35637	11.32699

Interpretation Since the calculated value is less than the critical value (**.422< 1.96**). Accept the null hypotheses. There is no significance difference between about Male and Female about Occupational Stress factors.

One way ANOVA for group difference in OS of library professionals of three different age groups

Hypotheses: H_0: There is no significance difference between age groups about Occupational Stress factors ($\mu_1= \mu_2= \mu_3$)

H_1: There is significance difference between age group about Occupational Stress factors ($\mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \neq \mu_3$).

Table 4

Descriptive								
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Min	Max
Below 25	28	191.0000	24.49339	4.62881	181.5025	200.4975	153.00	256.00
25-30	44	188.6136	21.17943	3.19292	182.1745	195.0528	153.00	256.00
30 to above	28	189.8214	25.63137	4.84387	179.8826	199.7602	153.00	256.00
Total	100	189.6200	23.20823	2.32082	185.0150	194.2250	153.00	256.00

Table 5

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	99.021	2	49.511	**.090**	.914
Within Groups	53224.539	97	548.707		
Total	53323.560	99			

Interpretation: Calculated value (F)= degree of freedom in the nominator (no of samles-1) and degree of freedom dominator (n_t –k) where $n_t = \sum n_j$ =total sample size, k= No of samples i.e. Number of degree of freedom in the nominator = (3-1)=2 Number of degree of freedom of the dominator = (100-3)=97 Critical value of F for the 0.05 significance level is 3.09. Since calculated value (**.090<3.09**). Accept the null hypotheses. There is no significance difference between age group about Occupational Stress factors.

T-Test for the significance of difference between mean OS scores of marital status library professionals

Hypotheses:

H_0: There is no significance difference according to marital status about Occupational Stress factors.

$H_{1:}$ There is significance difference according to marital status about Occupational Stress factors.

Table 6

Group Statistics					
	Marital Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
OS	Single	39	189.3590	21.68493	3.47237
	Married	61	189.7869	24.30714	3.11221

Table 7

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
OS	Equal variances assumed	.889	.348	**.089**	98	.929	-.42791	4.78224	-9.91811	9.06229

Interpretation Since the calculated value is less than the critical value (.089< 1.96). Accept the null hypotheses. There is no significance difference according to marital status about Occupational Stress factors.

One way ANOVA for group difference in OS among groups of Library Professionals formed on the basis of their educational qualifications

Hypotheses:

$H_{0:}$ There is no significance difference between educational qualification about Occupational Stress factors ($\mu_1= \mu_2= \mu_3= \mu_4= \mu_5= \mu_6= \mu_7= \mu_8$)

$H_{1:}$ There is significance difference between educational qualifications about Occupational Stress factors ($\mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \neq \mu_4 \neq \mu_5 \neq \mu_5 \neq \mu_6 \neq \mu_7 \neq \mu_8$).

Table 8

Descriptive								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
BA	46	189.8043	24.44006	3.60349	182.5465	197.0621	153.00	256.00
BCOM	3	177.3333	20.55075	11.86498	126.2824	228.3842	156.00	197.00
BSC	12	195.5833	22.07202	6.37164	181.5594	209.6072	169.00	235.00
MA	15	187.8667	16.26946	4.20076	178.8569	196.8764	155.00	233.00
MCOM	3	188.3333	58.62025	33.84442	42.7126	333.9541	153.00	256.00
MSC	3	177.3333	20.55075	11.86498	126.2824	228.3842	156.00	197.00
MPHIL	6	201.0000	26.84027	10.95749	172.8329	229.1671	169.00	235.00
OTHERS	12	185.9167	16.20583	4.67822	175.6200	196.2134	155.00	218.00
Total	100	189.6200	23.20823	2.32082	185.0150	194.2250	153.00	256.00

Table 9

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2326.754	7	332.393	**.600**	.755
Within Groups	50996.806	92	554.313		

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2326.754	7	332.393	**.600**	.755
Within Groups	50996.806	92	554.313		
Total	53323.560	99			

Interpretation: Calculated value (F)= degree of freedom in the nominator (no of samles-100) and degree of freedom dominator (n_t –k) where $n_t = \sum n_j$ =total sample size, k= No of samples i.e. Number of degree of freedom in the nominator = (8-1)=7
Number of degree of freedom of the dominator = (100-8)=92 Critical value of F for the 0.05 significance level is 2.11. Since calculated value (**.600<2.11**). Accept the null hypotheses. There is no significance difference between educational qualifications about Occupational Stress factors.

One way ANOVA for group difference in OS among groups of Library Professionals formed on the basis of their professional qualifications
Hypotheses:
$H_{0:}$ There is no significance difference between professional qualification about Occupational Stress factors ($\mu_1= \mu_2= \mu_3= \mu_4= \mu_5= \mu_6$)
$H_{1:}$ There is significance difference between professional qualifications about Occupational Stress factors ($\mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \neq \mu_4 \neq \mu_5 \neq \mu_5 \neq \mu_6$).

Table 10

Descriptive								
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Min	Max
Diploma	18	187.1111	24.86644	5.86108	174.7453	199.4769	153.00	256.00
BLIB	9	195.7778	23.66315	7.88772	177.5887	213.9669	169.00	235.00
MLIB	51	190.3333	23.66066	3.31315	183.6787	196.9880	153.00	256.00
MPHIL	15	187.8000	22.92597	5.91946	175.1040	200.4960	156.00	235.00
PHD	1	218.0000	.	.	.	.	218.00	218.00
OTHER	6	181.6667	15.92064	6.49957	164.9590	198.3744	155.00	197.00
Total	100	189.6200	23.20823	2.32082	185.0150	194.2250	153.00	256.00

Table 11

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1715.160	5	343.032	.625	.681
Within Groups	51608.400	94	549.026		
Total	53323.560	99			

Interpretation: Calculated value (F)= degree of freedom in the nominator (no of samles-1) and degree of freedom dominator (n_t –k) where $n_t = \sum n_j$ =total sample size, k= No of samples i.e. Number of degree of freedom in the nominator = (6-1)=5
Number of degree of freedom of the dominator = (100-6)=94 Critical value of F for the 0.05 significance level is 2.31. Since calculated value (**.625<2.31).** Accept the null hypotheses. There is no significance difference between professional qualifications about Occupational Stress factors.

T-Test for the significance of difference between mean OS scores of Nature of Job (Supervisory and Non-supervisory) of library professionals
Hypotheses:

H_0: There is no significance difference according to Nature of Job (Supervisor/Non Supervisor) about Occupational Stress factors.
H_1: There is significance difference according to Nature of Job (Supervisor/Non Supervisor) about Occupational Stress factors.

Table 12

Group Statistics					
	Supervisory /Non Supervisory	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
OS	Supervisory	63	190.4762	23.41206	2.94964
	Non supervisory	37	188.1622	23.10305	3.79812

Table 13

Independent Samples Test									
	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
								95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.002	.962	**.480**	98	.633	2.31403	4.82577	-7.26255	11.89061

Interpretation Since the calculated value is less than the critical value (.480< 1.96). Accept the null hypotheses. There is no significance difference according to Nature of Job (Supervisor/Non Supervisor) about Occupational Stress factors.

T-Test for the significance of difference between mean OS scores of Involvement in IT or Not library professionals
Hypotheses:
H_0: There is no significance difference according to Involvement in IT about Occupational Stress factors.
H_1: There is significance difference according to Involvement in IT about Occupational Stress factors.

Table 14

Group Statistics					
	Involvement in IT/Not Involved	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
OS	Involved	91	190.1319	23.65925	2.48016
	Non Involved	9	184.4444	18.30376	6.10125

Table 15

Independent Samples Test									
	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
								95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.249	.619	**.700**	98	.486	5.68742	8.13061	-10.44750	21.82235

Interpretation Since the calculated value is less than the critical value (**.700< 1.96**). Accept the null hypotheses. There is no significance difference according to involvement in IT about Occupational Stress factors.

T-Test for the significance of difference between mean OS scores of library professional (urban/rural) library professionals
Hypotheses:

H_0: There is no significance difference according to library professional (urban/rural) about Occupational Stress factors.

H_1: There is significance difference according to library professional (urban/rural) about Occupational Stress factors.

Table 16

Group Statistics					
	URBAN/RURAL	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
OS	URBAN	71	189.4930	22.54258	2.67531
	RURAL	29	189.9310	25.17642	4.67514

Table 17

Independent Samples Test									
	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
								95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.668	.416	**.085**	98	.932	-.43808	5.14046	-10.63916	9.76301

Interpretation Since the calculated value is less than the critical value (.085< 1.96). Accept the null hypotheses. There is no significance difference according to library professional (urban/rural) about Occupational Stress factors.

One way ANOVA for group difference in OS among groups of Library Professionals formed on the basis of their designation
Hypotheses:

H_0: There is no significance difference between designation about Occupational Stress factors ($\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = \mu_4$)

H_1: There is significance difference between designations about Occupational Stress factors ($\mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \neq \mu_3 \neq \mu_4$).

Table 18

Descriptive								
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Min	Max
Librarian	30	191.2667	23.66131	4.31994	182.4314	200.1019	153.00	256.00
Asst Librarian	25	189.2400	26.01006	5.20201	178.5036	199.9764	153.00	256.00
Library Asst	30	188.6000	23.13469	4.22380	179.9614	197.2386	153.00	256.00
Library Attnd	15	189.0000	19.28730	4.97996	178.3190	199.6810	155.00	227.00
Total	100	189.6200	23.20823	2.32082	185.0150	194.2250	153.00	256.00

Table 19

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	121.933	3	40.644	**.073**	.974
Within Groups	53201.627	96	554.184		
Total	53323.560	99			

Interpretation: Calculated value (F)= degree of freedom in the nominator (no of samles-1) and degree of freedom dominator (n_t –k) where $n_t = \sum n_j$ =total sample size, k= No of samples
i.e. Number of degree of freedom in the nominator = (4-1)=3
Number of degree of freedom of the dominator = (100-4)=96 Critical value of F for the 0.05 significance level is 2.70. Since calculated value (.073<2.70). Accept the null hypotheses. There is no significance difference between designations about Occupational Stress factors.

One way ANOVA for group difference in OS among groups of Library Professionals formed on the basis of their salary
Hypotheses:
H_0: There is no significance difference between salary about Occupational Stress factors ($\mu_1=\mu_2=\mu_3=\mu_4$)
H_1: There is significance difference between salary about Occupational Stress factors ($\mu_1\neq\mu_2\neq\mu_3\neq\mu_4$).

Table 20

Descriptive								
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Min	Max
Below 10k	41	190.1463	22.29188	3.48141	183.1102	197.1825	153.00	256.00
10-15 k	24	189.6667	25.83504	5.27356	178.7575	200.5758	153.00	256.00
15-20 k	23	190.5652	26.12005	5.44641	179.2701	201.8604	153.00	256.00
Above 20 k	12	185.9167	16.20583	4.67822	175.6200	196.2134	155.00	218.00
Total	100	189.6200	23.20823	2.32082	185.0150	194.2250	153.00	256.00

Table 21

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	196.536	3	65.512	**.118**	.949
Within Groups	53127.024	96	553.407		
Total	53323.560	99			

Interpretation: Calculated value (F)= degree of freedom in the nominator (no of samles-1) and degree of freedom dominator (n_t –k) where $n_t = \sum n_j$ =total sample size, k= No of samples i.e. Number of degree of freedom in the nominator = (4-1)=3
Number of degree of freedom of the dominator = (100-4)=96 Critical value of F for the 0.05 significance level is 2.70. Since calculated value (.118<2.70). Accept the null hypotheses. There is no significance difference between salary about Occupational Stress factors.

One way ANOVA for group difference in OS among groups of Library Professionals formed on the basis of their experience
Hypotheses:
H_0: There is no significance difference between experience about Occupational Stress factors ($\mu_1= \mu_2$)
H_1: There is significance difference between experience about Occupational Stress factors ($\mu_1\neq\mu_2$).

Table 22

Descriptive								
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Min	Max
Below 5 yr	58	190.3448	23.93672	3.14305	184.0510	196.6387	153.00	256.00
Above 5 yr	42	188.6190	22.41075	3.45805	181.6354	195.6027	153.00	256.00
Total	100	189.6200	23.20823	2.32082	185.0150	194.2250	153.00	256.00

Table 23

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	72.552	1	72.552	**.134**	.716
Within Groups	53251.008	98	543.378		
Total	53323.560	99			

Interpretation: Calculated value (F)= degree of freedom in the nominator (no of samles-1) and degree of freedom dominator (n_t –k) where $n_t = \sum n_j$ =total sample size, k= No of samples i.e. Number of degree of freedom in the nominator = (2-1)=1 Number of degree of freedom of the dominator = (100-2)=98 Critical value of F for the 0.05 significance level is 3.94. Since calculated value (.**134<3.94**). Accept the null hypotheses. There is no significance difference between experience about Occupational Stress factors.

One way ANOVA for group difference in OS of library professionals categorized on the basis of the number of children they have

$H_{0:}$ There is no significance difference between children they have about Occupational Stress factors ($\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3$)

$H_{1:}$ There is significance difference between children they have about Occupational Stress factors ($\mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \neq \mu_3$).

Table 24

Descriptive								
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Min	Max
No Child	54	190.0185	24.65267	3.35480	183.2896	196.7474	153.00	256.00
1 child	34	190.2941	23.37770	4.00924	182.1373	198.4510	153.00	256.00
more than 1	12	185.9167	16.20583	4.67822	175.6200	196.2134	155.00	218.00
Total	100	189.6200	23.20823	2.32082	185.0150	194.2250	153.00	256.00

Table 25

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	188.603	2	94.302	**.172**	.842
Within Groups	53134.957	97	547.783		
Total	53323.560	99			

Interpretation: Calculated value (F)= degree of freedom in the nominator (no of samles-1) and degree of freedom dominator (n_t –k) where $n_t = \sum n_j$ =total sample size, k= No of samples i.e. Number of degree of freedom in the nominator = (3-1)=2 Number of degree of freedom of the dominator = (100-3)=97 Critical value of F for the 0.05 significance level is 3.09. Since calculated value (.**172<3.09**). Accept the null hypotheses. There is no significance difference between children they have about Occupational Stress factors.

VI. CONCLUSION

There is no significance difference according to Gender; marital status; supervisory status; involvement in IT; and library professional (urban/rural), age group; educational qualifications; professional qualifications; designations; salary; experiences; and children they have about Occupational Stress factors means that all factor of stress management are equally impact on gender, marital status and others demographic profile of library professionals. The percentage of librarians having high level of 'Occupational Stress' is zero. The magnitude of the mean score of OS is 189.62 in the sample with a standard deviation of 23.20. Therefore it is observed that the library professionals working in academic libraries of Private Engineering & Management Colleges in Haryana do not experience any Stress in their occupation. Every stress management factors are

important and they equally impact on library professionals, so whatever factors we chose in our study we can't ignore any factor if we want to reduce the stress among library professionals. In our study we found out that the good stress management system can get satisfaction of employee among library professionals and says that every organization need to have good stress management system. The library professionals have to manage control the events that impact their work and produce stress or to allow stress to manage them, in this present era. The library professionals have to do more effective work what they did in the past in their personal or professional lives. It is simply not possible to remove all sources of stress in the digital library workplace but, the library managers can manage stress among their teams which will help to reduce some of its consequences, such as: poor morale, reduced performance and team conflict. The best ways to manage stress in digital library environment are: create a supportive culture; appreciate people's differences; recognize the signs of stress; resolve issues as they arise; consider teambuilding; enable autonomy; and have a contingency plan.

VII. REFERENCES

1. http://www.pathways.cu.edu.eg/subpages/training_courses/Stress%20Management7/Chapter2.htm
2. . Routray, Bijalaxmi and Satpathy, Sunil Kumar: "Stress Management of Library & Information Science Professionals In Digital Environment" available at http://eprints.rclis.org/bitstream/10760/8152/1/stress_management.pdf (accessed on 09-07-2011)
3. Chuma Opara NNADOZIE & Emmanuel Uwazie ANYANWU (2008). Stress Among Selected Library Practitioners in Nigerian: A Diagnosis and prescription. Samaru Journal of Information Studies Vol.8 (2)2008 available at http://www.ajol.info/index.php/sjis/article/view/44823/28317 Access on 20th Nov 2011.
4. Haridasan, Sudharma and Sultan, Tarannum (2002). Occupational Stress and burnout among the library staff of Gorakhpur University: A survey, journal of Library and Information science, Vol. 27(1), June, 41-52.
5. http://creatingabetterlife.net/2011/04/10-tips-for-stress-management-at-w... (accessed on 11-07-2011)
6. http://www.juliodiazjatuf.com.ar/images/2007_bancos_stress_management.pdf (accessed on 12-07-2011)
7. http://www.lesstress.net/different-types-of-stress.htm
8. http://www.lesstress.net/different-types-of-stress.htm (accessed on 15-07-2011)
9. http://www.r020.com.ar/paperlandia/detalle.php?id_handler=3232 (accessed on 12-07-2011)
10. Julita Nawe, (1995) "Work-related stress among the library and information workforce", Library Review, Vol. 44 Iss: 6, pp.30 – 37
11. Mahalakshmi K and Sornam S (2011). "Techno stress among library professionals of Anna University of Technology, Coimbatore", Pearl: A Journal of Library and Information Science Vol 5(3), pp. 9-12.
12. Routray, B. and S. K. Satpathy (2007). "Stress management of Library and Information Science Professionals in Digital Environment" LIS E-Prints in Library and Information Science. www.eprints.rclis.org
13. Sornam, S and Sudha, S. (2003). Occupational role stress on women librarians: A study, SRELS Journal of Information Management, Vol. 40(2), June, 147-156. Available at http://www.indianjournals.com/ijor.aspx?target=ijor:sjim&volume=40&issue=2&article=007 access on October 30, 2011.
14. Togia, Aspasia (2005). Measurement of burnout and the Influence of Background Characteristics in Greek Academic Librarians, Library Management, Vol. 26(3), 130-138. Available at http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=1463271&show=html access on November 20, 2011.