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1.0 Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic has adversely affected the society members. However, its impact was not similar as different people reacted differently to the challenging situations. The responsibility of developing good sportspersons and healthy society is primarily relies on the physical education lecturers. However, their regular job took a direct hit due to the Covid-19 induced lockdowns. All this was associated with high amount of uncertainty with their future. In the backdrop of above, this investigation was carried out to compare the status of psychological factors like stress, anxiety, hostility and frustration tolerance of physical education lecturers of rural and urban areas of Nagpur District of Maharashtra. All the standard methods for data collection and analysis were employed to undertake this study. The results of the study show that stress, anxiety and hostility were significantly high in the physical education lecturers of urban area, while the frustration tolerance was moderate and high amongst the physical education lecturers of urban and rural areas respectively.
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2.0 Introduction

The persistence of COVID-19 pandemic has severely affected the personal and professional lifestyle of almost all people and the physical education lecturers are no different. However, the physical education lecturers being involved in the outdoor activities suffered a lot due to pandemic period lockdowns (Aperribai et al., 2020). The regular adverse news related to the pandemic made the life quite difficult and studies have reported that the corona virus has induced a lot of fear among the people (Asmundson and Taylor, 2020), worry, panic, anxiety, or depression-related distress (Bao et al., 2020). Recent studies have overwhelmingly reported about the adverse effect of pandemic on the psychological aspects of health such as, an increase in depression and stress levels (Ozamiz-Etxebarria...
et al., 2020), furthermore, high anxiety has been related to impaired sleep in many research studies (Rajkumar, 2020).

In addition to above, the social situations have also changed due to the disease and the subsequent guidelines of lockdowns (Liu et al., 2020), containment zones, quarantine, etc. (Zhang et al., 2020). In many areas of India, people worldwide have either completely stopped their work or made changes to their profession in view of the evolving situations. All this has made a lot of impact on the psychological health of the people and especially, the physical education lecturers. The uncertainty associated with the future also made the things very difficult for many of them and most of them were and are in a dilemma whether to stay in the same profession or to change it. In the present situation, the state and national governments are implementing new precautionary and responsive measures on a daily or weekly basis to contain the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic. Moreover, the guidelines laid down by the governments for rural and urban areas are not same and this has variable impact on the personal, social and psychological factors of the people (Mahase, 2020). In view of the above, this study has been conducted to compare selected psychological factors such as stress, anxiety, hostility and frustration of physical education lecturers of Nagpur District of Maharashtra.

2.0 Research Methodology

2.1 Design of Study, Sampling method and Sample Size

The study was carried out by using a descriptive research design. All the physical education lecturers working in the academic colleges situated in the Nagpur District of Maharashtra and affiliated to Rashtrasant Tukadoji Maharaj Nagpur University, Nagpur were considered as the population. Out of all these 40 each physical education lecturers from rural and urban areas of the Nagpur District were selected randomly as the sample making the total as 80.

2.2 Data Collection

Data collection was done by using survey methodology.

2.3 Instrument of Data Collection

For data collection purpose following standardized tests was used-

2.3.1 Personal Stress

Personal Stress Source of physical education lecturers was assessed by using Personal Stress Source Inventory prepared by Arun Kumar Singh, Ashish K. Singh and Arpana Singh.

2.3.2 Anxiety

Anxiety level of physical education lecturers was assessed by using Sinha’s Comprehensive Anxiety Test prepared by A. K. P. Sinha and L. N. K. Sinha.

2.3.3 Hostility

Hostility level of physical education lecturers was assessed by using self prepared test. Prior to its use the reliability and validity of the test was determined and Fixed Response (Qualitative) Rating scale was used.
2.3.4 Frustration Tolerance

The Frustration Tolerance level of physical education lecturers was assessed by using Frustration Tolerance Test prepared by S. N. Rai.

2.4 Tester’s Reliability

To ensure that the investigator is well versed with techniques of conducting the tests, the investigator along with an assistant had a number of practice sessions in testing procedure as mentioned in the respective test manuals. The tester’s reliability was evaluated together with reliability of tests. A Pearson’s product moment correlation was computed between the two measures of each variable.

2.5 Statistical Procedure employed and Significance Level

The descriptive statistics such as Mean, Standard Deviation, Frequency, Mode, etc. were determined. Independent ‘t’ test and Chi-Square test was used for comparison of the test values. The data was analysed using SPSS 18.0 Software. The significance level was chosen to be 0.05 (or equivalently, 5%).

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Stress level of Physical Education Lecturers

Table 3.1: Stress level of Physical Education Lecturers of Academic Colleges of Rural and Urban Areas of Nagpur Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean ±SD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.4 ±4.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44.3 ±5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: Number of players; SD: Standard Deviation; MD: Mean Difference; t: t Value; p: Probability

Above Table 3.1 shows results pertaining stress level of Physical Education Lecturers of Academic Colleges of Rural and Urban Areas of Study Area i.e. Nagpur Region. The results show that the average stress level test score of physical education lecturers of rural areas is 31.4±4.6, whereas for physical education lecturers of urban area it is 44.3±5.1. The comparative analysis shows that there is significant difference in the stress level of physical education lecturers working in rural and urban areas.
3.2 Anxiety of Physical Education Lecturers

Table 3.2: Anxiety of Physical Education Lecturers of Academic Colleges of Rural and Urban Areas of Nagpur Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>±SD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>±6.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.124</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>±7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: Number of players; SD: Standard Deviation; MD: Mean Difference; t: t Value; p: Probability

Above Table 3.2 shows results pertaining anxiety level of Physical Education Lecturers of Academic Colleges of Rural and Urban Areas of Study Area i.e. Nagpur Region. The results show that the average anxiety test score of physical education lecturers of rural areas is 49.2±6.2, whereas for physical education lecturers of urban area it is 60.3±7.3. The comparative analysis shows that there is significant difference in the anxiety level of physical education lecturers working in rural and urban areas.

3.3 Hostility of Physical Education Lecturers

Table 3.3: Hostility of Physical Education Lecturers of Academic Colleges of Rural and Urban Areas of Nagpur Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>±SD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>±3.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.024</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>±2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: Number of players; SD: Standard Deviation; MD: Mean Difference; t: t Value; p: Probability

Above Table 3.3 shows results pertaining hostility level of Physical Education Lecturers of Academic Colleges of Rural and Urban Areas of Study Area i.e. Nagpur Region. The results show that the hostility test score of physical education lecturers of rural areas is 22.1±3.4, whereas for physical education lecturers of urban area it is 29.4±2.6. The comparative assessment shows that there is significant difference in the hostility level of physical education lecturers working in rural and urban areas.
3.4 Frustration Tolerance of Physical Education Lecturers

Table 3.4: Frustration Tolerance of Physical Education Lecturers of Academic Colleges of Rural and Urban Areas of Nagpur Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Frustration Tolerance</th>
<th>Physical Education Lecturers of Rural Area</th>
<th>Physical Education Lecturers of Urban Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi–square 26.156; df: 2, p<0.05; Table Value: 5.99

Above Table 3.4 shows results pertaining frustration tolerance level of Physical Education Lecturers of Academic Colleges of Rural and Urban Areas of Study Area i.e. Nagpur Region. The results show that the 12.5% physical education lecturers of rural areas and 10.0% lecturers of urban areas have low frustration tolerance level. In addition to this frustration tolerance level of 17.5% lecturers of rural area and 72.5% lecturers of urban area is moderate. Furthermore frustration tolerance of 70.0% lecturers of rural area and 17.5% lecturers of urban area is of high level.

4.0 Conclusions

4.1 Stress level of Physical Education Lecturers

- The comparative assessment showed that there is a significant (p<0.05) difference in the stress level of physical education lecturers of study area however stress level of physical education lecturers of urban area is higher than those working in rural areas.

4.2 Anxiety of Physical Education Lecturers

- The comparative assessment showed that there is a significant (p<0.05) difference in the anxiety level of physical education lecturers of study area however anxiety level of physical education lecturers of urban area is higher than the those from rural area.

4.3 Hostility of Physical Education Lecturers

- The comparative assessment showed that there is a significant (p<0.05) difference in the hostility level of physical education lecturers of study area however physical education lecturers of urban area are more hostile in nature.

4.4 Frustration Tolerance of Physical Education Lecturers

- The comparative assessment showed that there is a significant (p<0.05) difference in the frustration tolerance level of physical education lecturers of study area. Specifically, the most of the physical education lecturers of urban area displayed moderate level of frustration tolerance while majority lecturers of rural area have high level of frustration tolerance.
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