

EFFECT OF JOB STRESS ON EMPLOYEE CONTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR: A CASE STUDY OF DELUXI NIGERIA LIMITED

ATARIA JENNIFER OBIAGELI
Human Resource Management
Distance Learning Center
Ahmadu Bello University Zaria

ABDULMALIK ABUBAKAR YUSUF
Department of Actuarial Science and Insurance
ABU Business School
Ahmadu Bello University Zaria
Phone number: +2348065346078
Email : abubakarabdulmalik1985@gmail.com

&

HALIMA SHUAIBU
Distance Learning Center
Ahmadu Bello University Zaria
Phone number: +2348069807220
Email: saasalimsuleiman@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to evaluate the general effects of six hypothesized factors that contribute to job stress and subsequently productivity level in employees at Deluxi Nigeria Limited. The data utilized was acquired using a questionnaire method that consists of 72 participants which amount to more than 80% of the total workforce. The major objective of this study is to delineate the causes of job stress and their effect on productivity level. The methodology used was a reflective approach that involves two basic phases; the measurements model phase and the structural model phase. The independent constructs include career development, work overload, role ambiguity, job insecurity, work family life, personality, while job stress and productivity level were dependent variance. The result demonstrated a good reliability and validity with AVE (0.57 - 0.90), Composite Reliability (0.71 - 0.95), Cronbach Alpha (0.17 - 0.90); although, JOBINS and WORKOVER have Cronbach value of 0.172 and 0.303 respectively. However, this anomalies occur as a result of low outer loading of the individual items that formed the construct (<0.50). Again, all the constructs conform to the standard for discriminant validity. Fornell – Larker's criteria values were higher for internal correlation than for external. Furthermore, the result of HTMT buttresses the correlation with none of the value going above the cut-off of 0.90. Using the significance value of 0.05, the result of the structural modeling discovered that CARDEV, JOBIN, ROLEAMB are significant with p-values lesser than 0.05. However, WORKFAM, PERS and WORKOVER have little effect on JSTRESS with p-values of 0.3, 0.9, and 0.2 respectively. Also, path analysis revealed that there is no direct effect between the independent construct and productivity level. However, there

is an indirect relation via job stress. The study also reveals that career development, job insecurity and role ambiguity are the major factors that contribute to work related stress. It was therefore recommended that the company consider all these factors when designing a stress management scheme for the workers in order to enhance her productivity.

Keywords: Effect, Job Stress, Employee, Counterproductive work behavior, Deluxi Nigeria Limited.

1.0 Introduction

For decades, stress has always been associated with almost every work of life. The concept of stress has a long tradition in organizational and social literature (Somerfield and McCrae, 2000). Moreover, over the years, it has been escalated by the rapid growth in the competitive nature of businesses. In most cases, the workers are at the receiving end of the pressure, that amount from this development. In basic terms, stress can be defined as the reaction of a person to the outcome of external environmental condition that poses excessive pressure (Ivancevich et al., 2006; Robbins and Sanghi, 2006). This can range from psychological, behavioral, to physiological pressures.

Based on the drastic change today, it is almost impossible to live without stress. Occupational stress can either be resourceful or deterrent to job efficiency. This implies that, stress is not totally avoidable (Seibt et al., 2009) and harmful (Arbabisarjou et al., 2013; Luthans, 1989). However, it must be monitored consistently and kept within a reasonable and healthy level (i.e. not too low and not too high), such that it supports high performance in an organization and not otherwise. The significance of occupational stress was also bolstered by (Rofle, 2005). Regardless, the effects of excess stress on employees cannot be over emphasized. These effect ranges from physical, mental and psychological distress in the employees (Swanson, et al., 2008). In most cases they are overlooked, because the results are not immediate in most cases. Moreso, when ignored over the years, the cumulative impact can be telling on the individual, family and even the society at large. It is therefore important to understand the relationship between the stressors, their impact on stress and performance level; thus, maximizing the potentials that come with proper stress management at work.

Today, many studies have been carried out with respect to the telling effects of job stress on employees; although, some disputed the fact that all job stress are bad in its entirety. However, most of them established that, significant numbers of employees around the globe are affected by job stress in one form or the other, whether mild or severe. According to (Selye, 2010), more than three billion workers were exposed to job stress and this number is predicted to increase over the years. This is a concern because, it will lead to low productivity level in organizations, not excluding the direct consequence on the health of the employees involved. In order to be able to manage or control stress as a factor contributing to the overall success of an organization, it is apt to first understand what it really means and what constitutes the precursors. According to (Swanson, et al., 2008), it is not isolated to the work environment, it can also emanate from the individual behavior, socioeconomic, and family issues in some cases.

Many organizations do not take the issue of job related stress seriously. Still, it has a significant impact on the both physical, mental health and psychology of the workers depending on the level of stress they are exposed to and how long (Maneze, 2005; Lawrence, 1995; Sengupta, 2007; Mimura and Griffiths, 2003). Job stress does not directly impact the productivity of an organization, it manifests in desperate dimension which can range from mild to chronic consequences depending on the type of work or industry. The consequences include, decrease in job satisfaction, absenteeism, low morale, thought of quitting, among many other negative outcomes. This in turn has a telling effect on the organization performance. For example, recurring absenteeism in a critical department like customer care, might greatly affect the unit's performance and the organization by extension.

Generally, the effect of stress is enormous that it cannot be measured accurately. Stress has both direct and indirect effect on both the individual and the organization. Also, the effect can range from immediate to long time impact. Often, the effect on an organization is underscored by employers, because they are the receiving end, whereas the impacts on the workers are neglected. However, since the collective work of the employees contributes to the success of an organization. It will be wrong to ignore the impact on the latter. Low productivity at work can be majorly traced back to job stress (Dean, 2002) and this also account for rise in absenteeism, low morale and corresponding deteriorating performance level (DCS Gaumail, 2003). Interestingly, the effect of work related stress is not only restricted to employees at the lower level. Moreover, even executives and managers also experience occupational (Elovainio et al., 2002). This observed neglected impact of work related stress, is the major motivation behind this study.

The detrimental effect job stress has on both individuals (i.e, employees) and their organization has made it a vital area of concentration that needs to be diligently studied. On one hand, this effect includes the physical and mental well-being of the individual. On the other, it is related to the productivity level of the organization. While studying this effect, Reveinio (2017) tried to determine the level of work related stress in employees with respect to their performance. However, the possibility of different individual responding to stress in a different manner, was not considered. According to (Imrab et al., 2013), an inverse correlation exists between job stress and productivity of an organization. Also, Usman et al. (2014) discovered that, the major triggers of stress in employees are work overload, poor reward policies and role ambiguity. Granted, the positions are valid, as this factor contributes their own quota to job stress. Regardless, there are also other external factors like home conflict and other non-work related activities that can also cause stress at work. Another factor most researchers overlooks when estimating the causes of stress is job security. Conversely, the causes and symptoms of stress are multi-faceted. It is the accumulation of these disparate factors over time that manifest as stress. In some rare cases, when the employee has undergone several series of the strain. They become accustomed to it and it becomes a routine (Jungwee, 2007).

This study attempted to establish the relationship between job stress and employee productivity. The specific objectives of the present study are as follows:

First, is to determine the level of job stress according to the following factors: work overload, role ambiguity, work-life balance, job security, and personality trait and their impact on employee work performance. Then, the effects of job stress on the productivity level of employees are evaluated.

The success of every organization is founded by maximum productivity. This can only be achieved when the employee put in enough work in order to deliver their given tasks in a timely manner. From previous studies, it can be inferred that work associated stress significantly affect the output of an employee with respect to stress (Rofle, 2005). This means that the influence of stress in organization set goals cannot be overemphasized. The focus of this research is to understand the effect of work related stress on the staff of Deluxi Nigeria Limited and Nigerian workers in extension, with respect to their productivity. Also, the study seeks to pinpoint the stressors that are responsible for this harmful event or occurrence. This will equip the management (i.e. decision makers) of an organization with the necessary information needed to increase the performance of their workers and consequently, their organization.

Although, the design of this study is locally targeted at workers in Deluxi Nigeria Limited and this might limit the application in other field. However, since the effect of work related stress on productivity is universal. Therefore, it will also be apt to implement some of the ideas generated in this study to be utilized, with proper modification, with respect to other diverse fields.

2.0 Literature Review

Attempt has being made by several researches and theories to classify stress based on its effect on health, organization among other significant areas of life. One of them, Smith et al., (2006), simply classified it into chronic stress, traumatic stress and acute stress. According to them, chronic stress is one which the person experience consistently with blatant idea of how to overcome it. Traumatic is one that is triggered by an uncontrolled event like natural disasters. On the other hand, acute stress which is the most common, is temporal in nature. Moreover, it is known to have mild effect on the individual.

Evers et al., (2000) discovered six important constraints in which work related stress can be evaluated. They include work-family interaction, job success, job role, work environment, staffs relationship, intrinsic to the job. However, they did not consider other stressors like job insecurity and other external factors that might contribute to stress. Apart from the earlier mentioned factors, in their attempt to study the sources of stress in employees, Jins and Radhakrishnan (2013) pin-points other factors like low morale, repetitive routine, harassment, among many others.

The cursors that triggers stress in workers are multi-dimensional and interconnected in nature. For the purpose of this research, some of them will be examined. This causes ranges from work overload, role ambiguity, work-life balance, personality, job insecurity, career development, and productivity. Among these, only the lather two are dependent variables, while others are independence constraints. The relationship between all this factors and job stress and job productivity are reviewed in details below.

2.1 Productivity Level

Productivity level is an independent variable in this study. The correlation between job stress and productivity has been studied by various researchers. Many of them posited that there is an inverse relationship between the two (Ahmed and Ramzan, 2013). This means that increase in job stress often leads to decrease in productivity and vice versa. During the probe of the effect of work related stress on school teachers, Jeyarai, (2013) found out that, work related stress is the major cause of high absenteeism rate and job dissatisfaction in the education field. While trying to establish the relationship between job stress and productivity, Mathis and Jackson (2000), discovered that performance is a product of three characteristics; Effort, Ability and Time Utilized on a particular task. This literally connotes that, absence or reduction in the weight of these factors will lead to a corresponding reduction in performance. Also, (Olugbile, 1982; Asika and Ade-Serrano, 1985; Akinnusi, 1995), while studying the impact on Nigerian workers, established that high level of stress combined with other social-economic factors have a telling consequence on the performance level of an average Nigerian worker especially in urbanized area like Lagos where transportation and other social factor contributes to job stress.

2.2 Work Overload

Work overload is said to be a major contributing factor that leads to job stress. This occurs when the assigned task is above the capacity of an individual employee at a particular point in time (Margolis et al., 1974; Dyck, 2001). This mounts excess pressure on them and affects the way in which the task is executed. Mahmood et al. (2010) discovered that working under excessive pressure causes workers to lose interest in the work thereby amounting to a decline in performance over time. This can also lead to some form of dissatisfaction on the job (i.e. job insecurity). Although some researchers like Parasuraman and Hancock (2001), have a contrary position with respect to the effect of workload on job stress. Instead, they believe task load leads to job stress. They established the difference between task load and workload, describing the former as the environmental load on the organism; while, workload was defined as the experience of the task load. Consequently, the impact of the workload on job stress and productivity respectively cannot be over emphasized.

2.3 Role Ambiguity

Again, role ambiguity is another factor that contributes to stress and corresponding decline in performance of an employee with respect to time. It is simply the situation where the responsibilities of individual employees and how to fulfill them are not well defined by the employer (Dyer and Quine, 1998). Because of this, employees experience low morale and motivation to effectively execute their responsibilities. Role ambiguity is more common for new employees or workers assigned to a new role. For a novice, this might lead to job dissatisfaction (i.e. job insecurity), which will in turn result to low output. Performance of an employee is a result of how well the task given are carried out (Jex, 2002). Therefore, it should be considered as one of the contributing factors with respect to job stress and subsequent productivity level.

2.4 Work-Family Life

The inability of an employee to establish buoyancy between work and family, also plays a major role in the generation of stress at work. In reverse relationship, McCubbin and Figley

(1983) considered job stress as a factor that poses threat to the healthy relationship in a family. According to Anderson (2003), work-life escalation is also a precursor which generates stress in employees of an organization.

2.5 Personality

The capacity to handle stress differs for different people (Michie, 2003). Therefore, it is also vital to put into consideration this factor when evaluating the total impact of stress on employees. The handling of stress is dynamic and not absolute as it is portrayed by a lot of studies (Fako, 2010). Since, it is the accumulation of individual task executed that leads to the overall productivity of any organization (Mangkunegara, 2009). Therefore, it will be reasonable to consider the strength or weakness of an individual employee with respect to stress. Granted, this cannot be vaguely measured or evaluated. Regardless, it is still important that this factor is put into consideration during the process of evaluation. Moreover, what might be strenuous to one, might still be manageable to the other.

2.6 Job Insecurity

This is another low hanging foot that can lead to stress on an employee (Jungwee, 2007). The manner in which previous staffs of a company were disengaged or the introduction of a new staff with similar role might raise some concerns. The typical working environment can also contribute to stress in an organization. Studies have shown that a worker tends to perform better in a conducive environment. There is also a correlation between career development and job insecurity. When an employee does not experience career development in their organization, they start feeling detached from the firm. This might not be observed immediately. However, with time, it degenerates into low morale and consequent thought of leaving. During this stage, the productivity of the individual is reduced. Again, since one of the result of job stress is dissatisfaction (Frost, 2003). The urge to quit might amount to loss for an organization, especially when it involves diligent and adept employees

2.7 Productivity Level

The measure of performance or productivity is a significant subject that should also be discuss in this regard. In most cases, it is solely determined by the organization. What company A might classify as a high productivity of an employee might not be the same as company B. Employers have set goals and objectives that must be carried out in order to meet certain target financially. This means they need to distribute just as much work to employees. However, in the same sense, the amount of work required to be done with respect to the capability of an individual is also a determinant of the quality of their output. So, organizations will have to consider striking a balance between their target and quality, thereby relieving the worker off excess stress.

3.0 Methodology

The study area of this research is Deluxi Nigeria Limited located in Lagos State, Nigeria. Initially, the total workforce of 96 people was approached to participate in the study. However, for private reasons, we only got 72 responses. This includes staffs in all departments not excluding the high level managers. The mode of data collection was a carefully designed questionnaire that put into consideration various variables discussed in the literature review. The basis of the questionnaire was the Likert Scale (5 point). The questionnaires were designed

in such a way that the participant understands the question on the first glance. The questions under each constraint are designed to be reflective on the constraint while providing an objective base for comparative analysis. Data analysis and evaluation were aided by SMART PLS software. The analysis of the result is divided into two sections, measurement and structural model (Chin, 2010). The first section involves the probing of the reliability and validity of the constructs while the other involves structural modeling with a sampling size of 5000. Measurement evaluation includes data reliability and validity was carried out using the reflective model method. This was followed by structural model generation and analysis. A bootstrapping calculation method was utilized in order to establish the significance of the constructs and paths.

4.0 Discussion of Results

4.1 Data Validity and Reliability

4.1.1 Constructive Reliability

The result of the construct reliability and validity as seen in Table 1, shows that all the construct satisfied the reliability test with Average Variance Extracted (AVE) ranging from 0.6 to 0.9 which is more than the set standard (Hair et al. 2006, 2017b). Again minimum Composite reliability also ranges from 0.6 to 0.7. Utilizing the recommended Composite Reliability standard of >0.7, all the constructs were viable apart from JOBIN which recorded a value of 0.64. >0.7. The Cronbach alpha also recorded values ranging from 0.17 to 0.89 with both JOBINS and WORKOVER being the anomaly with values of 0.17 and 0.30 respectively (Pallant, 2007). From the result, it can be inferred that all the construct generally show some form of reliability, which means that the question used for the measurement of the constructs are valid.

Constructs	Items	Path Coefficient	Cronbach Alpha	rhoA	Composite Reliability	AVE
CARDEV	CD1	0.925	0.899	1.092	0.949	0.902
	CD2	0.975				
JOBINS	J11	0.971	0.172	0.379	0.641	0.526
	J12	0.33				
JSTRESS	JS1	0.913	0.868	0.903	0.918	0.788
	JS2	0.874				
	JS6	0.876				
PERS	P1	0.738	0.813	5.396	0.867	0.77
	P2	0.997				
PRODLVL	PL1	0.98	0.801	1.602	0.889	0.802
	PL2	0.802				
ROLEAMB	RA4	0.385	0.91	0.971	0.836	0.657
	RA5	0.967				
	RA7	0.947				
WORKFAM	WFL3	0.947	0.778	0.912	0.895	0.81
	WFL4	0.851				
WORKOVER	WO2	0.494	0.303	0.479	0.705	0.567
	WO3	0.943				

Table 1: Constructive Reliability

4.1.2 Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity is used to check the correlation between constructs including itself, in order to establish a clear difference in individual constructs. The discriminant validity result using the Fornell-Larcker Criteria is displayed in Table 2. It shows that the all the constructs have stronger relationship within themselves than they do with other constraints. This was established by observing the values of correlation between individual construct which is higher than their correlation with others.

Constructs	CARD EV	JOBIN S	JSTRES S	PER S	PRODL VL	ROLEA MB	WORKF AM	WORKOVE R
CARDEV	0.95							
JOBINS	-0.064	0.725						
JSTRESS	-0.364	0.346	0.888					
PERS	-0.319	0.241	0.216	0.87 7				
PRODLVL	0.171	-0.189	-0.184	- 0.09 9	0.896			
ROLEAMB	-0.179	-0.017	0.472	0.09 2	-0.021	0.81		
WORKFAM	-0.011	-0.046	0.173	0.00 7	0.099	0.073	0.9	
WORKOVER	-0.03	0.165	0.162	0.03 8	-0.111	-0.05	-0.02	0.753

Table 2: Discriminant Validity using Fornell- Larcker Criteria (Fornell and Larcker, 1981)

Apart from cross loading and Fornell-Larcker Criteria, another novel tool that can be used to establish discriminant validity between the constructs is Heterotrait – Monotrait (HTMT) Ratio. Henseler et al., (2015) recommend that the novel heterotrait-monotrait also known as HTMT, should be used in collaboration with other conventional evaluation method like Fornell-Larcker and cross loading. It advised that values should also be less than 0.90 for the discriminant validity to be accepted. The result of the HTMT Ratio is displayed below in Table 3, and it is observed that all the construct in the study satisfies the set condition. This further bolster the result generated using the Fornell- Larcker Criteria and cross loading.

Constructs	CARDEV	JOBINS	JSTRESS	PERS	PRODLVL	ROLEAMB	WORKFAM	WORKOVER
CARDEV								
JOBINS	0.432							
JSTRESS	0.391	0.721						
PERS	0.346	0.66	0.168					
PRODLVL	0.156	0.622	0.211	0.147				
ROLEAMB	0.179	0.39	0.503	0.159	0.159			
WORKFAM	0.032	0.37	0.194	0.156	0.5	0.122		
WORKOVER	0.134	0.823	0.276	0.266	0.289	0.198	0.236	

Table 3: Discriminant Validity using Heterotrait – Monotrait (HTMT) Ratio

4.2 Structural Modeling

In order to establish the relation between the constructs, a complete bootstrapping was initiated to generate a model in this regard. This was carried out using 5000 samples (Streukens and Leroi Werelds, 2016), 300 iterations, weighing scheme of factor and significance level of 0.05. The result of this calculation as displayed below in Table 4. It is observed that WORKFAM, PERS and WORKOVER have little effect on JSTRESS with p-values of 0.3, 0.9, and 0.2 respectively. However other independent constructs including CARDEV, JOBINS, ROLEAMB have a significant value lesser than 0.05. Therefore, it can deduced that, career development, job insecurity, and role ambiguity have more impact on job stress and consequently productivity level, than work overload, personality and work family life. That is, they should be given more emphasis when crafting the mechanism to manage work stress and increase productivity level of employees.

Constructs Paths	Path Coefficient	T-Statistics	P-Value	Remarks
CARDEV -> JSTRESS	-0.258	2.068	0.039	Significant
JOBINS -> JSTRESS	0.321	2.088	0.037	Significant
JSTRESS -> PRODLVL	-0.184	2.362	0.018	Significant
PERS -> JSTRESS	0.012	0.093	0.926	Insignificant
ROLEAMB -> JSTRESS	0.426	2.125	0.034	Significant
WORKFAM -> JSTRESS	0.157	1.031	0.302	Insignificant
WORKOVER -> JSTRESS	0.124	1.215	0.225	Insignificant

Table 4: Structural Modeling and Path Analysis

5.0 Conclusion

This study was conducted to determine the level of Job stress and its corresponding effect on the productivity level of the employees of Deluxi Nigeria Limited. From the study result, it was observed that the data validity of majority of the constructs are valid and this shows that research design is good and reliable for the generation of a structural model. The structural model generated to determine the effect of the constructs with respect to work related stress and employee productivity level, shows that career development, job insecurity, role ambiguity are significant factors that contribute to stress at work (significance < 0.05). Furthermore, the result also bolstered the direct correlation that has being established between job stress and productivity.

6.0 Recommendations

The study recommends that Deluxi Nigeria Limited, should device mechanisms to manage job stress considering all significant job stressors diligently evaluated in this study. This should involve making significant effort to create innovative and inclusive structures that will relieve their worker off unnecessary or extreme stress during work. Also, the result of this study does not totally accept personality, work overload and work overload as significant

constructs, but they should not be totally excluded when designing the solution to job stress and productivity level subsequently. Furthermore, the scope of this study is limited to Deluxi Nigeria Limited. However, by extension, the approach can be adopted and modified in other diverse work environments and fields. Also, the number of respondents should be increase in order to promote data inclusiveness.

References

- Ahmed, A., & Ramzan, M. (2013). Effects of job stress on employees job performance a study on banking sector of Pakistan. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 11(6), 61-68.
- Akinnusi, M. (1995). Stress among a sample of bank executives in Nigeria. *Management in Nigeria*, April-June, 5-15.
- Anderson, R. (2003). Stress at work: the current perspective. *The journal of the Royal Society for the Promotion of Health*, 123(2), 81-87.
- Arbabisarjou, A., Ajdari, Z., Omeidi, K., & Jalalinejad, R. (2013). The relationship between Job stress and performance among the hospitals Nurses. *World Sci J*, 1, 181-8.
- Asika, N. and Ade-Serrano, A. (1985) Executive Stress. *Nigerian Journal of Management Studies*. Vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 558-565.
- Chin, W. W. (2010). How to write up and report PLS analyses. In *Handbook of partial least squares* (pp. 655-690). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Dean, M. (2002). *Critical and effective histories: Foucault's methods and historical sociology*. Routledge.
- Dyck, D., & Roithmayr, T. (2001). The toxic workplace. *Benefits Canada*, 25(3), 52.
- Dyer, S., & Quine, L. (1998). Predictors of job satisfaction and burnout among the direct care staff of a community learning disability service. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 11(4), 320-332.
- Elovainio, M., Kivimäki, M., & Vahtera, J. (2002). Organizational justice: evidence of a new psychosocial predictor of health. *American journal of public health*, 92(1), 105-108.
- Scott, E., Engelke, M., Swanson, M. (2008). New graduate nurse transitioning: Necessary or nice. *Applied Nursing Research*, Volume 21, Issue 2, 2008, Pages 75-83, ISSN 0897-1897. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnr.2006.12.002>.
- Evers, A., Frese, M., & Cooper, C. L. (2000). Revisions and further developments of the Occupational Stress Indicator: LISREL results from four Dutch studies. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(2), 221-240.
- Fako, T. T. (2010). Occupational Stress among University Employees in Botswana. *European Journal of Social Sciences*. 15(3), pp. 313-326.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics.
- Frost, H. M. (2003). Bone's mechanostat: a 2003 update. *The Anatomical Record Part A: Discoveries in Molecular, Cellular, and Evolutionary Biology: An Official Publication of the American Association of Anatomists*, 275(2), 1081-1101.
- Gaumail, D. C. S. (2003). *Work stress management and prevention*.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Matthews, L. M., Matthews, R. L., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). PLS-SEM or CB-SEM: updated guidelines on which method to use. *International Journal of Multivariate Data Analysis*, 1(2), 107-123.

- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* 6th Edition. Pearson Prentice Hall. New Jersey.
- humans: Critique and reformulation. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 87, 49-74.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 43(1), 115-135.
- Imrab, S., Mushtaq, A., Qudsia, B. (2013). Factors Affecting the Motivation of Academic Staff (A case study of University College Kotli, UAJ&K). *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*. Vol. 2 No. 1.
- Ivancevich, J. Konapske, R. Matteson, M. (2006). *Organ Behave Manage* New York: McGraw Hill.
- Jex, S.M. (2002). *Organizational Psychology. A Scientist Practitioner Approach*: New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Jeyaraj, S. S. (2013). Occupational stress among the teachers of the higher secondary schools in Madurai District, Tamil Nadu. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 7(5), 63-79.
- Jins P., & Radhakrishnan, R. (2013). A study on causes of work stress among tile factory workers in Kannur District in Kerala.
- Jungwee P. (2007). Work stress and job performance. *Perspectives on Labour and Income*, 8(12), 5-17. Labour and Household Surveys Analysis Division, Statistics Canada. Retrieved from Google articals. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-001x/2007112/article/10466-eng.pdf>
- Lawrence R.M., (1995) Managing job stress: An employee assistance/human resource management partnership, *Personnel Review*, Vol. 24 Iss: 1, pp.41 – 50.
- Luthans, F., Luthans, B. C., & Luthans, K. W. (2021). *Organizational Behavior: An Evidence-Based Approach* Fourteenth Edition. IAP.
- Mahmood, B., Hussain, S., Hannan, A., & Muhammad, N. (2010). The relationship between stress and work performance in an Industrial Environment of Faisalabad district. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences (Pakistan)*.
- Mangkunegara, A. P. (2009). *Evaluasi Kinerja SDM*. Bandung. PT Refika Aditama. 31.
- Margolis, B. L., Kroes, W. H., & Quinn, R. P. (1974). Job stress: An unlisted occupational hazard. *Journal of occupational medicine*, 16(10), 659-661.
- Mathis, R.L., and J.H. Jackson. (2000). *Human resource management*. 9th ed. Cincinnati, OH: Southwestern College Publishing.
- McCubbin, H. I., & Figley, C. R. (1983). Bridging normative and catastrophic family stress. *Stress and the family*/edited by Hamilton I. McCubbin & Charles R. Fisley.
- Meneze, M. M. (2005). *The Impact of Stress on productivity at Education Training & Development Practices: Sector Education and Training Authority*. Pretoria, South Africa: University of Pretoria.
- Michie, S., & Williams, S. (2003). Reducing work related psychological ill health and sickness absence: a systematic literature review. *Occupational and environmental medicine*, 60(1), 3-9.
- Mimura, C., & Griffiths, P. (2003). The effectiveness of current approaches to workplace stress management in the nursing profession: an evidence based literature review. *Occupational and environmental medicine*, 60(1), 10-15.

- Olugbile, A. O., & Oyemade, A. (1982). Health and the environment-a comparative study of agricultural and industrial workers in Nigeria. *African Journal of Medicine and Medical Sciences*, 10(3-4), 107-112.
- Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS*. Routledge.
- Parasuraman, R., & Hancock, P. A. (2001). Adaptive control of mental workload.
- Robbins & Sanghi (2006). *Organizational Behavior*. (11th Edition.), India: Dorling Kindersley Publishing. Accessed 2nd January, <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/f436/6c05609c46242f050d1f36848265e918e28b.pdf>
- Rolfe, H., Foreman, J., & Tylee, A. (2006). *Welfare Or Farewell?: Mental Health and Stress in the Workplace*. National Inst. of Economic and Social Research.
- Seibt, R., Spitzer, S., Blank, M., & Scheuch, K. (2009). Predictors of work ability in occupations with psychological stress. *Journal of Public Health*, 17(1), 9-18.
- Selye, H. (2010). Confusion and Controversy in the stress field. *Journal of Human Stress*, 1(2), 37-44.<https://doi.org/10.1080/0097840X.1975.9940406>
- Sengupta, D. (2007). *You can beat your stress*. Excel Books.
- Somerfield, M. R., & McCrae, R. R. (2000). Stress and coping research: Methodological challenges, theoretical advances, and clinical applications. *American Psychologist*, 55(6), 620–625. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.6.620>
- Smith, B. W., Shelley, B. M., Leahigh, L., & Vanleit, B. (2006). A preliminary study of the effects of a modified mindfulness intervention on binge eating. *Complementary Health Practice Review*, 11(3), 133-143.
- Streukens, S., & Leroi-Werelds, S. (2016). Bootstrapping and PLS-SEM: A step-by-step guide to get more out of your bootstrap results. *European Management Journal*, 34(6), 618-632.
- Usman, M., Ali, M., Yousaf, Z., Anwar, F., Waqas, M., & Khan, M. A. S. (2020). The relationship between laissez-faire leadership and burnout: Mediation through work alienation and the moderating role of political skill. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 37(4), 423-434.