

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Effects of Stress on Employee Productivity within the Hospitality Industry in Ghana Using Selected Cafeterias

Beatrice Atta Mensah

Assistant Registrar, Department of Hotel Catering and Management Studies,
Accra Technical University, Ghana

Sylvester Achio

Professor, Catholic Institute of Business and Technology, Ghana

Isaac Ofori Asare

Head, Department of Training and Research, Vita Verde Consult, Ghana

Abstract:

In today's competitive global environment, employee productivity is an essential element of a company's success. Employee productivity can be significantly hindered by high levels of stress experienced in the work environment. Stress is a universal phenomenon and persons from nearly every walk of life have to face stress. Employers today are critically analyzing the stress management issues that contribute to lower job performance of employees. The main aim of the study is to examine the impact of stress and its effect on employees' productivity at the selected cafeterias. Descriptive survey was adopted as the research design. Purposive and simple random sampling techniques were used in selecting a sample size of 320 employees from 20 cafeterias in Accra. Questionnaires were used as data collection instrument for the study. The results obtained suggest there is statistically and significant impact of stress on productivity. The size of the impact was estimated to be ($V=0.50$). Also, demographic variables such as Age, gender and educational of employees have significant impact on some stress variables. It was recommended that there must be education on the impact of stress on employees' productivity in the cafeterias especially.

Keywords: Stress, productivity, employees, hospitality

1. Introduction

In modern world stress has become an integral part of every employee in an organization. In today's business life employees normally work for longer hours than before to meet the high demands by employers of organizations. Stress is a complex and dynamic phenomenon which must be managed well to ensure that, there is effective performance of the employees at the work place. The aim of any business organization is to ensuring that, there is high and quality output or productivity and as a result employers must managed the employees well to avoid excessive stress on the employees which in the short and long run could affect the performance of the employees. Studies have shown that, organizational stress experienced by employees, accounts for about 50-60% of all lost working days. In most cases the organizational stress become very harmful when individuals are required to perform without the needed capabilities or resources to undertake the assigned task. There are two main factors that are attributed to organizational stress and its impact on performance. They include physical and psychosocial factors (Clegg,2011). The physical factors that cause stress are mostly attributed with anxiety among the employees. The psychosocial factors that cause stress include the following; work design, management, working environment which affects the employees negatively. Many studies have shown that, there is a high correlation between stress and employees' productivity. Robbins (2004) defined stress as a dynamic condition in which an individual is confronted with opportunity, constraint or demand related to what he desires and for which the outcome is perceived to be both uncertain and important. From the definition, when there is high level of stress on the employees it reduces their productivity since, they are unable to concentrate on their assigned task due to either the excessive workload and or pressure on them. Many of the stress related studies are done in the area of banking and other areas with few in the hospitality sector especially cafeterias. Most of the studies regarding stress and its impact on the employees' productivity in the hospitality industry are limited to the restaurants and the hotels. Studies have shown that aside the negative impact of stress on productivity, it also leads to employee's turnover. Most employees in the hospitality industry turn to leave their job due to the high level of stress they experience as a result of the high demand from their employers (Akgunduz&Sanli, 2017; Glebbeek&Bax, 2004; Price, 2001).Literature suggested that organizational stress is likely to have significant impact on the performance of the industry employees and as a result likely to lead to high level of turnover intentions (Arshadi&Damiri, 2013; Wong & Laschinger,2015).

Employee job performance refers to the level of productivity of an individual employee, relative to his or her peers, on several job related behaviours and outcomes (Sarwar, Ketavan, & Butt, 2015). It could be viewed as an activity in which an individual is able to perform the assigned task successfully within a given time frame.

Job performance is productivity that is the comparison of the amount of effectiveness that results from a certain level of costs associated with effectiveness (Sarwar, Ketavan, & Butt, 2015). Job performance is under two main groups namely; task performance and contextual performance (Badar, 2011). The task performance is the traditional notion of the ability of how well workers perform and complete specific tasks. Contextual performance measures aspects of performance unrelated to specific tasks such as; volunteering, putting in extra effort, cooperating, following rules and procedures and endorsing the goals of an organization that are important in the job. In Ghana much, studies on stress in the cafeterias and its impact on productivity have not received much light. This study examines the relationship that employees of selected cafeterias experience and its impact on productivity.

1.1. Objectives

The main objectives of the research were; to assess the relationship in job stress and productivity among employees. Also, impact of demographic characteristics on stress variables.

1.2. Study Hypotheses

Based on stated objectives, these research hypotheses have been formulated as follows;

1.2.1. Hypothesis One

- Null: There is no significant relationship between stress and employee productivity in cafeterias.
- Alternative: There is significant relationship between stress and employee productivity in cafeterias.

1.2.2. Hypothesis Two

- Null: Demographic characteristics, has no impact on stress variables.
- Alternative: Demographic characteristics, has no impact on stress variables.

2. Materials and Methods

The study was carried in four university cafeterias in greater Accra. This was conducted from the month of January to April. The study used 320 employees from twenty (20) selected cafeterias in Greater Accra. Respondents who were willing to response to the research instrument were included in the study. Initially, 400 employees were engaged, however at the time of the collection of the instruments from the employees, only 80% (320) were fully completed and submitted for the analysis. The result instrument was adopted from (Okeke et al (2016) in their study on stress among commercial bank workers in Nigeria. In this study employees who were willing to response to the research instrument voluntary were included.

3. Result and Discussion

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the employees. Out of the total of 320, 45.6% (146) of the employees were males while 54.4% (174) were females. The distribution of the age group suggests that, majority of the employees were within the age group 30-39 years, followed by those within the age group 20-29 years while the age group with the least number of employees represent those within 40-49 years as they formed about 12.2% (39). Information regarding the educational level of the employees were obtained and the result shows that, about 24.7% (79) have had basic education, secondary education leavers formed about 26.1%, tertiary graduates formed about 29.4% while those with no formal education formed about 17.8% (57).

Table 2 presents the analysis of how employees perceived their role of the selected cafeterias used in the study. The analysis shows that about 28.4% of the employees indicated that, they always like working for the cafeteria unit. 23.4% indicated sometimes while 25.3% indicated that not all. The average statistics suggest that (2.45 ± 1.15) employees indicated that they sometimes like to work at the selected cafeterias used for the study, although most employees indicated otherwise. It could also be observed that majority of the employees always or sometimes work under pressure (45.3%). Information regarding the roles of the employees are keen to ensuring effective performance in the workplace, in this study, it has been revealed that about 31.6% always have adequate information relating to their jobs, 29.4% indicated sometimes they get information while about 13.4% indicated that, they do not get any information regarding their roles from anybody.

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	146	45.6
Female	174	54.4
Age Group		
20-29	85	26.6
30-39	115	35.9
40-49	39	12.2
>50	81	25.3
Educational Level		
Basic	79	24.7
Secondary	90	28.1
Tertiary	94	29.4
No Formal Education	57	17.8

Table 1: Socio Demographic Profile of Employees

Do you like working for Cafeteria Unit of the facility?	N	%	Mean	SD
Always	91	28.4	2.45	1.15
Sometimes	75	23.4		
Seldom	73	22.8		
Not at all	81	25.3		
Do you think you have control over your job?				
Always	82	25.6	2.37	1.06
Sometimes	98	30.6		
Seldom	79	24.7		
Not at all	61	19.1		
Do you work under pressure?				
Always	72	22.5	2.59	1.11
Sometimes	73	22.8		
Seldom	89	27.8		
Not at all	86	26.9		
Do you have adequate information on your role at work?				
Always	101	31.6	2.21	1.03
Sometimes	94	29.4		
Seldom	82	25.6		
Not at all	43	13.4		
Total	320	100		

Table 2: Summary Statistics on How Employees Perceived Their Roles

Table 3 presents the result of the association between the constructs / items and three demographic profile (Gender, age group and educational level) of employees. The first construct (dependent of success). The construct has 5 main items and their associated relationship with demographic profile. The result suggest that three items are identified to be associated with gender in the chi-square test of independence. The items include; supportive supervisor ($X^2 = 10.13, p < 0.05$); Supportive subordinates ($X^2 = 10.914, p < 0.05$); The creator ($X^2 = 10.13, p < 0.05$) as indicated in the Table 2. Supportive supervisor variable had the highest predictive effect of influencing Gender. From the table, respondents who indicated that, their success depended on supportive supervisor were 156 and majority of them being females as they represent about 63.5%. Also, those who indicated that, their success depends on Supportive subordinates, they were 120 and most of them were males as they formed about 57.5%. Some of the employees believe that their success depended highly on the creator and such employees were 146 and about 61.6% of them were females. The next construct represent problem solving. Under this construct, there are four main items or ways through which employees at the selected cafeteria could solve their problems namely; Consult your supervisor, seek professional help, stay away from work, discuss it informally with colleagues. Out of these items only one item associates well with gender at 5% significance level. The item is Stay away from work ($X^2 = 3.97, p < 0.05$). Which suggest that the only means that employees use to solving their problems is to stay away from work, which associate well with gender. It could be observed form the table most of the employees who indicated (stay away from job) were males as they formed about 51.7% against the female of 48.3%. The last construct under the Table 3 indicates (What do you do when you feel tensed at work). Six main items were developed and out of the number five have association with gender, namely; Take a smoke break ($X^2 = 3.97, p < 0.05$.); Work out with exercise ($X^2 = 5.82, p < 0.05$.); Confront the problem ($X^2 = 8.40, p < 0.05$.); Take time out ($X^2 = 4.89, p < 0.05$.); Take it out on someone ($X^2 = 7.36, p < 0.05$). In each instance (items) it showed significance, that females were dominating. For example, in the association between take a smoke break and gender, the result suggests that most of the

respondents were males. It implies that most males would like to take a smoke break when they are tensed at the workplace. Table 4 presents the association between items and age group. In this table the only items that have significant association with items are shown. For full details see appendix. Three constructs are shown and, in each case, significant items are identified. The first construct has three items associating well with age at 5% significance level. Hard work and focus has ($X^2 = 28.54, p < 0.05$). The next construct has to do with how tension is dealt with in the work place, under these five items associated well with age group. While the last construct represent how problems are solved. This construct has three items being statistically and significantly associating with age group as shown in the Table 4 (full details see appendix). The significant association between the constructs and educational level is presented in Table 5 below. The result suggests that, three items under the first construct associate well with educational level namely; Hard work and focus ($X^2 = 18.53, p < 0.05$); Supportive subordinates ($X^2 = 13.53, p < 0.05$) and the Creator ($X^2 = 11.47, p < 0.05$). From the result under the first construct, employees who indicated that their successes depended on hard work and focus, were mostly basic school leavers as they formed about 33.3% of those who indicated yes under the item. The same interpretation applies to the rest of the items in the table (See appendix for full detail).

Based on the result as indicted in Table 3, more females are likely to indicate that their success on the job at the selected cafeterias are based on the supportive supervisor as compared to that of the males' employees. This suggested because the industry is dominated by females, the employees wants a leader or superior that is or are supportive in their dealing. Also, it was obtained from the result that, more males employees at the cafeterias believe that their success depend on supportive subordinates.

Item		Gender				
What does success on your job depend on	Level	Male	Female	Total	χ^2	P-value
Supportive supervisor	Yes	57	99	156	10.13	0.001
	No	89	75	164		
	N	146	174	320		
Supportive subordinates	Yes	69	51	120	10.914	0.001
	No	77	123	200		
	N	146	174	320		
The creator	Yes	56	90	146	5.718	0.017
	No	90	84	174		
	N	146	174	320		
When you have a problem at work, do you						
Stay away from work	Yes	74	69	143	3.9707	0.048
	No	72	105	177		
	N	146	174	320		
What do you do when you feel tense at work?						
Take a smoke break	Yes	72	105	177	3.907	0.048
	No	74	69	143		
	N	146	174	320		
Work out with exercise	Yes	65	101	166	5.817	0.016
	No	81	73	154		
	N	146	174	320		
Confront the problem	Yes	90	79	169	8.403	0.004
	No	56	95	151		
	Total	146	174	320		
Take time out	Yes	55	87	142	4.889	0.027
	No	91	87	178		
	N	146	174	320		
Take it out on someone	Yes	106	101	207	7.364	0.007
	No	40	73	113		
	N	146	174	320		

Table 3: Construct/Items Relationship with Gender

Note: χ^2 represent chi – square, p – value < 0.05 indicates significacne association

What does success on your job depend on	Level	Age group					N	χ^2	P-value
		20-29	30-39	40-49	>50				
Hard work and focus	Yes	30	70	9	50	159	28.541 ^a	0.000	
	No	55	45	30	31	161			
	N	85	115	39	81	320			
Supportive subordinates	Yes	43	42	18	17	120	16.929 ^a	0.001	
	No	42	73	21	64	200			
	N	85	115	39	81	320			
Fate/luck	Yes	34	51	24	52	161	13.465 ^a	0.004	
	No	51	64	15	29	159			
	N	85	115	39	81	320			
What do you do when you feel tense at work?									
Take a smoke break	Yes	49	47	27	54	177	17.174 ^a	0.001	
	No	36	68	12	27	143			
	N	85	115	39	81	320			
Take alcohol after work	Yes	48	72	18	30	168	13.646 ^a	0.003	
	No	37	43	21	51	152			
	N	85	115	39	81	320			
Work out with exercise	Yes	37	56	15	58	166	18.278 ^a	0.000	
	No	48	59	24	23	154			
	N	85	115	39	81	320			
Confront the problem	Yes	52	45	22	50	169	13.811 ^a	0.003	
	No	33	70	17	31	151			
	N	85	115	39	81	320			
Take it out on someone	Yes	51	66	27	63	207	9.926 ^a	0.019	
	No	34	49	12	18	113			
	N	85	115	39	81	320			
When you have a problem at work, do you									
Consult your supervisor	Yes	35	60	22	19	136	19.573 ^a	0.000	
	No	50	55	17	62	184			
	N	85	115	39	81	320			
Seek professional help	Yes	21	58	33	47	159	42.530 ^a	0.000	
	No	64	57	6	34	161			
	N	85	115	39	81	320			
Discuss it informally with colleague	Yes	41	62	13	30	146	8.201 ^a	0.042	
	No	44	53	26	51	174			
	N	85	115	39	81	320			

Table 4: Construct/Items Relationship with Age Group

Note: χ^2 represent chi – square, p – value < 0.05 indicates significacne association

What Does Success on Your Job Depend on		Educational Level					N	χ^2	P-value
		Basic	Secondary	Tertiary	No education				
Hard work and focus	Yes	53	32	50	24	159	18.531	0.000	
	No	26	58	44	33	161			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
Supportive subordinates	Yes	37	38	21	24	120	13.527	0.004	
	No	42	52	73	33	200			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
The creator	Yes	36	41	53	16	146	11.466	0.009	
	No	43	49	41	41	174			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
When you have a problem at work, do you									
Seek professional help	Yes	49	44	47	19	159	10.935	0.012	
	No	30	46	47	38	161			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
Discuss it informally with colleague	Yes	36	33	38	39	146	15.875	0.001	
	No	43	57	56	18	174			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
What do you do when you feel tense at work?									
Take a smoke break	Yes	31	47	70	29	177	23.011	0.000	
	No	48	43	24	28	143			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
Take alcohol after work	Yes	50	36	54	28	168	10.511	0.015	
	No	29	54	40	29	152			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
Work out with exercise	Yes	35	36	63	32	166	15.951	0.001	
	No	44	54	31	25	154			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
Confront the problem	Yes	52	29	65	23	169	34.295	0.000	
	No	27	61	29	34	151			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			

Table 5: Construct/Items Relationship with Educational Level

Note: χ^2 represent chi – square, p – value < 0.05 indicates significacne association

Table 6 provides descriptive statistics for the stress items. Twelve items were used to access the impact of stress on employee's productivity at the selected cafeterias. The first item Q1, has an estimated mean value of (\bar{x} =3.72; SD=0.84). This means that employees agree that working under pressure is a major stressor, which affects their productivity at the workplace. Item Q2, has an estimated mean value of (\bar{x} =3.23; SD=0.86) which indicates agreement that more employees believe that, environmental pressure causes stress among employees. Moving on to item q4, suggest that excessive load and working extra hours affect their productivity negatively. The item had a high value of mean (\bar{x} =4.26; SD=0.52) indicating that employees strongly agree that excessive work load affects their output at their workplace significantly. From Table 6 all the items have high value of mean ranging from 3.23 to 4.29 while the standard deviation (SD) of the items ranges from 0.52 to 0.99.

Also, the internal reliability testing using the Cronbach alpha confirms that the survey is generalizable which suggest that it will produce similar results with when given to similar employees in different workplace. The reliability analyses for the study produce Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.82. Alpha value normally ranges between 0.00 to 1.00. The closer the Cronbach's alpha coefficient is to 1.00 the greater the internal consistency of the items in the scale. Alpha coefficients above 0.70 are considered acceptable (George & Mallery, 2003).

Item	Item	\bar{x}	SD	Cronbach Alpha
Q1	Working under pressure is a major stressor.	3.72	0.84	0.82
Q2	Environmental pressure is a factor that causes stress among employees.	3.23	0.86	
Q3	The pressure from the organization leads to stress and frustration among employees.	3.77	0.95	
Q4	Excessive work load and working extra hours or overnight affects employee's productivity negatively.	4.26	0.52	
Q5	The conflicting demands of the three elements in the organization (employer, employee and consumers) can cause stress.	4.13	0.82	
Q6	Stress hinders effective performance of duties by the employees.	3.25	0.99	
Q7	Lack of effective organization planning and coordination leads to stress.	4.29	0.88	
Q8	The pressure from the family can affect employee productivity negatively.	3.82	0.80	
Q9	Effective stress management leads to higher productivity among employees.	3.99	0.99	
Q10	Effective communication channel in the organization can help to minimize stress.	3.28	0.61	
Q11	Improper management of stress among employees affects organizational productivity.	3.28	0.59	
Q12	Proper leadership styles reduce the level of stress among employees.	4.20	0.57	

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics of the Items

3.1. Hypothesis Testing

- H_0 : There is no significant relationship between stress and employee productivity in cafeterias
- H_1 : There is significant relationship between stress and employee productivity in cafeterias.

The hypothesis seeks to find out if stress in the organization especially in the cafeteria has influence on employees' performance. Many studies have shown that stress in the organization affect employees' productivity (Okeke et al,2016; Gouhar and Shafiqur ,2015; Indhu and Thirumakkal ,2015; Zeb,2015). The result obtained in this study is also in line with the previous researchers. In this study as indicated in Table 7, has a chi-square goodness of fit result of, $\chi^2 = 73.336$; $p - value = 0.011$ and also a large effect size of 0.50 (Cohen ,1988).the result suggest that, the null hypothesis is rejected and concludes that stress has statistically and significant impact on the productivity of the employees of the selected cafeterias used for the study. The result implies that, employees who experience stress in the cafeterias are likely to underperform their assigned task.

Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Q1	11 42.3%	11 42.3%	1 3.8%	2 7.7%	1 3.8%	26 100.0%
Q2	8 33.3%	13 54.2%	1 4.2%	1 4.2%	1 4.2%	24 100.0%
Q3	12 46.2%	11 42.3%	1 3.8%	1 3.8%	1 3.8%	26 100.0%
Q4	12 44.4%	11 40.7%	1 3.7%	2 7.4%	1 3.7%	27 100.0%
Q5	13 48.1%	11 40.7%	1 3.7%	1 3.7%	1 3.7%	27 100.0%
Q6	13 46.4%	12 42.9%	1 3.6%	1 3.6%	1 3.6%	28 100.0%
Q7	8 32.0%	9 36.0%	1 4.0%	4 16.0%	3 12.0%	25 100.0%
Q8	13 52.0%	9 36.0%	1 4.0%	1 4.0%	1 4.0%	25 100.0%
Q9	12 48.0%	9 36.0%	1 4.0%	2 8.0%	1 4.0%	25 100.0%

Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Q10	12 46.2%	11 42.3%	1 3.8%	1 3.8%	1 3.8%	26 100.0%
Q11	11 30.6%	11 30.6%	2 5.6%	1 2.8%	11 30.6%	36 100.0%
Q12	12 70.6%	1 5.9%	1 5.9%	1 5.9%	2 11.8%	17 100.0%
Q13	1 6.7%	3 20.0%	2 13.3%	3 20.0%	6 40.0%	15 100.0%
	138 42.2%	122 37.3%	15 4.6%	21 6.4%	31 9.5%	327 100.0%
$\chi^2 = 73.336$						
$P\text{-value} = 0.011$						
$Cramer's V \text{ statistic} = 0.50$						

Table 7: Association between Stress Factors and Employees' Productivity
 χ^2 Represent Chi-Square

This study examined stress and its impact on employees' productivity in the hospitality industry with reference to selected cafeterias in Accra. The investigation was carried out using descriptive statistics techniques to describe the stress items and chi-square test to test the hypothesis that, there is or no association between stress and employees' productivity. The findings of the analysis suggested that, there is association between stress and employees' productivity with a high association effect of (Cramer's V statistic=0.50). The result implies that the extent of the association that exist between the variables is statistically high as indicated by Cohen (1988). This result means that, individuals who are employed in the cafeterias used are really undergoing high level of stress. Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics of the items and it shows that, all items have an estimated mean value of more than 3.00 which represent agreement it was excessive work load and working extra and overnight causes stress which affect the performance of the employees. The item had a high estimated mean value of ($\bar{x} = 4.26 \pm 0.52$) which suggest that excessive work load at the work place on the employees causes stress which would eventually affect the performance of the employees in both short and long run. When there are unsolved conflicts between employees, employers and customers, these cause stress and have significant impact on the performance of the employees. The finding also suggested that ineffective planning at the work place has a high tendency of causing stress among the employees which affects their performance.

4. Conclusion

Most studies in the hospitality industry are done in restaurants and stars hotels (3-5-star hotel) with either little or no research about work stress among employees who work in cafeterias. This study has led to important insights about the stress and its association with employee's productivity using chi-square goodness of fit statistic. The result obtained suggests that, employees at the cafeterias are under pressure which causes lot of stress and eventually affects their productivity. Some overwork even at night, which cause a lot of stress. The chi-square test result indicated that, there is high association between stress and employee's performance.

Taken together, these conclusions inform us on the stress that employees, at the cafeterias go through and its impact on their performance. Given these significant outcomes, there is the need to inform stakeholders in the hospitality industry to conduct periodic education on stress management for small businesses like the cafeterias. Based on the result obtained, it is hoped that, this outcome will support social policy-makers as they plan on how to expand the Cafeteria business of the hospitality industry in the country.

5. Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to all the field workers who helped in the gathering of the data.

6. Funding

The study received no funding from any person or institution

7. References

- i. Okeke, M. N., Echo, O., & Oboreh, J. C. (2016). Effects of stress on employee productivity. *International Journal of Accounting Research*, 42(3495), 1-12.
- ii. Indhu, M. G. & Thirumakkal, M. (2015). A Study on Role of Occupational Stress on Employees Productivity. *International Journal of Management*, 6(1) 560 – 572.
- iii. Zeb, A. (2015). The Impact of job stress on employee's performance: Investigating the moderating effect of employees' motivation. *City University Research Journal*, 5(1).
- iv. Akgunduz, Y., & Sanli, S. C., (2017). The effect of employee advocacy and perceived organizational support on job embeddedness and turnover intention in hotels. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 31, 118-125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2016.12.002>

- v. Glebbeek, A. C., & Bax, E. H. (2004). Is high employee turnover really harmful: An empirical test using company records. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47 (2), 286-277.
- vi. Price, J. (2001). Reflections on the determinants of voluntary turnover. *International Journal of Manpower*, 22(3), 600-624.
- vii. Arshadi, N., & Damiri, H. (2013). The relationship of job stress with turnover intention and job performance: Moderating role of OBSE. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 84(2), 706-710. doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.631
- viii. Wong, C. A. & Laschinger, H. K. S., (2015). The influence of front-line manager job strain on burnout, commitment and turnover intention: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 52(12), 1824-1833
- ix. Golubic Rt Milosevic Mt Knezevic B, Mustajbegovic J. Work related stress, education and work ability among hospital nurses. *J Adv Nurs* 2009; 65:2056—66.
- x. Mursali A, Basuki E, Dharmono S. Relationship between noise and job stress at a private thread spinning company. *Univ Med* 2009; 28:8—16.
- xi. Clegg A. Occupational stress in nursing: a review of the literature. *J Nurs Manag* 2001
- xii. Sarwar, A., Ketavan, C., & Butt, N. S. (2015). Impact of eLearning Perception and eLearning Advantages on eLearning for Stress Management (Mediating Role of eLearning for Corporate Training). *Pakistan Journal of Statistics and Operation Research*, 11(2), 241-258.
- xiii. Badar, M. R. (2011). Factors Causing Stress and Impact on Job Performance, A Case Study of Banks of Bahawalpur, Pakistan. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 3(12), 9-17.

Appendix

Item	Level	Gender			X ²	P-value
		Male	Female	Total		
What does success on your job depend on	Yes	77	82	159	1.001	0.317
	No	69	92	161		
	N	146	174	320		
Supportive supervisor	Yes	57	99	156	10.13	0.001
	No	89	75	164		
	N	146	174	320		
Supportive subordinates	Yes	69	51	120	10.914	0.001
	No	77	123	200		
	N	146	174	320		
Fate/luck	Yes	79	82	161	1.549	0.213
	No	67	92	159		
	N	146	174	320		
The creator	Yes	56	90	146	5.718	0.017
	No	90	84	174		
	N	146	174	320		
When you have a problem at work, do you						
Consult your supervisor	Yes	64	72	136	0.196	0.658
	No	82	102	184		
	N	146	174	320		
Seek professional help	Yes	76	83	159	0.602	0.438
	No	70	91	161		
	N	146	174	320		
Stay away from work	Yes	74	69	143	3.9707	0.048
	No	72	105	177		
	N	146	174	320		
Discuss it informally with colleague	Yes	59	87	146	2.942	0.086
	No	87	87	174		
	N	146	174	320		
What do you do when you feel tense at work?						
Take a smoke break	Yes	72	105	177	3.907	0.048
	No	74	69	143		
	N	146	174	320		
Take alcohol after work	Yes	78	90	168	0.092	0.762
	No	68	84	152		
	N	146	174	320		
Work out with exercise	Yes	65	101	166	5.817	0.016
	No	81	73	154		
	N	146	174	320		
Confront the problem	Yes	90	79	169	8.403	0.004
	No	56	95	151		
	Total	146	174	320		
Take time out	Yes	55	87	142	4.889	0.027
	No	91	87	178		
	N	146	174	320		
Take it out on someone	Yes	106	101	207	7.364	0.007
	No	40	73	113		
	N	146	174	320		

Table 8: Construct/Items Relationship with Gender

What does success on your job depend on	Level	Age group				N	χ^2	P-value
		20 - 29	30- 39	40 - 49	>5 0			
Hard work and focus	Yes	30	70	9	50	159	28.541 _a	0.000
	No	55	45	30	31	161		
		85	115	39	81	320		
Supportive supervisor	Yes	44	60	14	38	156	3.537 _a	0.316
	No	41	55	25	43	164		
		85	115	39	81	320		
Supportive subordinates	Yes	43	42	18	17	120	16.929 _a	0.001
	No	42	73	21	64	200		
		85	115	39	81	320		
Fate/luck	Yes	34	51	24	52	161	13.465 _a	0.004
	No	51	64	15	29	159		
		85	115	39	81	320		
The creator	Yes	33	49	21	43	146	4.887 _a	0.180
	No	52	66	18	38	174		
		85	115	39	81	320		
What do you do when you feel tense at work?								
Take a smoke break	Yes	49	47	27	54	177	17.174 _a	0.001
	No	36	68	12	27	143		
		85	115	39	81	320		
Take alcohol after work	Yes	48	72	18	30	168	13.646 _a	0.003
	No	37	43	21	51	152		
		85	115	39	81	320		
Work out with exercise	Yes	37	56	15	58	166	18.278 _a	0.000
	No	48	59	24	23	154		
		85	115	39	81	320		
Confront the problem	Yes	52	45	22	50	169	13.811 _a	0.003
	No	33	70	17	31	151		
	N	85	115	39	81	320		
Take time out	Yes	40	46	15	41	142	2.971 _a	0.396
	No	45	69	24	40	178		
	N	85	115	39	81	320		
Take it out on someone	Yes	51	66	27	63	207	9.926 _a	0.019
	No	34	49	12	18	113		
	N	85	115	39	81	320		
When you have a problem at work, do you								

Consult your supervisor	Yes	35	60	22	19	136	19.573 _a	0.000
	No	50	55	17	62	184		
	N	85	115	39	81	320		
Seek professional help	Yes	21	58	33	47	159	42.530 _a	0.000
	No	64	57	6	34	161		
	N	85	115	39	81	320		
Stay away from work	Yes	36	53	14	40	143	2.220 ^a	0.528
	No	49	62	25	41	177		
	N	85	115	39	81	320		
Discuss it informally with colleague	Yes	41	62	13	30	146	8.201 ^a	0.042
	No	44	53	26	51	174		
	N	85	115	39	81	320		

Table 9: Construct/Items Relationship with Age Group

Item		Educational level					N	χ^2	P-value
		Basic	Secondary	Tertiary	No education				
What does success on your job depend on									
	Hard work and focus	Yes	53	32	50	24	159	18.531	0.000
		No	26	58	44	33	161		
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
Supportive supervisor	Yes	34	44	48	30	156	1.578	0.664	
	No	45	46	46	27	164			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
Supportive subordinates	Yes	37	38	21	24	120	13.527	0.004	
	No	42	52	73	33	200			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
Fate/luck	Yes	40	54	44	23	161	6.106	0.107	
	No	39	36	50	34	159			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
The creator	Yes	36	41	53	16	146	11.466	0.009	
	No	43	49	41	41	174			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
When you have a problem at work, do you									
Consult your supervisor	Yes	37	36	43	20	136	2.524	0.471	
	No	42	54	51	37	184			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
Seek professional help	Yes	49	44	47	19	159	10.935	0.012	
	No	30	46	47	38	161			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
Stay away from work	Yes	35	36	47	25	143	1.894	0.595	
	No	44	54	47	32	177			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			
Discuss it informally with colleague	Yes	36	33	38	39	146	15.875	0.001	
	No	43	57	56	18	174			
	N	79	90	94	57	320			

What do you do when you feel tense at work?								
Take a smoke break	Yes	31	47	70	29	177	23.011	0.000
	No	48	43	24	28	143		
	N	79	90	94	57	320		
Take alcohol after work	Yes	50	36	54	28	168	10.511	0.015
	No	29	54	40	29	152		
	N	79	90	94	57	320		
Work out with exercise	Yes	35	36	63	32	166	15.951	0.001
	No	44	54	31	25	154		
	N	79	90	94	57	320		
Confront the problem	Yes	52	29	65	23	169	34.295	0.000
	No	27	61	29	34	151		
	N	79	90	94	57	320		
Take time out	Yes	30	38	50	24	142	4.559	0.207
	No	49	52	44	33	178		
	N	79	90	94	57	320		

Table 10: Construct/Items Relationship with Gender Educational Level