

**THE EFFECT OF OCCUPATIONAL STRESS ON EMPLOYEE  
PRODUCTIVITY AND PERFORMANCE**

**BY**

**Fortune Chiamaka NZEMECHI**

**MGS2104936**

**DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

**FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES**

**UNIVERSITY OF BENIN**

**BENIN CITY**

**OCTOBER, 2025**

**THE EFFECT OF OCCUPATIONAL STRESS ON EMPLOYEE  
PRODUCTIVITY AND PERFORMANCE**

**BY**

**Fortune Chiamaka NZEMECHI**

**MGS2104936**

**A RESEARCH PROJECT WRITTEN AND SUBMITTED TO THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT,  
FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF  
BENIN IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN INDUSTRIAL  
RELATIONS AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN CITY**

**OCTOBER, 2025**

## **DECLARATION**

I, Fortune Chiamaka NZEMECHI, hereby declare that this project is completely my own composition in the Department of Human Resource Management. All references made from the work of others have duly acknowledged.

---

---

**Signature**

**Date**



## **CERTIFICATION**

We certify that this work titled was carried out by Fortune Chiamaka NZEMECHI in the Department of Human Resource Management, University of Benin, Benin City.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**PROJECT SUPERVISOR**

**DATE**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**DATE**

**PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR**

---

---

DATE

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

### **DEDICATION**

This Project work is dedicated to the Lord almighty, who has never failed and has supplied me with strength to carry out this project.



## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

Firstly, all praise and glory to God, the creator of the universe and the protector of my soul. My sincerest acknowledgement and gratitude is extended to my supervisor and course adviser, Dr. Mrs Ized Oguns Obasohan for her invaluable guidance, motivation and support through the course of carrying out this project. Her patience, diligence, warm-heartedness, unwavering dedication and professionalism has been inspiring and influential in shaping my ideas and helping me overcome challenges along the way, May God continue to bless you abundantly, Ma.

To the entire Department of Human Resource Management, the Head of Department, Dr. E. E. Idubor and the distinguished lecturers, I say a big thank you for all your support and advice. I would also like to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to my remarkable family; my Dad, Mr Paul Nzemechi and my Mom, Mrs Esther Nzemechi for their prayers, love, financial support, care and for paving a way for me to successfully complete this programme. I would also like to thank my siblings Miss Chelsea, Mr Francis, and Jennifer for standing by side through thick and thin. To my love, Mr Odion Ebuehi, my heartfelt gratitude and thanks goes to you for always believing in me. Your affection, wisdom, advice, generosity and guidance throughout my stay in the university has been enormously helpful. Thank you for showing me endless love and compassion. I also want to thank Mrs Favour Okosun for her constant support and words of

advice, I am truly grateful for the time and wisdom you have shared with me, Ma. I am also grateful to my friends and course-mates, Ose, Omovigho and Precious for their words of encouragement, endless engaging conversations and acts of kindness. Their companionship and understanding during my moments of stress have been a source of strength and inspiration.

Finally, to all my course-mates, I am indeed grateful for the good times we have spent together, these memories will stay with me for a long time. May God continue to strengthen you all.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TITLE PAGE - - - - -  
i

DECLARATION -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ii
CERTIFICATION-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	iii								
DEDICATION-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	v								
TABLE OF CONTENTS-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	vii								
ABSTRACT-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	x								
CHAPTER ONE-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
INTRODUCTION-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1								
1.1 Background to the Study-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1								
1.2 Statement of the Problem-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4

1.3 Research Questions-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
1.4 Objective of the Study-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5								
1.5 Research Hypothesis--	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
1.6 Significance of the Study-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6								
1.7 Scope of the Study-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
1.8 Limitations to the Study-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7								
CHAPTER TWO-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
LITERATURE REVIEW-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8								
2.1 Introduction-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
2.2 Performance and Productivity-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8								

2.2.1 Employee Performance-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8									
2.2.2 Productivity-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
2.3 Stress-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12
2.3.1 Concept of Stress-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14
2.3.2 Stress Process or Response Stages-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
16									
2.3.3 Types of Stress-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17									
2.3.4 Causes of Stress at Work-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19
2.3.5 Effect of Stress	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
27									
2.3.6 Managing Stress-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31
2.3.7 Relationship between Stress, Performance and Productivity-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	32								

2.3.8 Empirical Framework- - - - - - - -

35

2.4 Theoretical Framework- - - - - - - -

37

2.4.1 Systemic Stress: Selye's Theory- - - - -

37

2.4.2 Psychological Stress: The Lazarus Theory- - - -

40

CHAPTER THREE- - - - - - - -

44

METHODOLOGY- - - - - - - -

44

3.1 Introduction- - - - - - - - 44

3.2 Research Design- - - - - - - -

44

3.3 Population of the Study-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
45								
3.4 Sample Size Determination--	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	45
3.5 Operationalization and Measurement of Variables-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
46								
3.6 The Research Instrument-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
49								
3.7 Source of Data-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
50								
3.8 Data Analysis- -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50
CHAPTER FOUR-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
51								
<b>DATA PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF ANALYSIS</b>								
-	51							
4.1 Introduction-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51

4.2 Demographic Background of Respondents-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
51								
4.3 Data Presentation and Analysis-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
53								
4.4 One-Way ANOVA-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61
4.4.1 Hypothesis Testing-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
64								
4.5 Discussions of Findings-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
67								
CHAPTER FIVE-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS								69
5.1 Introduction-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69
5.2 Summary of Findings-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
69								
5.3 Conclusion-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70

5.4 Recommendation-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
									71
5.4.1 Policy Recommendation-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	71
5.4.2 Recommendation for Further Studies-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
									72
REFERENCES	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	73

## **ABSTRACT**

*This research work centered on the effects of stress on employees productivity, and performance using the Notre Dame Table Water employees as a case study. Stress in this context has been recently known as a significant problem which that affect the job performance, productivity and also the employees' health generally. Six research questions and two research hypotheses were adopted in this study. The major objective or purpose of the study is to examine or assess the effect of stress on employees' productivity and performance among Notre Dame Table Water employees. In achieving this, the descriptive survey research design was adopted. The population of the study comprised of all employees of Notre Dame Table Water, of which has three departments; administrative department having 5 employees, Sales department having 32 employees and production department having 65 employees. This gives a total of 102 employees of Notre Dame Table Water. Data collected through the administered questionnaires, were analyzed using the descriptive statistics of frequency distribution and percentages and the*

*inferential statistics of involved the use of ANOVA. From the findings, it was revealed that there is high level of stress felt among Notre Dame Table Water employee. Also, the study also revealed that dysfunctional stress lowers the performance and productivity of employees as well as reduce job commitment. The researcher recommended there should be well defined job functions and clearly stated job roles, Management should also invest in stress management strategies that will help increase job performance and productivity and finally Management should improve working environment to enable carrying out of job functions easy and reduce stress*

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background to the Study

People must deal with stress in almost every aspect of life and it is a common component of all types of job. Stress has been characterized in various courses throughout the years, as indicated by Robbins and Sanghi (2006) Stress is a dynamic condition in which an individual is opportuned with a chance, requirements or request identified with what he or she wants and for which the result is seen to be both uncertain and essential. Stress is a natural term which refers to the outcomes of the disappointment of a human body to react properly to emotional or physical dangers to the living being, regardless of whether real or envisioned (Selye, 1956). Recently, stress has increased across all spheres of life, but it has been more noticeable at work. Stress in organizations is typically a new trend of contemporary lifestyles.

Firms has found job stress to be challenging, and abnormal state pressure causes low profitability, expanded non-attendance and gathering to other workers' issues like liquor addiction, drug misuse, hypertension and host of different issues (Meneze, 2005). Stress is the psychological and physical condition that happens when we receive or change in accordance with the environment (Coon & Mitterer, 2000). Brent (2001) considers stress to be a condition that outcomes when the individual or environmental transactions lead the person to see an error whether genuine or not between the demands of a situation and the resources of the individual's biological, sociological or social framework. Stress can subsequently be portrayed as the unfavorable mental and physical responses that happen in a person because of his or her failure to adapt to the demands being made on him or her (Moorhead and Griffen, 1998).

Numerous studies have been conducted to examine the relationship between workplace stress, performance at work, and productivity. Job

performance may be viewed as an activity in which a person successfully completes the work assigned to him or her within the typical constraints of appropriate resource utilization (Global Journal of Management and Business Research, 2011). Halgin and Whitbourne (2003) conceptualized stress as an unpleasant emotional response a man has when he or she sees an occasion as threatening. They expressed that this emotional response may include increased physiological arousal because of expanded reactivity of the sympathetic sensory system. Simply put, the event—also known as a stressful life occasion—is the stressor. In relation to this work, the term "stress" refers to a bodily state or scenario that predisposes people to feeling uneasy, discouraged, angry, hostile, deficient, and having a low level of disappointment resistance. (Wai, 2003). Productivity is the main force behind an organization's development and benefit, it is for the most part the relationship between income and output. Productivity

speaks of the connectivity between inputs and outputs in the production procedure (the ONS Productivity Handbook).

The requests on workers is developing significantly and this is cause of stress in employees. Job stress is of utmost importance and is now used as a major performance indicator for both an individual and an organization. Employees serve as resources for an organization, but when they are under stress, unfavorable outcomes like rising absenteeism, low productivity, low motivation, and financial harm rise (which ultimately affect the worker's behavior at work and cause him or her to behave in a way that is counter-beneficial). Stress in organizations influences both the individual and the organization.

Notwithstanding, in spite of the downside of stress, it is not so terrible for individual workers or their organization performance and productivity, it is for the most part perceived that in any event low level of stress can upgrade work performance and productivity (Journal of

Economics and Sustainable Development). So that the harmful effects of pressure can be minimized or reduced, it is crucial that the causes, affects, and management of stress be given top attention in the workplace.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Stress as a concept has attracted a lot of attention from diverse disciplines. The purpose of the study is to ascertain how stress affects the performance and output of employees. Employees may experience a great deal of stress on the job due to the numerous physical and mental risks they are exposed to. Some employees may experience such high levels of stress on a daily basis that it may negatively impact their performance on the job, their productivity, and their general health. Most businesses that wish to increase productivity end up burdening workers with too much work in order to meet deadlines, which may have negative psychological and physical impacts on the workers and

produce results that are counter to what the businesses are trying to accomplish.

Every employee has a unique duty or task to carry out that is focused on achieving the business's overall goal. If employees are under a lot of stress, the goal of the organization may not be met. However, it has been acknowledged that Nigeria, and particularly Edo State, lacks pertinent literature on stress management in corporate organizations. The purpose of this study is to find out the effects of stress on employees' performance. The goal of the study is to determine how stress affects Uniben Water personnel and how stress may be eliminated or reduced in order to improve daily productivity, employee performance, and job productivity.

### **1.3 Research Questions**

The following questions guided the study;

1. What is the general level of stress among employees in Notre Dame Table Water?

2. What is the causes of stress for employees of Notre Dame Table Water ?
3. What are the effects of functional stress on employees' performance?
4. What are the effects of dysfunctional stress on employees' performance?
5. Are there ways of preventing dysfunctional stress?
6. What strategies can be used to manage/cope with stress?

#### **1.4 Objective of the Study**

This study aims specifically to:

1. Find out the general level of stress among employees in Notre Dame Table Water;
2. Identify the causes of stress for employees of Notre Dame Table Water;
3. Determine the impact of functional stress on employee' performance;

4. Determine the effects of dysfunctional stress on employee's performance;
5. Discover if there are ways of preventing dysfunctional stress;
6. Find out what strategies can be used to manage/cope with stress;

### **1.5 Research Hypothesis**

In relation to the research questions, statement of problems, and the objectives of this research, the following hypothesis have been formulated in a null form;

H<sub>Oi</sub>: There's High Level of stress among employees of Notre Dame Table Water

H<sub>Oii</sub>: There is no significant impact between Functional and dysfunctional stress and employees' performance and productivity.

### **1.6 Significance of the Study**

Management and employees will benefit from having a better understanding of the origins, consequences, and potential treatments for

stress. The study will also contribute to the body of knowledge and aid in the development of reliable data for subsequent scholars.

### **1.7 Scope of the Study**

The study is mainly concerned with the effect of stress on employees' performance. This study is delimited to Notre Dame Table Water, Benin Edo State. The questionnaire designed as a research instrument for this study will be restricted to the research problems and questions already identified.

### **1.8 Limitation to the study**

The researchers encountered a number of limitation in the course of this study were;

The smallness of the sample was a limitation to the study as the study covered only employees from Notre Dame Table Water, also the employees were unwilling to fill questionnaires even when they were less busy. The location of the organization was quite far from the

researcher and the researchers were not financially buoyant which was part of the limitations faced was.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

The chapter is devoted to a thorough search, assessment, and analysis of authors' and academics' works that are relevant to the research inquiry. To provide a more detailed theoretical knowledge of the nature of stress, its origins, and the effects it will have on performance and productivity, several writers' perspectives will be utilized. This chapter explains the relationship between stress, employee performance, and productivity as well as the meaning of employee performance, productivity, and stress. It also describes the stress process, the causes or sources of stress at work, its effects on management, and its theoretical and empirical underpinnings.

#### **2.2 Performance and Productivity**

##### **2.2.1 Employee Performance**

Performance assesses whether an individual plays out an occupation well.

Execution is a fundamental standard for organizational outcomes and

accomplishment. Campbell (1993) portrays work performance as an individual-level variable, or something an individual does, this separates it from a more encompassing construct, for example, organizational performance or national performance which are more elevated amount factors. Campbell considers special situations when portraying performance as a conduct. For instance, he clears up that performance should not be direct noticable exercise of a man. It can involve mental production, for instance, answers and decisions. Nevertheless, the individual should have control over their performance, taking into account whether it is behavioral or mental in nature. The ability of employees to reach their own goals and those of the company is referred to as work work performance. However, individuals' capacities to satisfy their own goals, aspirations, standards, or organizational objectives can also be considered as work performance (Ismail, 2009). There is no broad, acceptable theory about employees performance. A fundamental foundation for organizational productivity is the effectiveness with which firms manage, motivate, and inspire their personnel.

Performance must be viewed as a multi-dimensional issue, according to researchers. On the most fundamental level one can perceive a procedural aspect (i.e., behavioral) and a result part of performance (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993, Campbell, McCloy, Oppler, and Sager, 1993; Roe, 1999). The behavior perspective refers to what people do while at work, the activity itself (Campbell, 1990). Performance includes specific behavior (e.g., deals with customers, teaching insights to college undergraduates, programming computer software, storing up parts of an products). This performance recommends that simply actions can be scaled (i.e., counted) are seen as execution (Campbell et al., 1993). The performance concept expressively portrays behavior which is objective situated, i.e. behavior which the organization employs the worker to do well as performance (Campbell et al., 1993). Also, execution must be differentiated from effectiveness and from productivity (profitability) or efficiency (Campbell et al., 1993; Pritchard et al., 1992). Effectiveness refers to the assessments of the consequences of performance (i.e., monetary value of sales). In correlation, profitability is the

ratio of effectiveness to the expense of achieving the result. High employee's performance leads an organization and have more prominent open doors for workers than the individuals who have low performance (Vans Cotter, 2000).

### **2.2.2 Productivity**

The notion of productivity is taken into account by the International Labor Organization in its report. In this vein, some people view productivity as a gauge of the health of the economy, while others just take into account particular factories or plants. Productivity is defined by the ILO as the ratio of wealth output to the contribution of assets used in the production process, according to the publication Higher Productivity in Assembling Businesses. Professor Mahta characterizes productivity as the 'proportion of output to the comparing work'. He puts the validity of this definition on its popularity. Meneze (2006) characterized productivity as the worker's capacity to deliver work or good and services as per the normal demands set by the employers, or exceeding the normal standards. Salter (1987) acknowledges the proportion of work productivity as output per man hour. Kendrick additionally opined

that "productivity" used to signify the proportion of yield or output to any or all related contributions or inputs to genuine terms.

Productivity per period is calculated by dividing it by the total amount of expenses or resources (capital, energy, material, and personnel) used during that period (Business Dictionary). Estimating contributions (inputs) in proportion to yields is the fundamental perspective of productivity (output). It often involves calculating the amount of yield produced in a specific amount of time. A simple productivity equation can be given as;

$$\text{Productivity} = \frac{\text{Outputs provided by the process}}{\text{Inputs consumed by the process.}}$$

The most inclusive approach of assessing production. Every factor that might affect productivity is included, such as the level of yield (output), work disruptions, employee absenteeism, turnover, and customer loyalty. Due to the variety of elements taken into account, productivity can be expressed and evaluated differently depending on the job, organization, or industry.

### **2.3. Stress**

The term stress is a mind boggling and dynamic idea, work stress is essentially a mismatch between the individual capacities and organization's interest (Radiwal, 2011 & Jayashree, 2010). Stress starts with the demand and opportunity from environment for a man and finishes with the person's reaction to that demand and opportunity (Shah, 2003). As per Robbins (2004), "Stress is a dynamic condition in which an individual is faced with opportunities, requirement or demand identified with what he wants and which the result is seen to be both questionable and important". From this description, it follows that when stress presents a chance for gain, it can also have beneficial benefits. Stress is a mental or physical pressure-causing physical, physiological, or emotional component that might contribute to the onset of a condition (Merriam-Webster Dictionary). Stress condition is a state brought on by pressure, particularly one of physical or mental strain brought on by elements that tend to upset an existing equilibrium. Stress is also defined by Sherman, Bahlander, and Snell (1996) as any adjustment interest on a person brought on by physical, emotional, or mental components that

necessitates practices of adaptation. According to Taylor Shelley (1995), stress is defined as a series of unpleasant emotional experiences that are followed by anticipated biochemical, physiological, cognitive, and behavioral alterations that are coordinated either with attempts to change the circumstances or adapt to their consequences. According to Bennett (1994), stress is defined as a broad range of emotional, behavioral, and physical symptoms that result from difficulties that a person encounters when making an effort to adapt to their environment. The ecological condition signals a danger to an interest that is higher than a man's capabilities and resources, hence stress is possible, according to this theory.

Stress as characterized by the UK Health and Safety Executives (HSE) is 'the unfavorable response individuals give to unreasonable weights or different sorts of interest put on them'. Stress exhibits a hazard to our health and performance at work. It happens when the weights or requests upon a worker, which may as well as may not be business related, move toward becoming 'over the top' and past the capacity of the employees to adapt. Professor Derek

Mowbray (2010) depicts stress like this 'stress is at the wrong end of a continuum that incorporates the improvement of pressure, the redirection of strain, and the disaster that is stress, stressed individuals don't think and tend to freeze with nervousness. Inability to treat and take out stress regularly results in genuine physical conditions". Blumenthal (2003), opined that stress is anything that surprises individuals' capacity to keep up basic variable (which can be social, mental, emotional or biological in nature) inside satisfactory points of restrictions. The feeling of stress encompasses a demanding or resource-consuming occurrence as well as the amorphous sense of worry felt in its apprehension. A person's mental introduction, which includes factors like culture, otherworldliness, traits, convictions, and prior experiences, determines whether an event is seen as distressing. An event may be perceived as unpleasant if people judge it as disturbing. Events that are deemed to be overwhelming, destabilizing, inappropriate, or conflicting are likely to be felt as stressful.

### **2.3.1 Concept of Stress**

Selye first used the term "stress" in 1965 and defined it as "the non-specific response of the body to any reason for change". It refers generally to the physiological reactions caused by any stressful occasion (stressor). The Autonomic Nervous System (ANS), which controls the body's organs and regulates things like heart rate, breathing rate, vein pressure, galvanic skin reaction, etc., starts reactions. The autonomic nervous system (ANS) is divided into two subsystems: the sympathetic nervous system (SNS) and the parasympathetic nervous system (PNS). Walter Cannon and Hans Selye are recognized building up stress as a genuine logical phenomenon. Advancement, as indicated by Darwin, is the nonstop physiological adjustment of an animal groups to its outer condition that guarantees its long term survival. Cannon authored the expression "fight or flight" to clarify the physical response of individuals when they encounter a potential debilitating occasion or circumstance. Predictable with Darwin, Cannon thought about the capacity to react rapidly to an outside danger by (battling or escaping) a positive developmental reaction that increases human survival. Selye

established a three-phase hypothesis to explain how living things respond to harmful stimuli, expanding on Cannon's work by examining the long-term effects of pressure.

Cannon and Selye in a general sense guided our comprehension and treatment of occupation stress in three vital ways. First, in accordance with Darwin's life form condition fit model and the value-based viewpoint, work stress is seen as a laborer workplace. Second, on the grounds that the two men exhibited transformative adjustment as a reactive procedure, social workers encountering stress are regularly shown as passive and exploited people, as opposed to active and dynamic creatures. Third, the majority of pressure relief measures are designed to induce reactive adaptation rather than proactive modification of the work environment. Work stress is now seen as a man-centered issue.

### **2.3.2 Stress Process or Response Stages**

Arnold, Robertson and Cooper (1993) further simplified the stress process of Walter Cannon and Han Selye. They believed that stress process is from; Alarm → Resistance → Exhaustion.

The body's reaction to stress at this stage is the alert state, which is the initial step in which the stressor or threat is detected or found. The "fight or flight reaction" will be activated at this period; the flight response would be to escape the source of danger, whereas the fight response would be to remain and confront or fight off the danger. The body will attempt to gather resources during the resistance stage, which comes after the adaptation stage, in order to get through it and reestablish stability to the person's body, which has chosen to either fight or flee. The third and final stage will be reached, nevertheless, if the defense strategy fails to operate or fails to adapt for whatever reason. The last stage of fatigue occurs when all of the body's resources have been used up and the body is unable to continue performing its usual duties. If stage three is prolonged, the symptoms of the neurological

system may return and there may be long-term harm. The end outcome might be observable health problems or, in the worst case scenario, death.

### 2.3.3 Types of Stress

Diverse type of stress have been distinguished throughout the years some of which could incorporate physical stress, psychosocial stress, mental stress, behavioral stress, and others. Stress have been characterized into three major types;

***Eustress:*** The term "eustress" refers to stress that has a beneficial outcome. Hans Selye coined the phrase, which consists of the Greek word eu, which means excellent, and stress, which means genuinely wonderful tension. It is a good kind of stress that can be either mental, physical, or biochemical in nature. It describes a person's constructive response to a stressor, which may depend on their current control, desirability, location, and timing of the stressor. Eustress occurs when the gap between what one needs to do and what one needs is slightly pushed, yet not in significant way, or, in other words more than what an individual can deal with. This encourages challenge and motivation since the objective isn't too far distant, eustress has an essentially positive connection with life satisfaction. It is a positive response to stress that

creates a desire to accomplish and overcome a challenge and to increase performance, it has the following qualities;

- Motivates, and focuses energy
- It is short-term lived
- It is usually within an individual's coping abilities
- It improves performance

***Acute stress:*** This syndrome, which develops as a result of a stressful or scary incident, is also known as acute stress disorder or shock. The form of stress that is most well-known and identifiable is this one. The person can identify the stressor, or the cause of the stress, and is aware of why he is stressed. In most cases, short-term stress does not severely or permanently impair the body.

***Chronic stress:*** This kind of stress emerges from emotional pressure suffered over a long term of time in which an individual sees there is almost no control, it is results because of repeated exposure to circumstances that prompt the release of stress hormones. Chronic stress wears on a person and affects their

mental stability and physical health, which can lead to breakdown and even death. Chronic stress is any stress that the body experiences repeatedly or only once with long-lasting detrimental effects. There are two types of chronic stress;

- The form that can be detected without the help of a professional e.g. insufficient sleep, little or too much exercise and others.
- The form that the pre-existing impact occurs within the body and can do damage causing obvious symptoms e.g. fungal and viral infections, inflammation. This is known to be Subclinical (Obscure)

#### **2.2.3.4 Causes of Stress at Work**

Repetti (1990), McGonagle and Kessler (1990), Pervin (1992), agree with Arnold, Robertson and Cooper (1993) in talking about the causes or sources of stress. Arnold, Robertson and Cooper (1993), identified five major causes of work stress as: factors intrinsic to the job, role in the organization, relationships at work, career development and organizational structure and climate.

### ***Factors intrinsic to the job***

They explained the factors intrinsic to the job to include:

➤ **Poor working conditions**

This report addresses how the working environment, including levels of noise, lighting that is either too bright or too dim, heat, fumes, inadequate ventilation, odours, and other potential risks, can affect a worker's overall physical and mental health. Poor working conditions affect the physical layout of the office. If a company is disorganized and its employees are dispersed around, this can result in a bad communication network and poor working relationships, both of which can cause stress in the workers.

➤ **Shift work**

This comprises workers who are required to work shifts, some of which involve working staggered hours, which affects a worker's blood temperature, metabolic rate, glucose levels, mental

performance, rest pattern, and causes hypertension, mild diabetes, and peptic ulcers.

➤ Long hours

Most professions now require long hours because employers want to make as much money as possible. In order to satisfy the demands placed on them, employers force their employees to put in more hours than they had planned. Long workdays in many occupations appear to have a negative impact on workers' health and stress levels.

➤ Risk and danger

Risk and risk are connected to modern occupations. Jobs with greater risk and hazard make workers feel more stressed. Rush, respiratory fluctuations, and muscular tension are the results of an employee being constantly aware of possible risk and prepared to act quickly. These are all seen as long-term health threats.

➤ New technology

Employees must regularly adapt to new tools, systems, and working methods as a result of the introduction of new technology into the workplace. putting the worker under a great deal of pressure at work. For instance, a manager skilled in the most recent methods could put extra pressure on staff members educated in the traditional methods, which might raise his level of stress.

➤ Work under-load

This refers to the problem when workers' workloads are not appropriate for their skills and capacities and do not sufficiently challenge them in their occupations. Job under-load is associated with routine labor that is tedious and underwhelming, which puts employees under a lot of stress. This suggests that employees suffer the negative impacts of a high state of stress when they are not given work that challenges their skills and talents.

➤ Work overload

The amount of work that is assigned to employees is usually considerably more than they can handle or beyond their capacity. Due to the pressure of deadlines, the employee has an excessive amount of work to perform, which frequently generates stress in workers.

### ***Role in the Organization***

When an employee's role in an organization is clearly defined and understood, and expectations placed upon are clear stress can be kept to a minimum. However, this is not the case in many work sites. Arnold, Robertson and Cooper (1993) continued to explain Role in the organization to include:

➤ **Role ambiguity**

Employees who are unclear about their roles at work and how their performance is evaluated often experience role ambiguity.

Regardless matter how well they may work, employees are unaware of their place in the company and how they can be rewarded. There is strong evidence, according to Johns (1996), that job ambiguity can cause stress. Lack of direction may be stressful, especially for those with low levels of tolerance for this kind of uncertainty.

➤ Role conflict

Conflict between two of an employee's supervisors' requests might result in role conflict. Employees are left puzzled and unhappy when they try to balance the two requests while trying to follow both of their superiors' instructions. Three distinct types of employment struggles are distinguished by Luthans (2002). The friction that already exists between a person and their work is one of these. Another type of intra-job conflict is when two people have conflicting ideas on how to do a certain task. Inter role conflict also results from the conflicting demands of at least two occupations that must be performed concurrently. According to Luthans (2002), the

organizational role is the most significant in the study of organizational behavior, even if all the roles that men and women bring to the workplace are vital to their behavior. The demands and goals of jobs like equipment operator, clerk team leader, sales staff specialist, system analyst, departmental head, vice president, and executive of the board frequently conflict. Conflict may have a detrimental impact on performance.

➤ **Responsibility**

There are primarily two types of responsibility in an organization: responsibility for people and responsibility for things like finances, hardware, and other items. Being responsible for people puts a lot of strain on you. Being in charge of people typically entails spending more time with them, attending meetings and attempting to solve their difficulties, resolving conflicts and disagreements among them, and making difficult relationship decisions.

***Relationship at Work***

Dealing with management, colleagues, peers and subordinates can influence the manner in which an employee feels. Individuals, high on the requirement for relationship, work best in stable work teams where they can become more acquainted with one another well. It may extend the measure too far to propose that somebody high on this factor would suffer stress in the event that they were working with a large number of their circumstances, which did not enable relationships to frame, but rather it is likely that they won't work as well as and they might. Despite what might be expected, when an employee encounters poor working organization with superiors, partners and subordinates his feeling of stress increases. This is on the account that most employees invest such a great amount of energy and time at the work environment and accordingly poor working relationship can influence them unfavorably. It is more probable that they would stay away from problems of enforced intimacy by taking part in few interactions as possible with others

and by distancing themselves mentally. There are numerous individuals who don't care for the possibility that relationship at work ought to be something besides formal and entirely business related, even to the point of outside life not being discussed.

### ***Career Development***

Organizations have turned out to be adaptable, implying that power and obligation currently streams all through the organization. The work force has turned out to be more diversified. Jobs and careers get scarcer. For the individual who had been determined to ascend through an organization, the challenge has of late turned out to be greater. Opportunity to learn new abilities are presently getting to be requirements. Career development causes a considerable measure of stress employees through their working lives, workers need to continually develop their profession life. Staying stagnant is rapidly turning into an inadequate approach to deal with work. Lack of job security, fear of redundancy, obsolescence and various performance

appraisal can cause pressure and strain. What's more the dissatisfaction of having achieved one's profession ceiling, or having been over promoted can result in stress.

### ***Organization Structure and Climate***

Employees lack enough opportunity to contribute when they don't feel like they belong in the company. They feel unimportant because of this, which may lead to tension and stress connected to their jobs. In any event, Betts (1994) argued that because people come from different backgrounds, there are variations in the causes of job stress. In other words, a particular attitude or degree of stress may affect a particular employee more so than another. Physical and psychological reasons are divided into two categories. He continued by saying that among the physical causes are the physical workload at hand and the physical environment, which includes temperature, humidity, vibration, etc. Mental workload and mental environment are among the psychological factors.

On the other hand, Robbins (2004) identified the following as causes of stress at work:

➤ Economic Uncertainties

At the point when the economy is contracting, individuals end up on edge about their job stability and this could prompt an increase in the stress level.

➤ Technological Uncertainties

In a relatively short period of time, innovation might render an employee's knowledge and expertise obsolete. Numerous workers face dangers from computers, mechanical robots, computerization, and similar sorts of technological innovation growth, which might also lead to stress.

➤ Organizational Leadership

This reflects the senior executives' management style for the company. A culture of worry, fear, and tension is created by many high authorities. They place unreasonably high expectations on

workers to perform in a short amount of time, impose overly strict restrictions, and repeatedly fire individuals who don't meet the criteria on time.

### **2.3.5 Effect of Stress**

Job stress was defined as those aspects of the work that provide risks to the individual on a physical, emotional, and mental level. In other words, the five magnitudes of the uniqueness of the task that produces stress were conceived. Since the physical environment was thought to be unstable in the administrative workplace, it was not included in the current study (McLean 1974; Osipow and Spokane 1983). The strain was conceptualized to comprise of four psychiatric state of affairs of undertakings, the four psychiatric states of affairs given by Ilfeld, Almal, Maseem and Khan (2011).

Depression: Frequently feeling lonely, exhausted, discouraged, or low in energy; loss of sexual want; and having contemplations of potentially ending one's life;

Anxiety: Frequency of sour or upset stomach, feeling faint or dazed, hand trembling, maintaining a strategic distance from things, and feeling afraid or fearful;

Cognitive Disturbance: Frequently encountering trouble in recollecting things or concentrating; mind going blank;

Anger: Regularly losing temper; feeling basically irritated, annoyed, or critical of others; getting furious over less important things..

Three relationships are known to be significant psychosocial determinants of the mental as well as physical health of working people.

- The relationship between the employee and his or her job.
- Between the employee and other employees at work.
- Between the employee and the organization.

Blumenthal (2003) differentiated different effects of stress as follows:

- Subjective effect: This leads to tension, depression, disappointment, exhaustion and low confidence.

- Behavioral effects: leads to accident proneness, impaired speech, restlessness and distractions.
- Cognitive effects: stress that affects our thought process leading to difficulty or fear of making decisions, forgetfulness, hypersensitivity, mental blocks and trouble focusing or thinking clearly. This may be intensified by substances abuse.
- Physiological responses: This begins in the brain and spreads to various body organs. The adrenaline medulla releases catecholamine, which raises blood pressure in the kidneys and induces the liver to release sugar into the circulatory system. In order to combat stress, the pituitary organ boosts the secretion of corticosteroids, but if this occurs for an extended period of time, the immune system is suppressed. Although "fight or flight" emotions are adaptive for handling stress, they are rarely employed in metropolitan workplaces. The buildup of immune-suppressive stress

hormones in the body has an impact on degenerative processes and disorders.

- Effects on health: Long-term exposure to stress has negative effects on health that are severe. Stress may contribute to illnesses including asthma, amenorrhea, coronary heart disease, chest pains, diarrhea, dyspepsia, headaches, diabetes mellitus, ulcers, and a decreased libido, among other problems. People should be aware that stress suppresses the immune system in the world as we currently know it, where AIDS is alarmingly prevalent. HIV weakens a person's immune system, rendering them defenseless against various infections and diseases.

The most recent focus is on how these inadequacies are dangerous, and job stress concepts also show how stress may be beneficial to health. Work that is satisfying and health-promoting contains intriguing and difficult responsibilities, real accountability, chances for personal success, recognition of such accomplishment, and extensions for personal development. According

to Michac (1997), causes of stress include poor time management, ambiguous or undefined sets of responsibilities, feelings of inadequacy and instability, failure to complete tasks, a lack of communication, poor interpersonal relationships, and the difficulty and complexity of the assignments. He also listed additional factors that contribute to low productivity, including inadequate organizational training, machine breakdowns, a lack of established execution norms, a lack of proper planning and inspiration, change, a poor organizational environment, inadequate communication at various levels, and a failure to recognize the organization's goals.

As a result of abnormal state stress's negative effects on productivity, absenteeism, and the accumulation of other employee problems like alcoholism, drug abuse, hypertension, and a variety of cardiovascular diseases, occupational stress is seen as on the rise and has evolved into a test for employers (Meneze 2005). Personality traits have been linked to a predisposition toward stress, unease, and other occupational health difficulties

in several fields of medicine; these traits may heighten feelings of occupational stress and disappointment (Michie and Williams 2003).

### **2.3.6 Managing Stress**

Claude and Cole (1992) suggested that in order to manage work stress effectively, management should consider doing the following:

Provide work which permits some personal choice in a manner which is carried out and the sequence in which it is carried out, encourage employees' participation and cooperation in decisions which influence them, management should set clear goals and targets and provide adequate feedback on performance as well as induct new recruits thoroughly. Management should provide training as an on-going updating process, provide consistent rewards for effective output, review performance gaps at the time of occurrence, and give employees the chance to attempt new obligations and distinctive assignments. Management should also design job to have even work pressures, encourage team working procedures and friendly work relations,

provide secure and reasonable personnel practices and ensure work environment is free of hazards and risk.

This implies that if these approaches and measures outlined above are precisely actualized it could go a far way to limit the level of stress on employees. In the same view, Lucey (1994) said stress can be managed in an organization through increasing employees autonomy in their job, increase or decrease personal responsibility, allow more flexible working hours – by the used of flexi–time, job rotation and transfers, provide better working conditions, including social/fitness clubs etc. and institute a counseling service.

### **2.3.7 Relationship between stress, performance and productivity**

Working under stress is a universal component that affects people from all walks of life. Today's managers are seriously examining the stress management concerns that contribute to lower employee performance, starting with dissatisfaction and high turnover and eventually affecting company goals and objectives (its productivity).

Employee performance is defined as goals reached and professional successes. It aims to produce the intended results. Although the core of performance management is performance evaluation, the complete process encompasses all organizational rules, procedures, and design elements that interact to generate employee performance (Cardy 2004). Employee engagement is one factor that has drawn more attention as a significant factor in determining employee effectiveness (Macey, Schneider, Barbera, and Young, 2009). Studies (Mone and London, 2010) suggest that fostering employee engagement will lead to higher levels of performance.

Mathis and Jackson (2000) defined productivity as a measure of the quantity and quality of work done considering the cost of the resource it took to do the work. Steers (1991) is of the opinion that it is useful from a managerial standpoint to consider several forms of counterproductive behavior that are known to result from prolonged stress. Thompson and Mc Hugh (1995) are of the opinion that when specifically regarding stress in the workplace, contemporary accounts of the stress 'process' often follow the notion of stress

as resulting from a misfit between an individual and their particular environment, where internal or external factors push the individuals adaptive capacities beyond his or her limit. In any case, no two individuals respond to a similar activity in the specific same way, since individual personal factors additionally impact stress. For instance, type A personalities, those who work compulsively and feel compelled to always be on time and fulfill deadlines, typically put themselves under greater stress than do others (Dessler 2000). Mathis and Jackson (2000) suggested that to measure organizational human resource productivity one has to consider unit labour cost, or the total labour cost per unit of output. The writers went on to say that a person's performance is influenced by three things: their capacity for doing the task, their amount of effort, and the assistance they get. It is commonly accepted in management literature that these components interact so that performance (P) is the sum of ability (A) times effort (E) times support (S), or  $P=A \times E \times S$ . If any of these are lacking or decreased, performance suffers. They also stress

that productivity must take into account production quality because it is possible to produce more but with inferior quality as an alternative.

Organizational effects including decreased performance, unhappiness, a lack of motivation and commitment, and an increase in absenteeism and turnover may be caused by work-related stress.

Gbolahan and Catherine, (2012) looks at the connections between perceived stress and performance appraisal discomfort with center self-assessments and gender orientation as directing factors. Neither center self-assessments nor gender orientation altogether moderatre the relationship between performance appraisal discomfort and perceived stress. Ladies earned less pay and their perceived stress was altogether higher than men's. The discoveries propose that HR professionals need to consider singular qualities more than organizational policy in effective of performance appraisal and stress reduction strategy and as a result worker-related interventions may be particularly pertinent.

### **2.3.8 Empirical Framework**

Ritchie and Martin (1999) contend that performance is impacted by stress. They claim that when individuals with high expectations for interest and utility at work are placed in positions where instrumentality reigns, they are more prone to experience stress and alienation.

Dunham (1976) announced the result of a teacher of instructor stress, in view of an investigation of information, which included reports of 658 teachers in primary and secondary school. Reports were acquired from teachers at conferences and courses. They were requested to describe their stress situation, how they reacted to them, and what proposals, they would make for diminishing stress. The author reported that the two conclusion of his review were that more teachers were encountering stress and more teachers experienced extreme stress. He distinguished four regular stress circumstances as reorganization, role-conflict and job ambiguity, and poor working conditions.

Blumenthal (2003) is of the opinion that stress affects process prompting a trouble or fear of making decisions, distraction, hypersensitivity, inabilities to

think straight and trouble concerning thinking. Stress can affect a person's health by causing dysfunction or interruption in numerous areas

Frost (2003) demonstrates that every organization suffers from emotional suffering. According to Frost, the regularity with which devoted, diligent people encounter unpleasant situations at work or receive terrible news that dashes their hopes, aspirations, or confidence may reduce their productivity and raise their stress levels.

According to Thompson and McHugh (1995), individuals may experience role ambiguity when the requirements of a work or tasks are unclear and societal norms and standards of comparison are insufficient. Job conflicts typically arise when opposing desires from several roles in a person's job set.

## **2.4 Theoretical Review**

Theories that focus on the specific relationship between external demands (stressors) and bodily processes (stress) and can be grouped in two different

categories: approaches to ‘systemic stress’ based in physiology and psychobiology (Selye 1976 et al) and approaches to ‘psychological stress’ developed within the field of cognitive psychology (Lazarus 1966, 1991, Lazarus and Folkman 1984, McGrath 1982).

#### **2.4.1 Systemic Stress: Selye's Theory**

The endocrinologist Hans Selye's well-crafted work is largely responsible for the stress concept's growing acceptance in science and popular culture. In a series of animal tests, he discovered that when administered seriously and for an adequate amount of time, a range of stimulus events (such as warm, cold, or hazardous chemicals) are suitable for delivering common effects, which means not particular to either stimulus. (Aside from these general changes in the body, each stimulus certainly has a unique effect; for instance, heat causes vasodilatation whereas cold causes vasoconstriction). Selye claims that these unrelated alterations represent the prototypical, or particular, example of a reaction to basic stress. According to Selye (1976), this stress manifests as "a

syndrome that includes all the nonspecifically induced alterations in a biologic framework."

The "General Adaptation Syndrome" (GAS), a stereotyped response pattern, consists of three stages;

(a) An initial shock stage and a subsequent counter shock stage are components of the alarm reaction. Autonomic sensitivity, an increase in adrenaline release, and intestinal ulcerations are all signs of the shock stage.

The counter shock phase, which is characterized by increased adrenocortical activity, indicates the beginning of defense measures.

(b) If noxious stimulus is continued, the body moves into the resistance phase. This stage purports to demonstrate the living form's adaptation to the stressor as the alarm reaction's adverse effects disappear. But at the same time as resistance to the noxious stimuli develops, resistance to other types of stressors decreases.

(c) The phase of fatigue can be reached via resistance if the unpleasant stimuli continues. The living form's capacity to adapt to the stressor is worn down,

stage (a) symptoms reappear, but resistance is no longer viable. If the stimulation continues, irreversible tissue damage manifests and the creature perishes.

Despite the fact that Selye's study had a significant effect on a whole generation of stress researchers, flaws in his theory were quickly found. The fundamental flaw was Selye's creation of stress as a reaction to several different situations, which had the fatal outcome that the notion of stress became the foundation for a broad variety of techniques. Along these lines, by turning into an equivalent word for different terms such as, tension, threat, conflict, or emotional excitement, the concept of stress was in threat of losing its scientific significance (Engel 1985). Other than this overarching concern, certain fundamental difficulties have been brought forth. One objection focused on the theory's central tenet of a general cause of the GAS. Mason (1971, 1975b) raised the point that the Selye-identified stressors all shared a similar emotional connotation in that they were unique, odd, and unfamiliar to the animal. In light of this, the animal's condition may be described as one

of weakness, susceptibility, and lack of control. Subsequently, the hormonal GAS reactions followed the (specific) emotional effect of such impacts as opposed to the influence of all things considered in accordance with this assumption, Mason (1975b) showed that in experiments where uncertainty had been eliminated with no GAS was observed. This criticism prompts a second, more significant argument: not at all like the physiological stress researched by Selye, the stress experienced by people is quite often the consequence of a cognitive mediation (Arnold 1960, Janis 1958, Lazarus 1966, 1974). Despite this, Selye omits to include the cognitive mechanisms that may explain how "objective" unpleasant occurrences are transformed into the subjective sensation of stress. Similarly, Selye does not regard stress management techniques as significant mediators of the stress-outcome link.

#### **2.4.2 Psychological Stress: The Lazarus Theory**

Two concepts are central to any psychological stress theory;

- i. Appraisal, i.e., people's assessment of the noteworthiness of what is happening for their well-being,

ii. Coping, i.e., people's efforts in thought and activity to oversee particular requests (Lazarus 1993).

iii. Coping, i.e.,

Since its first introduction as an extensive hypothesis (Lazarus 1966), the Lazarus stress theory has experienced a few fundamental updates (Lazarus 1991, Lazarus and Folkman 1984, Lazarus and Launier 1978). In the most recent version (Lazarus 1991), stress is viewed as a relation concept, i.e., stress isn't characterized as a particular sort of external stimulation nor a particular pattern of physiological, behavioural, or subjective responses. Rather, stress is seen as a relationship ('transaction') among people and their condition. 'Psychological stress refers to a relationship with the environment that the individual appraises as significant for his or her well-being and in which the demand taxes or surpass accessible coping resources' (Lazarus and Folkman 1986). This definition focuses to two procedures as focal mediators inside the person– environmental transaction: cognitive appraisal evaluation and adapting.

The concept of appraisal, brought into emotion research by Arnold (1960) and explained as for stress forms by Lazarus (1966, Lazarus and Launier 1978), is a key factor for understanding stress significant transactions. This idea is predicated on the concept that emotional processes (including stress) are dependent on sincere aspirations that individuals exhibit regarding the importance and result of a certain event. This idea is crucial for understanding individual variations in an environment's inspired feeling's quality, intensity, and duration that are objectively comparable for different persons. The majority of the time, it is anticipated that a specific pattern of evaluation creates, maintains, and ultimately modifies the outcome state. These evaluations are then influenced by a variety of personal and environmental variables. The most important elements on the individual level are motivational tendencies, objectives, values, and general expectations. Important situational parameters are consistency, controllability, and approach of a possibly unpleasant occasion. Within primary appraisal, three segments are recognized:

- i. The degree to which an experience relates to topics that the person cares about is referred to as goal relevance.
- ii. The degree to which a scene proceeds in accordance with individual aspirations and goals is known as goal consistency.
- iii. Depending on the degree of ego participation, several aspects of personal accountability are assigned, such as self-assurance, moral character, inner perfection, or self-identity.

In like manner, three auxiliary examination segments are recognized:

- i. A person's assessment of who is responsible for a given circumstance yields either fault or credit.
- ii. Utilizing potential Lazarus alludes to a man's appraisal of the likelihood that particular behavioral or cognitive efforts would produce an event that will significantly affect him personally.
- iii. Future aspirations relate to the assessment of the subsequent course of an event in terms of goal harmony or incongruence.

Specific primary and secondary evaluation instances cause different levels of stress. We distinguish three types: damage, danger, and challenge (Lazarus and Folkman 1984). The recent (mental) hurt or misfortune is referred to as "damage" in this sentence. The perception of potentially imminent harm is known as danger. Requests that a guy feels confident with present challenge. These varied forms of mental stress are interjected into specific emotional reactions, so illuminating the intimate relationship between the realms of stress and emotions.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Preamble**

This section specifies the procedures employed by the researcher in putting together the analysis adopted, that is the instrument used for the study. This section covered research design, population and sample, sampling techniques, source of data, data analysis method, operationalization and measurement of variables.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

Research design is the blue print of the study. It aims at assessing the effects of stress on employee's performance and productivity, the descriptive survey is adopted for the study as a source of primary data obtained from employees of Notre Dame Table Water. The survey has an advantage of producing good number of responses from a wide range of people and at the same time it provides a more accurate picture of events at a point in time. The method is selected by the researcher because it assists in obtaining precise data on how

employee's productivity and performance can be affected by stress, the causes of stress and procedures for managing stress. It would involve measurement, classification, analysis, comparison and interpretation of data.

### **3.3 Population of the Study**

The study population consists of all employees of Notre Dame Table Water, of which has three departments; administrative department having 5 employees, Sales department having 32 employees and production department having 65 employees. This gives a total of 102 employees of Notre Dame Table Water.

### **3.4 Sample Size Determination**

The population of this study are employees in Benin City, Edo State. Yamane's statistical technique was opted to determine the sample size, at 5% error tolerance and 95% degree of freedom. The calculation formula of Taro Yamane is presented as follows.

n =

Where :

n= sample size required

N = number of people in the population

e = allowable error (%)

n =

n=

### **3.5 Operationalization and Measurement of Variables**

The focus of this study was to derive the extent to which performance and productivity are affected by stress using Notre Dame Table Water as a sample from a pool of Edo State employees. The variables used to measure stress, performance and productivity include; communication, anxiety, supervision, compensation package, motivation and stress scale which were included in the questionnaire.

**Table 3.1 Operationalization and Measurement of Variables**

<b>S/N</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Operationalization &amp; Measurement</b>	<b>Representation in Questionnaire</b>
1	Gender	2 scale interval	Question 1
2	Age	4 point interval scale	Question 2
3	Educational background	3 scale interval	Question 3
4	Marital status	2 scale interval	Question 4
5	Working experience	5 scale interval	Question 5
6	Independent Variable: Stress	Stress is operationally defined as any adjustive demand on an individual caused by physical, emotional or mental factors that requires coping behaviors. To be measured on a 5 point likert scale. The	Questions 6-14

		questionnaire on stress was adapted from Tepper 0(2011)	
7	Dependent Variable: Performance	Performance is operationally defined as a potential of employees to meet their goals and those of the organization.	
8	Productivity	Productivity is operationally defined as the ration between output of wealth and the input of resources used in the process of production.	
		Questions on Performance and Productivity is to be	

		measured on a 5 point likert scale from never to always. The performance scale as developed by the researcher. The productivity scale was adapted from Dwamena (2012)	Questions 15-26
--	--	---	-----------------

*Source: Researcher: 2025*

### **3.6 The Research Instrument**

The questionnaire contains two sections; Section A and Section B. Section A covered the demographic information of the respondents, queries about personal information of the respondent are asked, there are gender; age, education, job experience marital status as check-list questions. Section B has three sub divisions which contains questions on Stress, Performance, and Productivity entailing closed ended questions, five likert scale questions

ranging from never to always was adopted ( always=5, often=4, sometimes=3, seldom=2, never=1).

### **3.7 Source of Data**

The research embraced the use of primary data obtained using questionnaires.

### **3.8 Data Analysis**

The statistical tools used for this study is the SPSS (20.0) version and both the statistics was used. The descriptive method involved the use of the frequency distribution table, arithmetic mean and percentages, while the inferential method involved the use of ANOVA, which determined the statistically significant differences. In the course of study the ANOVA will be used, which examines the relationship between a dependent variable and independent variable.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

#### 4.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the presenting of original data collected through surveys from Notre Dame Table Water employees. Only 71 of the 81 respondents who were chosen for the study's analysis and interpretation (using descriptive statistics and the ANOVA) actually filled out the questionnaire, which is included in this chapter.

#### 4.2 Demographic Background of Respondents

This section focuses on the respondents' frequency and percentage distribution in relation to their different demographic variables.

Table 4.2.1 Background of Respondents

Variables	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	32	45.1
	Female	39	54.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Below 20 years	9	12.7
	21-30 years	45	63.4
	31-40 years	16	22.5
	41 years and above	1	1.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100</b>
Academic Qualification	Basic	6	8.5
	Secondary	18	25.4
	Tertiary	36	50.7
	Others	11	15.5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100</b>
Marital Status	Married	22	31.0
	Unmarried	49	69.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100</b>
Job Experience	Less than 5 years	29	40.8
	5-10 years	37	52.1
	11-15 years	4	5.6
	16-20 years	1	1.4
	Above 20 years	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100</b>

### ***Researcher's field work 2025***

From table 4.1 above, it was found that 32 representing 45.1% of the respondents were male while 39 representing 54.9% were women

From the information in the above table, it was found that 9 representing 12.7% of the respondents were between below 20 years, 45 representing 63.4% were between 21-30 years, 16 presenting 22.5% were between 31-40 years, 1 representing 1.4% were between 41 years and above.

With respect to academic qualification, it was found that 6 representing 8.5% had Basic qualification, 18 representing 25.4% had secondary qualification, 36 representing 50.7% had tertiary qualification, and 11 representing 15.5% had other qualification.

With respect to marital status it was found that 22 representing 31.0% were married and 49 representing 69.0% were unmarried

With regards to job experience it was found that 29 representing 40.8% had less than 5 years of experience, 37 representing 52.1% had 5-10 years of

experience, 4 representing 5.6% had 11-15 years of experience, 1 representing 1.4% had 16-20 years of experience.

### 4.3 Data Presentation and Analysis

According to research questions, data collection from questionnaire will be analyzed according to research questions stated earlier in chapter 1

Table 4.3.1 Response of respondents on what extent do they agree or disagree with this factors influences or encourages

<b>Variables/Questions</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>ST</b>	<b>O</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>Stress</b>						
<b>Have you ever felt stress during your work?</b>	2 (2.8%)	9 (12.7 %)	10 (14.1 %)	20 (42.3 %)	30 (42.3 %)	3.94
<b>Do different groups at work demand things from me that are hard to combine?</b>	5 (7%)	19 (26.8 %)	27 (38%)	8 (11.3 %)	12 (16.9)	<b>3.04</b>

<b>Are jobs clearly defined to avoid ambiguity?</b>	5 (7%)	10 (14.1%)	30 (42.3%)	14 (19.7%)	12 (16.9%)	<b>3.25</b>
<b>Does work environment bring about stress in your organization?</b>	4 (5.6%)	4 (5.6%)	20 (28.2%)	23 (32.4%)	20 (28.2%)	<b>3.72</b>
<b>Does your supervisor or manager help you sort out work problems?</b>	10 (14.1%)	12 (16.9%)	20 (28.2%)	7 (9.9%)	22 (31%)	<b>3.27</b>
<b>Does stress come to you because of decisions of management?</b>	11 (15.5%)	9 (12.7%)	23 (32.4%)	14 (19.7%)	14 (19.7%)	<b>3.15</b>
<b>My working times and working location is flexible and is safe</b>	15 (21.1%)	6 (8.5%)	24 (33.8%)	11 (15.5%)	15 (21.1%)	<b>3.07</b>

<b>Does family life affect your work life?</b>	16 (22.5%)	12 (16.9%)	27 (38%)	8 (11.3%)	8 (11.3%)	<b>2.72</b>
<b>Inadequate monetary reward causes me to feel stressed</b>	14 (19.7%)	10 (14.1%)	24 (33.8%)	3 (4.2%)	20 (28.2%)	<b>3.07</b>
<b>Performance and Productivity</b>						
<b>How often do you concentrate enough on your work?</b>	4 (5.6%)	8 (11.3%)	19 (26.8%)	8 (11.3%)	32 (45.1%)	<b>3.79</b>
<b>How often did you not do work at times when you were supposed to be working?</b>	20 (28.2%)	18 (25.4%)	20 (28.2%)	9 (12.7%)	4 (5.6%)	<b>2.42</b>
<b>Are you given enough authority to make decisions you</b>	18 (25.4%)	15 (21.1%)	23 (32.4%)	7 (9.9%)	7 (9.9%)	<b>2.75</b>

<b>need to make concerning your job?</b>						
<b>Does Job stress affect your commitment as an employee?</b>	5 (7%)	12 (16.9 %)	21 (29.6 %)	12 (16.9 %)	21 (29.6 %)	<b>3.45</b>
<b>How often do you receive feedback on your work?</b>	5 (7%)	7 (9.9%)	14 (19.7 %)	14 (19.7 %)	31 (43.7 %)	<b>3.83</b>
<b>How often did health problems limit the kind or amount of work you do?</b>	8 (11.3%)	17 (23.9 %)	17 (23.9 %)	16 (22.5 %)	13 (18.3 %)	<b>3.13</b>
<b>How often do you not find yourself working as carefully as you should?</b>	13 (18.3%)	16 (22.5 %)	24 (33.8 %)	5 (7%)	13 (18.3 %)	<b>2.85</b>
<b>How often was the quality of your work</b>	8	29	18	4 (5.6%)	12	<b>2.76</b>

<b>lower than it should be?</b>	(11.3%) )	(40.8 ) )	(25.4 ) )		(16.9 ) )	
<b>Is there an impact of job stress on the productivity of employees?</b>	4 (5.6%)	10 (14.1 ) )	20 (28.2 ) )	17 (23.9 ) )	20 (28.2 ) )	<b>3.55</b>
<b>Will an increase in your financial reward motivate you to produce more?</b>	9 (12.7%) )	6 (8.5%) )	19 (26.8 ) )	11 (15.5 ) )	26 (36.6 ) )	<b>3.55</b>
<b>Will an enhanced and improved working environment stimulate you to increase productivity?</b>	11 (15.5%) )	9 (12.7 ) )	12 (16.9 ) )	14 (19.7 ) )	25 (35.2 ) )	<b>3.46</b>

<b>The mission and vision statement of the company in line with my own personal goals?</b>	13 (18.3%)	5 (7%)	24 (33.8%)	10 (14.1%)	19 (26.8%)	<b>3.24</b>
--	---------------	-----------	---------------	---------------	---------------	-------------

***Researcher's field work: 2025***

From the information gotten from table 4.3 above with respect to stress, performance and productivity, it was found that, 2(2.8%) of respondents never agree to having felt stress during work, while 9(12.7%) of respondent seldom-agree with this as well, 10(14.1%) sometimes agree with this, 20(28.2%) respondents often agree to this and 20(42.3%) Always agree to this. Also 5(7%) never agree that different groups demanding different things are hard to combine, 19(26.8%) Seldom-agree to this as well, 27(38%) sometimes agree with this, 8(11.3%) often agree to this and 12(16.9%) respondents often agree to this as well. 5(7%) respondents never agree that clearly defined jobs avoid ambiguity, 10(14.1%) of respondent seldom-agree to this as well,

30(42.3%) sometimes agree to this, 14(19.7%) often agree to this as well, 12(16.9%) always agree to this. 4(5.6%) respondents never agree that work environment bring about stress, 4(5.6%) seldom-agree to this as well, 20(28.2%) sometimes agree to this, 23(32.4%) often agree to this and 20 (28.2%) respondents always agree to this.

The table above provides the information that 10(14.1%) respondents never agree that managers help to sort out work problems, 12 (16.9%) seldom agree with this view, 20(28.2%) respondents sometimes agree along with this view 7(9.9%) often agree with this, 22(31%) always agree with this view. Also 11(15.5%) never agree that the decisions of managers bring stress, 9(12.7%) respondents seldom agree with this view, 23(32.4%) sometimes agree with this view, 11 (15.5%) sometimes agree with this view, and 15(21.1%) always agree with this view. 15(21.1%) respondents never agree that their working times and location is flexible and safe, 6(8.5%) respondents seldom agree to this, 24(33.8%) respondents sometimes agree to this view, 11(15.5%) often agree to this as well, 15(21.1) always agree to this view as well. A total of

16(22.5%) respondent never agree to that family life affect their work life, 12(16.9%) seldom agree to this as well, 27(38%) sometimes agree to this view as well, 8 (11.3%) often agree to this view, and 8(11.3%) always agree to this as well. Also 14(19.7%) respondents never agree that inadequate monetary rewards can cause stress, 10(14.1%) seldom agree to the view, 24(33.8%) respondents sometimes agree to this statement, 3(4.2%) often agree to the statement, 20(28.2%) always agree to this view.

With respect to performance and productivity, it was found out that, 4 (5.6%) respondents never agree to concentrating well enough on their work, 8 (11.3%) seldom agree to this view, 19(26.8%) to this view, also 8(11.3%) respondents often agree with this as well, and 32(45.1%) always agree to this view. From the table it was shown that 20(28.2%) never agree to not doing work when they are supposed to be working, 18(25.4%) respondents seldom agree to this, 20(28.3%) sometimes agree to this, 9(12.7%) respondents often agree to this, 4(5.6%) always agree to this. 18(25.4%) respondents never agree that they are given enough authority to make decisions concerning their jobs,

15(21.1%) seldom agree to this, 23(32.4%) respondents sometimes agree to this, 7(9.9%) respondents often agree to this, and 7(9.9%) always agree that they are given enough authority to make decisions concerning their jobs. Also 5(7%) respondents never agree that stress affect their commitment, 12(16.9%) respondents seldom agree to this, 21(29.6%) sometimes agree to this as well, it also shows that 12(16.9%) often agree to this, and 21(29.6%) always agree to this as well.

Also, the table shows that 5(7%) respondents never receive feedback on their work, 7(9.9%) seldom receive feedback, 14(19.7%) respondents sometimes agree to this, 14(19.7%) respondent often agree to this, and 31(43.7%) always receive feedback on their work. 8(11.3%) respondents never had health issues limit the amount of work they do, 17(23.9%) seldom agree to this statement, 17(23.9%) sometimes agree to the statement, 16(22.5%) often agree to the statement and 13(18.3%) always agree to the statement. 13(18.3%) respondents never agree that they do not find themselves working as carefully as they should, 16(22.5%) respondents seldom agree to this, 24(33.8%)

sometimes agree to this as well, 5(7%) respondents often agree to this, 13(18.3%) always agree to this as well. The table shows that 8(11.3%) respondents never agree that the quality of their work is lower than it should be 29(40.8%) seldom agree to this, 18(25.4%) sometimes agree that their quality is lower than it show be, 4(5.6%) respondents often agree that the quality of their work is lower than it should be, and 12(16.9%) always agree that the quality of their work is lower than it should be.

From the table above it is shown that 4(5.6%) respondents never agree that job stress affects their productivity, 10(14.1%) seldom agree to this statement, 20(28.2%) respondents sometimes agree that job stress affects their productivity, 17(23.9%) respondents often agree to this, and 20(28.2%) always agree to this as well. 9(12.7%) respondents never agree that an increase in financial reward motivate them to increase output, 6(8.5%) respondents often agree to this as well, 19(26.8%) respondents sometimes agree to this view, 19(26.8%) respondents sometimes agree with this as well, 11(15.5%) respondents often agree with this, and 26(36.6%) always agree to this as well.

It was shown in the table above that 11(15.5%) respondents never agree that an enhanced and improved environment will increase productivity, 9(12.7%) respondent seldom agree to this, 12(16.9%) respondent sometimes agree to this, it also shows that 14(19.7%) respondent often agree to this and 25(35.2%) respondent always agree to this. Also 13(18.3%) respondents never agree that the mission and vision statement is in line with their personal goals, 5(7%) respondents seldom agree to this, 24(33.8%) sometimes agree to this view, 10(14.1%) respondents often agree with this and 19(26.8%) respondent always agree with this view as well.

#### 4.4. One-Way ANOVA

**Table 4.4.1: Relationship between stress, performance and productivity**

ITEMS	F	Sig	Decision
<b>Stress</b>			
Have you ever felt stress during your work?	5.747	0.001	Significant

Do different groups at work demand things from me that are hard to combine?	5.832	0.001	Significant
Are jobs clearly defined to avoid ambiguity?	7.110	0.000	Significant
Does work environment bring about stress in your organization?	0.232	0.874	Not Significant
Does your supervisor or manager help you sort out work problems?	2.084	0.111	Not Significant
Does stress come to you because of decisions of management?	0.391	0.760	Not Significant
My working times and working location is flexible and is safe	1.300	0.282	Not Significant
Does family life affect your work life?	1.859	0.145	Not Significant
Inadequate monetary reward causes me to feel stressed	1.859	0.145	Not Significant

<b>Performance and Productivity</b>			
How often do you concentrate enough on your work?	1.953	0.129	Not Significant
How often did you not do work at times when you were supposed to be working?	3.496	0.020	Significant
Are you given enough authority to make decisions you need to make concerning your job?	0.359	0.783	Not Significant
Does Job stress affect your commitment as an employee?	0.922	0.435	Not Significant
How often do you receive feedback on your work?	2.334	0.082	Not Significant
How often did health problems limit the kind or amount of work you do?	0.420	0.739	Not Significant
How often do you not find yourself working as carefully as you should?	1.093	0.358	Not Significant

How often was the quality of your work lower than it should be?	1.345	0.267	Not Significant
Is there an impact of job stress on the productivity of employees?	1.479	0.228	Not significant
Will an increase in your financial reward motivate you to produce more?	3.113	0.32	Not Significant
Will an enhanced and improved working environment stimulate you to increase productivity?	3.004	0.36	Not Significant
The mission and vision statement of the company in line with my own personal goals?	1.616	0.194	Not Significant

*Researcher' field work, 2025*

According to the data in Table 4.3 above, respondents' responses to the questions "Have you ever experienced stress at work?" "Do different groups at work require things of me that are difficult to combine?" and "Are jobs clearly defined to avoid ambiguity?" are significantly different from one another. This is because the level of significance, or P-Value, is .001, .001, and .000 respectively, which is lower than the alpha. It was found out from the Anova result that respondents indicate that, their responses were not significantly different because the level of significant or P-Value for each of the items listed above in respect to Stress are higher than the alpha level 0.05; which are as follows: does work environment bring about stress in your organization (.874), does your supervisor or manager help you sort out work problems (.111), Does stress come to you because of decisions of management (.760), My working times and working location is flexible and is safe (.282), Does family life affect your work life? (.145), Inadequate monetary reward causes me to feel stressed (.145).

With respect to views of respondents toward Performance and Productivity from Anova result, it was found out that, responses from respondents indicate that, their responses were not significantly different because their level of significant or P-Value for each item are higher than the level of Alpha which is 0.05: which are follows; How often do you concentrate enough on your work? (.129), are you given enough authority to make decisions you need to make concerning your job? (.783), does job stress affect your commitment as an employee? (.435), how often do you receive feedback on your work? (.082), how often did health problems limit the kind or amount of work you do? (.739), how often do you not find yourself working as carefully as you should? (.358), how often was the quality of your work lower than it should be? (.267), Is there an impact of job stress on the productivity of employees? (.228), the mission and vision statement of the company in line with my own personal goals? (.194). However, responses from respondents also indicate that, their response to how often did you not do work at times when you were supposed to be working, will an increase in your financial reward motive you

to produce more, and will an enhanced and improved working environment stimulate you to increase productivity are significantly different as their level of significant or P-Value .020, .032 and .036 respectively are lower than the alpha level 0.05.

#### 4.4.1 Hypothesis Testing

##### Hypothesis One

H<sub>01</sub>: There is high level of stress amongst Notre Dame Table Water . The data verifying the hypothesis are contained in the table 4.4.2

**Table 4.4.2: Hypothesis testing One**

#### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.757 <sup>a</sup>	4	.218

Likelihood Ratio	7.299	4	.121
Linear-by-Linear Association	.419	1	.517
N of Valid Cases	71		

The data in table 4.4.2 shows that the null hypothesis is not statistically significant and is therefore rejected, and  $H_a$  is accepted. The chi-square value of .218 which is greater than the level of significance of the value .05. This means that the general high level of stress felt by employees of Notre Dame Table Water is not high.

## Hypothesis Two

H0ii: Functional and dysfunctional stress do not impact on employees' performance. This data verifying the hypothesis are in table 4.4.3

**Table 4.4.3: Hypothesis testing Two**

### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.190 <sup>a</sup>	16	.017
Likelihood Ratio	33.472	16	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	.007	1	.935
N of Valid Cases	71		

--	--	--	--

The data in table 4.4.3 shows that the null hypothesis is statistically significant and is therefore accepted. The chi-square value of .017 which is lesser than the level of significance of the value .05. This means that functional and dysfunctional stress has impact on employees' performance and productivity.

#### **4.5 Discussions of Findings**

The analysis demonstrates that stress has an influence on performance, which is also consistent with Ritchie and Martin's (1999) findings. The outcome demonstrates that when employees are under stress, they frequently do not execute their jobs as they should, which lowers performance and productivity.

Stress levels and how it affects productivity and performance are related.

In line with Blumenthal (2003), who believes that stress affects our thought process and results in a difficulty or fear of making decisions, forgetfulness, hypersensitivity, mental blocks, and difficulty concerning thinking, stress

arises when there are conflicting demands on employees. This could lead to the perception of disobedience from the employee since employees are unable to combine both of the job roles in his daily activity.

According to Frost (2003), there are emotional problems in every company. The results demonstrate that employees are not distressed or pained by management decisions, the current financial reward system, or the working environment. Employees may experience pain from managers, unreasonable company policies, disruptive coworkers or clients, or from poorly managed businesses.

Thompson and McHugh (1995) propagated that where the demands of a role or roles are unclear and norms and standards of social comparison are lacking, people may experience role ambiguity, which is in line with the findings of the study. It shows that employees find it difficult to combine different and conflicting work demand According to Thompson and McHugh (1995) role conflicts generally exist between differing expectation from the various parts of a person's role set, for example those people expecting delivery; and

inevitable with the level of pressure that most of us are exposed to in or out of work since a person cannot fulfill the demands of all their roles

**CHAPTER FIVE**  
**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND**  
**RECOMMENDATION**

**5.1 Introduction**

This study was designed to investigate the Stress, Performance and Productivity using Notre Dame Table Water as its case study. This chapter summarizes the findings of this study, it is divided into three sections; Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations.

**5.2 Summary of Findings**

The study adopted the descriptive and inferential statistics; of which eighty-one (81) questionnaires were administered with seventy-one (71) duly filled and returned. The findings of this study are summarized below:

1. Generally, there is high level of stress felt among Notre Dame Table Water employees
2. The causes of stress identified through the questionnaire are; conflicting demands from different groups, managerial decisions

affecting employees negatively, imbalanced work and family life, inadequate monetary rewards, limitations arising from health and inadequate working environment.

3. Paying close attention to work and having enough authority to make decisions under stress conditions have proven to be functional in the organization.
4. The study reveals that dysfunctional stress lowers the performance and productivity of employees as well as reduce job commitment
5. Adequate feedback, improved work conditions, increased and adequate reward system, as well as connection between company goals and personal goals are ways of preventing dysfunctional stress and could also be strategies that can be used to cope with stress.

### **5.3 Conclusion**

The study's objective was to assess the impact of stress on Notre Dame Table Water employees' productivity. According to the study's findings, performance and productivity were negatively impacted by the issues that

upset workers. Conflicting demands from various groups, managerial decisions that have a negative impact on employees, an imbalance between work and family life, insufficient financial rewards, health-related restrictions, and an unsuitable work environment are a few of the causes that have been identified and analyzed. The huge number of variables that have been found, recorded, and measured, as well as the literature analysis, make it obvious that the study's objective has been met. This demonstrated that stress has a detrimental impact on Notre Dame Table Water 's production and performance.

## **5.4 Recommendation**

### **5.4.1 Policy Recommendation**

The research's conclusions suggest implementing the following policies to assist Notre Dame Table Water personnel in managing and reducing stress at work;

1. There should be well defined job functions and clearly stated job roles

2. Management should improve working environment to enable carrying out of job functions easy
3. Management should improve reward system
4. There should be better or enhanced communication channel within the organization
5. Management should identify reasons for job stress in employees within the context of the work environment
6. Management should also spend money on stress-reduction techniques that will improve employee performance and productivity.

#### **5.4.2 Recommendation for Further Studies**

For further studies other researchers should consider using a larger population size, using two or more organizations to widen the scope of coverage. Other researchers should also consider using organizations outside Edo state, could either be across state or internationally.

## REFERENCES

- Adetayo, J. O., Ajani, J. O. & Olabisi, Olawoyim (2014). AN overview of the effects of job stress on employees performance in nigeria tertiary hospitals. *Scientific Review Article*. .
- Akingunola, R. O. and Adigun, A. O. (2010). Occupational Stress and The Nigerian Banking Industry. *Journal of Economics and Engineering*. ISSN: 2078-0346, pp. 14-21.
- Akinnusi, M. (1995). Stress among a sample of Bank Executives in Nigeria. *Management in Nigeria*, April-June, pp.5-15.
- Al-khasawneh, A. L. and Futa, S. M. (2013). The Relationship between Job Stress and Nurses Performance in the Jordanian Hospitals: A Case Study in King Abdullah the Founder Hospital. *Asian Journal of Business Management*. 5(2), pp. 267-275.
- Arbabisarjou, A.; Ajdari, Z.; Omeidi, K. and Jalalinejad, R. (2013). The relationship between Job stress and performance among the hospitals Nurses. *World of Sciences Journal*. No. 2, pp. 181188.
- Ashley, D. (2019). Employee Performance Definition: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114 (3), 395-412. Available in;

<https://bizfluent.com/facts-7218608-employee-performance-definition.html>

Asika, N. and Ade-Serrano, A. (1985). Executive Stress. Nigerian Journal of Management

Studies. Vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 558-565.

Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Stress as a Community and Workplace Issue, ACCI, 001

Barley S and Knight D, 'Toward a cultural theory of stress complaints' in Staw B and Cummings L (eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior, JAI Press, 199

Beer M, Eisenstat R A and Spector B, The Critical Path for Corporate Renewal, Harvard

Business School Press, 1990.

Beheshtifar, M. and Nazarian, R. (2013). Role of Occupational Stress in organizations. Institute of Interdisciplinary Business Research. 4(9), pp. 648-657.

Berridge J, Cooper C L and Highley-Marchington C, Employee assistance programs and

workplace counselling,

Blackwell, S. (1998). Organisational Theory. New York: Dorchester Publishing Co., Inc.

Bowin, R.B. & Harvey D. (2001). Human Resource Management an Experiential Approach. 2nd Ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

B.L., Kroes, W.H., & Quinn, R.P. (1974). Job Stress: An Unlisted Occupational Hazard. Journal of Occupational Medicine, Vol, pp. 659-661.

Bristow J, 'Hooked on Self Esteem: an interview with Frank Furedi', Spiked Online, accessed 1 July at <http://www.spiked-online.com/Articles/00000006DF70.htm>, 005

Cartwright S, Cooper C L and Murphy L, (1995). 'Diagnosing a healthy organisation: A proactive approach to stress in the workplace' in Murphy L, Hurrell J, Sauter S and Keita G (Eds), Job Stress Interventions, American Psychological Association.

Chartered Society of Physiotherapy, Employment Relations & Union Services: Health & Safety Workplace Stress, CSP, churman S and Israel B, 'Redesigning work systems to reduce stress: A participatory action research approach to creating change'

Cooper C, Dewe P and O'Driscoll M, (2010). Organizational Stress, Sage, Cooper C L and Palmer S, Conquer Your Stress, Institute of Personnel and Development.

Cox, T.; Griffiths, A. and Cox, S. (2006). Work-related stress in nursing: Controlling the risk to

health. International Labour Office Working paper. No. CONDI/T/WP.4/1996.

Daniel C. O. “Effects of job stress on employee’s performance.” International Journal of Business, Management and Social Research 06(02) (2019): 375-382.

DCS gaumail (2003). Work Stress Management and Prevention. [Online]. Available from:

<http://dcsgaumail02.dcs.gov.za/exchange>. [Accessed: 12th January 2012]

Dean, C. (2002). Stress and Work Performance. HR Future. 2 (5).

Dessler, G. (2000). Human Resource Management.8th Ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Eatwell, J.M. and Newman,P. (1991) “The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics” vols. 3, 4 .& 12, Macmillan, Tokyo.

EC DG, Guidance on work-related stress: ‘Spice of Life – or Kiss of Death?’, Employment and Social Affairs, 1999 Stress at Work90

Fako, T. T. (2010). Occupational Stress among University Employees in Botswana. European Journal of Social Sciences. 15(3), pp. 313-326.

Furedi F, ‘Politicians, economists, teachers...why are they so desperate to make us happy?’, The Daily Telegraph, 07/05/006 Furedi F, ‘Why the

politics of happiness makes me mad'. Spiked Online, accessed 1 July 006 at <http://www.spiked-online.com/index.php?/site/article/311/> , 006

Furedi F, *Therapy Culture: Cultivating Vulnerability in an Uncertain Age*, Routledge, 003

Ganster&Loghan (2005). *An Experimental Evaluation of a Control Intervention to*

*Alleviate Job-Related Stress.*

Hans S. (2019). A syndrome produced by diverse noxious agents. *Nature*, 138:32. Margolis, Harkness A, Long B, Bermbach N, Patterson K, Jordan S and Kahn H, 'Talking about stress at work: Discourse analysis and implications for stress interventions', *Work and Stress*, Vol.19, No., 005.

Hobfoll S, *Stress, Culture and Community: The Psychology and Philosophy of Stress*, Plenum Press, 1998 HSE, *A business case for the Management Standards for Stress*, HSEBooks,006

<https://www.stannescollege.in/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Responsibilities-of-the-Academic-Staff-To-Students.Revised.pdf>

Irene, L. D. (2005). "Work-related Stress". European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.

Issa, B. A.; Yussuf, A. D.; Olanrewaju, G. T. and Oyewole, A. O. (2009). Stress in Residency Training as Perceived by Resident Doctors in a Nigerian University Teaching Hospital. *European Journal of Scientific Research*. 30(2), pp. 253-259

Iyaniwura, O. and Osoba, A.M. (1983). "Measuring Productivity; Conceptual and Statistical Problems: Improvement of Statistics" in Osoba A.M. (ed.) 'Productivity in Nigeria' Proceedings of a National Conference' NISER, Ibadan.

Jaffe D T, 'The Healthy Company; Research Paradigms for Personal and Organisation Health' in *Organisation Risk Factors for Stress* (eds)

Jamison D and O'Mara J (1991). *Managing the Workforce*, Jossey-Bass.

Johnston, R. and Quinlan, M. (1993). *The origins, management and regulation of occupational illness*. pp3-32, Melbourne Australia: Macmillan Education.

Jones F and Bright J, *Stress: Myth, Theory and Research*, Pearson Education, 001

Kenny D,(1995). 'Stressed organizations and organizations stressors: 'A systemic analysis of workplace injury'', *International Journal of Stress Management*, pp 59-67.

Kinman G and Jones F, 'Lay representations of workplace stress: What do people really mean when they say they are stressed?', Work and Stress, Vol. 19 no. ,005

Khan Impact of Stress on Employees Job Performance in Business Sector of Pakistan: Journal of Management and Business Research Volume 11 Issue 6 Version 1.0 May 2011. Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA) Print ISSN: 0975-5853

Lawlor, A. (1985) "Productivity Improvement Manual" Aldershot, United Kingdom.

Layard R, Happiness: Lessons from a New Science, Allen Lane, 004

Layard R, 'Happiness Is Back', Prospect, Vol.108, 005

Lazarus R S, Psychological Stress and the Coping Process, New York, McGrawHill, 1966

Lazarus R S and Folkman S, Stress, Appraisal, and Coping, New York, Springer, 1984

Lewig K and Dollard M .F. (1997). 'Social construction of work stress: Australian newsprint media portrayal of stress at work' Work and Stress, Vol. 15 No., 001.

Levin-Epstein, M. (2002). Tackle Work Place Stress to Improve Productivity, Reduce Absenteeism. Staff Leader.15 (2).

Luthans, F. (2002). *Organisational Behaviour*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

McGaghie, W.C, Bordage, G. and Shea, J.A. (2001). Problem statement, conceptual framework and research question. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/qliufg>. Date accessed: 5th June, 2018.

Michie, S and Williams, S (2003). Reducing psychological ill health and associated sickness absence: A systematic literature review", *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, Volume 60, Pages 3-9

Mimura, C and Griffiths, (2003). The effectiveness of current approaches to workplace stress management in the nursing profession: an evidence based literature review",

*Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, Volume 60, Pages 10-15

Murphy L, Hurrell J S and Keiter G (ed) *Job Stress Interventions: Current Practices and New Directions*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B. & Wright, P. M. (2004). *Fundamentals of Human Resource Management*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill.

O'Donnell M and Bevan S, 'Stress at work: time for a rethink?', *Occupational Health At Work*, Vol.1 No.3, October/November, 004

Olaoye, A. O. (1985). “ Total Factor Productivity Trends in Nigerian Manufacturing” Nigerian Journal of Economic and Social Studies, vol. 27(3), 317-345.

Organisational Health’ in Sauter S & Lawrence M (Eds.), Organisational Risk Factors for Job Stress, American Psychological Association. No. 8, pp 16-18, 1989

Omolara, B E. (2008). Influence of work related stress on organizational commitment at Olabisi Onabanjo University Ago Iwoye Ogun State Nigeria.EABR & TLC Conferences.

Pervin, K. (1992). Personnel Management, England: Stanley Thornes Publishers Ltd.

Pollock K, (1988). On the nature of social stress: production of a modern mythology’, Social Science and Medicine, Vol. 6 (3).

Raja, A. G. K., Furqan, A. K. & Muhammad, A. K. (2011). Impact of training and development on organizational performance”. Global Journal of Management and Business Research. 11(7), 1-7.

Raymond C, ‘Stress the real millennium bug’, Stress News, 1(4), 000  
<http://www.isma.org.uk/stressnw/millbug.htm#>

Repetti, M. (1990). Organisational Behaviour. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Robbins, S.P. (2004). *Organisation Behaviour*. 11th Ed. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Sauter S L and Murphy L R, American Psychological Association, Washington DC, pp 13- 39,

Selye, H. (1976). *Stress in health and disease*. Boston, MA: Butterworth

Selye, H. (1976). *The Stress of Life* (rev. edn.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Shrey D E and Lacerete M, *Principles and Practices of Disability Management in Industry*, GR Press, 1995

Smith A, Brice C, Collins A, Matthews V and McNamara R, *The scale of occupational stress: A further analysis of the impact of demographic factors and type of job*, HSE Contract Research Report No. 311/000, 000

Smith A, Johal S, Wadsworth E, Davey Smith G and Peters T, *The Scale of Occupational Stress: The Bristol Stress and Health at Work Study*, HSE Contract Research Report No.65/000,000

Toohy J, 'Managing the stress phenomenon at work' in Cotton P (Ed.), *Psychological Health in The Workplace: Understanding and Managing Occupational Stress*, The Australian Psychological Society, 1995

Victoria Workcover Authority (2007). *Stress-wise – Preventing work-related stress: A guide for employers in the public sector* (second edition). State Government of Australia.

Warrach, U. A., Ahmed, R.R., Ahmad, N. and Khoso, I. (2014). Impact of stress on JobPerformance: An Empirical study of the employees of private sector necessities of Karachi, Pakistan. Research Journal of management Sciences, 3(7), 14-17.

## APPENDIX

### QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE EFFECT OF OCCUPATIONAL STRESS ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY AND PERFORMANCE

Good day sir/ma

I am **Miss Fortune Chiamaka Nzemechi** Studying the *Effect of Occupational Stress on Employee Productivity and Performance*. The findings of this study will be of help in organizational reforms in the Nigeria. I hope to have a few minutes of your time to fill out this questionnaire as all information you provided on this questionnaire is highly confidential and can only be used for this research purpose. Your identity is not needed in any way. There are different section questions in this questionnaire with each question to be answered with Always, Often, Sometimes, Seldom, Never. Please place a tick (“√”) mark on the box for your response.

Please tell me if you have any other questions about the research or in how to fill in the questionnaire. On completion, please just hand back the form to me.

Thanks for your anticipated corporation.

#### **Section A: Background Information**

1. Gender  
Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. Age  
Below 20 years [ ] 21-30 years [ ] 31-40 years [ ] 41 years & above  
[ ]
3. Academic Qualification  
Basic [ ] Secondary [ ] Tertiary [ ] Others [ ]
4. Marital Status  
Married [ ] Single [ ]
5. Religion  
Christianity [ ] Islam [ ] Others [ ]

## SECTION B: STRESS

Stress is operationally defined as any adjustive demand on an individual caused by physical, emotional or mental factors that requires coping behaviors. To be measured on a 5 point likert scale.

The questionnaire on stress was adapted from Tepper (2011)

S/N		N	SD	ST	O	A
6	Have you ever felt stress during your work?					
7	Do different groups at work demand things from me that are hard to combine?					
8	Are jobs clearly defined to avoid ambiguity?					
9	Does work environment bring about stress in your organization?					
10	Does your supervisor or manager help you sort out work problems?					

11	Does stress come to you because of decisions of management?					
12	My working times and working location is flexible and is safe					
13	Does family life affect your work life?					
14	Inadequate monetary reward causes me to feel stressed					

### **PERFORMANCE AND PRODUCTIVITY**

S/ N		N	SD	ST	O	A
15	How often do you concentrate enough on your work?					
16	How often did you not do work at times when you were supposed to be working?					
17	Are you given enough authority to make decisions you need to make concerning your job?					
18	Does Job stress affect your commitment as an employee?					

19	How often do you receive feedback on your work?					
20	How often did health problems limit the kind or amount of work you do?					
21	How often do you not find yourself working as carefully as you should?					
22	How often was the quality of your work lower than it should be?					
23	Is there an impact of job stress on the productivity of employees?					
24	Will an increase in your financial reward motivate you to produce more?					
25	Will an enhanced and improved working environment stimulate you to increase productivity?					
26	The mission and vision statement of the company in line with my own personal goals?					