

Understanding Stress, Job Satisfaction and Physical Well Being Job

**Ridha Rahma Nisa /Izdiharunnisa/ Ramot Hasugian/Muhammad
Nur Habibie/Diana Stevani Br Tarigan.**

**14015ih@gmail.com/ajaridha56@gmail.com/hasugianramot7@gmail.c
om/**

m.habibie.97@gmail.com/dianastarkids1982@gmail.com.

ABSTRAC

The purpose of this study is to identify models for sources of stress, satisfaction and physical well-being and the relationship between the three. A total of 338 private sector managers from the Klang Valley provided a self-monitoring report. The results obtained show that the structural modeling does not change the fit index, a source of stress which includes workload, acceptance, and the balance between relationships and homework. In addition, stress sources are negatively related to satisfaction and physical well-being, satisfaction is a mediator for stress sources and physical well-being. Stress affects the physical well-being of managers through satisfaction.

Keywords: sources of stress, satisfaction and physical well-being and managers.

Introduction

Every working adult experience work stress. Work stress is always the concern of a developing country. Life threatening diseases in Malaysia since 2000 to present are coronary heart diseases, stroke and hypertension (Ministry of Health 2008). According to Kivimaki, (2003), individual who experienced high work stress will have 2.2 times more likely to die of heart attack. Besides heart attack, work stress is always associated with burnout.

Job satisfaction and mental and physical health (Spector, Cooper and Aguilar-Vafaie, 2002). This has alarmed the Malaysia government, thus the Ministry of Health had organized "Healthy Life Style" campaign from 2005 to 2007 to tap work stress. Workshop, seminar and poster with the title "cope with stress effectively", "healthy diet" and "active physical activities" were given to all the workplace.

Indonesia is one of the countries that are going through technology transformation from agricultural to manufacturing, from simple tool to machinery, computer and internet. Hence, the demand.

organization has increased upon their employee such as the employees are able to be contacted anytime, anywhere. Besides changes of the technology, economic crisis has brought merger and acquisition or retrenchment in the country, especially the position of a manager. In order to continue to work in an organization, performance is the gauge of an organization, hence, managers may work under great stress in their organization. Very few studies have examined managerial stress in Malaysia. Mohd Nasurdin and Kumaresan (2004 & 2005) who focused their study on managerial stress in electronic firms in Penang Island has suggested research should be conducted across various organization instead of homogenous industry because heterogeneous industry allow generalization.

Sources of stress vary according to researchers. According to Quick and Quick (1984) sources of stress in an organization encompass task demands, role demands, physical demands and interpersonal demands. However, according to Kahn and Byosiere (1992), organizational stress included stressors in organizational life, physical and psychosocial. Cooper, Sloan and Williams (as cited in Siu, Cooper & Donald, 1997), listed more details about sources of stress; factors intrinsic to job, managerial role, relationship with people, career and achievement, organizational structure and climate, and home-work balance. Williams and Cooper (1998) improved the earlier version and developed a new edition. The new edition of source of stress consists of workload, relationship, recognition, organizational climate, personal responsibility, managerial role, home-work balance and daily hassle. Sources of stress in this study conceptualized as the eight dimension proposed by Williams and Cooper (1998).

Satisfaction in a working environment refers to positive feelings, negative feelings and attitudes about job (Schultz & Schultz, 2006). According to Locked (1976), job satisfaction allows the fulfillment of important job values, in addition, those job values are congruent with his or her needs. Another researcher refers job satisfaction as the rewards from the job (Lawler & Worley, 2006). Thus, satisfaction in this study is refers to how satisfied an individual feel about their job and working environment.

Somatic Symptoms, cardiovascular disease and hypertension always associated with stress (Aanes, Mittelmark & Hetland, 2010; Brunner et al., 2004; Sawai, Ohshige, Kura & Tochikubo, 2008). According to Quick and Quick (1984), individual not able to cope with stress will have health problem. This is same as the exhaustion state of General Adaptation Syndrome (Selye, 1978). Individual may have physiological reaction such as headache, backache, increase of heart palpitation or allergic (Stranks, 2005). Therefore, physical well being in this study refers to uneasy physical sensation and energy level of an individual.

Work stress is associated with job satisfaction (Griva & Koekes, 2003; Harris & Daniels, 2007; Siu, 2002), whereas job satisfaction is an emotional respond toward job or job experiences. (Locke, 1983). According to Nelis et al. (2011) in their experiment, emotion is associated with psychological and physical well being, social relationships, and employability. Therefore, satisfaction may be associated with physical well being. Many researches are focus on the relationship of work stress with job satisfaction and physical well being. Nevertheless, there are limited study on the satisfaction mediate work stress and physical well being relationship, Researches from eastern countries such as Japan (Shimazu & Kosugi, 2003).

(Lu, Tseng & Cooper, 1999), Hong Kong (Siu, Cooper & Donald, 1997), Singapore (Fang, 2001) and western countries; U.K. (Lu, Kao, Cooper & Spector, 2000), the U.S. (Stetz, Stetz & Bliese, 2006), East and West German (Kirkcaldy, Petersen & Hubner, 2002) showed work stress among the managers are associated negatively with satisfaction and physical well being. However, a few studies indicated no significant relationship between work stress with satisfaction and physical well being (Lu, Siu & Cooper, 2005; Spector, Cooper & Aguilar-Vafaie, 2002; Lu, Cooper Kao & Zhou, 2003).

Most of the researches showed satisfaction is positively associated with physical well being. In the study of Spector and his friends from twenty four countries showed satisfaction correlated positively with physical well being except in Belgium and Romania which do not have significant relationship between these two variables whereas, China and U.K. have a negative association between satisfaction and physical well being (Spector et al, 2002). Managers in Hong Kong and Taiwan indicated satisfaction is positively associated with physical well being. However, managers in China do not exhibit any relationship between satisfaction and physical well being (Siu, Spector & Cooper, Lu & Yu, 2002).

From the discussion above, there are mixed result of work stress, satisfaction and physical well being relationship in the past study. Furthermore, the mediating effect of satisfaction in stress and physical wellbeing relationship is not clear. Therefore, the aim of this study is to identify sources of stress experienced by the managers across the organizations. Besides this, the study also intent to investigates the relationship of sources of stress, satisfaction

and physical well being among the managers, and the mediating effect of satisfaction on work stress and physical being relationship as well. By identifying sources of stress and the mediating effect for work stress and physical well being may reduce the cost of health expenditure for organizations.

Methodology

Subjects and Procedure

The present study used purposive sampling to recruit managers from the main component of Indonesia economy which are; education, manufacturing and insurance institution from Klang Valley. Education institution were selected from the list of University College and University that registered with the Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia, manufacturing institution were selected from the list of Federation of Indonesia Manufacturers whereas insurance institution were selected from insurance company registered with Bank Negara. Letters sent out to all the companies in the list to seek permission to conduct research, and it was followed up by phone calls to the companies. Questionnaires were mailed to human resource department of the respective company which agreed to participate in the research. A total of 602 questionnaires were distributed, the return rate was 338 (56%). The respondent consisted 176 female (52%) and 162 male (48%), aged between 25 and 59 (mean= 33.72, SD= 7.83). From the aspect of race; 172 Malay (51%), 142 Chinese (42%) and 24 Indian (7%). The composition of the industry; 39% managers from insurance company, 35% managers from education institution and 26% managers from manufacturing firm participated in the study.

- **Measurement**

Pressure Management Indicator (PMI) was used as the measurement instrument in this study (Williams, 2000). According to Williams and Cooper (1998), PMI is a compact and reliable stress measurement tool. Sources of stress are measured by eight subscales; workload, relationship, recognition, organization climate, personal responsibility, managerial role, home/work balance and daily hassle. The scale is rate on a 6 point Likert scale ranging from very definitely is not a source (1) to very definitely is a source (6). Higher score indicate greater stress. Satisfaction is measured by 6 point Likert scale ranging from very much dissatisfaction (1) to very much satisfaction (6). Higher score indicate higher satisfaction. Physical well being is measured by 6 point Likert scale ranging from never (1) to very frequently (6). Higher score indicate better physical.

- **Data Analysis**

Structural equation modeling (SEM) is selected for data analysis because it allows the analysis of all the variables in a single model instead of separate analysis. Furthermore, causal relationship of the model is able to be examined. In this study AMOS was used to identify the latent variables (stress, workload, recognition, relationship, home/work balance, satisfaction, physical well being), manifest variables (items used in the questionnaire) and relationship of the variables. The assumption of structural equation modeling such as multivariate normality, linearity and homoscedasticity are examined by SPSS. Cronbach's coefficient alpha (α) is used to assess the internal consistency of the factors.

In order to test the relationship of the variables, there are two steps to examine it. Firstly, maximum likelihood estimation procedure in confirmatory factor analysis was used to determine validity and measurement model. Secondly, full fledged measurement model and the relationship of the variables was examined (Figure 1). Goodness of fit indices used in this study are; Chi-square, Normed Fit Index (NFI), Goodness-of-fit index (GFI), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), the comparative fit index (CFI) and Tucker-Lewis index (TLI). NFI, GFI, CFI larger than 0.9 (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2005, Bentler, 1990), and TLI larger than .95 indicate a good fit the data with the model (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Results

The measurement model of this study comprises of sources of stress, satisfaction and physical well being. Modification index was used for repeated testing on the measurement model to verify the variables. After a few testing on the measurement model, few variables were removed from the measurement model. Now, the model was adequate and fitted the data. The goodness of fit indices for the measurement models are shown in Table 1.

Convergent validity of sources of stress was assessed by a set of variables which have relatively high standardized factor loading on sources of stress. Sources of stress in this study are workload, recognition, relationship and homework balance. If the variance in workload was accounted for by the demand of the work that made the managers' family and social life. In the SEM analysis also indicated 59% and 60% of the variance in recognition was accounted for by the unclear promotion and absence of potential career advancement, whereas if the variance in relationship was accounted for by discrimination and favoritism, feeling isolated and Lack of encouragement from the superiors. 70% and 74% of the variance in home work balance was accounted for by absence of emotional and social support from outside work. The data of this study support the convergent validity and discriminant validity of sources of stress measurement model. See Figure 1. Satisfaction and physical well being measurement model have high standardized factor loading Besides high

factor loading, all the items in satisfaction and physical well being more than explained. Data of this study support the convergent validity and discriminant validity of satisfaction and physical well being measurement model. See Figure 1. Internal consistency of the measurement instrument was satisfactory. to predict the factors such as satisfaction and physical well being. See figure 1. One of the aims of this study is to examine mediator effect in the model. According to Baron and Kenny (1986), mediator is a third variable influence the relationship of the other two variables. In order to examine moderator effect, the path coefficient of stress and physical well being was constrained. In SEM analysis, when the path was constrained in the model, stress has negative path coefficient with satisfaction. The findings.

CONTINUED RESULT

Internal consistency of the measurement instrument was satisfactory. The α for the first-order factors were .72 (workload), .74 (recognition), .85 (relationship), .84 (home/work balance), .91 (satisfaction), and .84 (physical well being). All the factors have α more than 0.7 (Jackson, 2006). To predict the factors such as satisfaction and physical well being. See figure 1. One of the aims of this study is to examine mediator effect in the model. According to Baron and Kenny (1986), mediator is a third variable influence the relationship of the other two variables. In order to examine moderator effect, the path coefficient of stress and physical well being was constrained. In SEM analysis, when the path was constrained in the model, stress has negative path coefficient with satisfaction. The findings of this study yielded managers who experienced high stress attributed it to high workload, did not have good balance between home and work place, lack of recognition from the organization, lack of good relationship at the work place. Workload has the highest factor loading to stress. This is due to the high job demand blurred the work and social life of the managers. 50% and 63% of the variance in workload was accounted for by the demand of the work that made the managers' family and social life. Hence, demand of work interfered with managers' family and social life, consequently contributing to sources of stress (Tezi & Gauthier, 2009). Lack of supportive working environment, discrimination and favoritism, feeling isolated, and lack of encouragement from superior which will increase the stress level of the managers. Without a fair treatment and encouragement from the organization the stress level experienced by the managers will increase.

result is consistent with Arasli and Tumer (2008). variance. Items 60% and above of the variance in satisfaction were accounted for kind of work required to be performed by the managers, opportunity to grow in the work, job that taps the range of skill managers possess and managers feel extended in his or her job. In the measurement model of physical well being, 59% of the variance in physical well being was accounted for do not want to go to work in the morning, whereas 75% of the variance in physical well being was accounted for lack of energy. The findings of this study yielded managers who experienced high stress attributed it to high workload, did not have good balance between home and work place, lack of recognition from the organization, lack of good relationship at the work place. Workload has the highest factor loading to stress.

This is due to the high job demand blurred the work and social life of the managers. 50% and 63% of the variance in workload was accounted for by the demand of the work that made the managers' family and social life. Hence, demand of work interfered with managers' family and social life, consequently contributing to sources of stress (Tezi & Gauthier, 2009). Lack of supportive working environment, discrimination and favoritism, feeling isolated, and lack of encouragement from superior which will increase the stress level of the managers. Without a fair treatment and encouragement from the organization the stress level experienced by the managers

will increase. The result is consistent with Arasli and Tumer (2008) The findings of this study yielded managers who experienced high stress attributed it to high workload, did not have good balance between home and work place, lack of recognition from the organization, lack of good relationship at the work place. Workload has the highest factor loading to stress. This is due to the high job demand blurred the work and social life of the managers. 50% and 63% of the variance in workload was accounted for by the demand of the work that made the managers' family and social life. Hence, demand of work interfered with managers' family and social life, consequently contributing to sources of stress (Tezi & Gauthier, 2009).o lack of supportive working environment, discrimination and favoritism, feeling isolated, and lack of encouragement from superior which will increase the stress level of the managers. Without a fair treatment and encouragement from the organization the stress level experienced by the managers will increase. The result is consistent with Arasli and Tumer (2008).

Discussion and Conclusion

This is a confirmatory study on sources of stress, satisfaction and physical well being model. The present study also intend to estimate the relationship of the variables; sources of stress, satisfaction and physical well being. There are a few studies investigating cross organizational and institutional managerial stress in Malaysia. Hence, the findings of the present study have expanded the knowledge regarding sources of stress, satisfaction and physical well being among the managers.n home-work balance was accounted for by measure the emotional support and practical support from the family or friends. In other words, managers without emotional support and practical support from outside the workplace experience work stress. The findings of the study were consistent with previous study (Lindorff, 2000; Luszczynska & Cieslak, 2006).

Relationship is another factor underlying sources of stress. Relationship in this study refer to lack of supportive working environment, discrimination and favoritism, feeling isolated, and lack of encouragement from superior which will increase the stress level of the managers. Without a fair treatment and encouragement from the organization the stress level experienced by the managers will increase. The result is consistent with Arasli and Tumer (2008).

The last factor of sources of stress in this study is recognition. Organizations which do not have clear promotion prospects and absence of potential advancement contribute to the factor of recognition. Without clear promotion guidelines managers experience frustration and disappointment, which in turn, cause stress. The result is consistent with Gillespie, Walsh, Winefield, Dua and Stough (2001).

More than 40% of the variance of the items of satisfaction and physical well being were accounted for by the factor of satisfaction and physical well being. Satisfaction of the managers are affected by the type of job they are engaging, skills they possess whether it matches with the job they are holding, whether their skill is utilized in the job and organizational climate. If a job does not match with the skill of the manager and the job does not allow the managers to expend their skill, dissatisfaction will occur among managers. In the aspect of physical well being, do not want to get up in the morning, tiredness, lack of energy and difficulty in sleeping, will affect managers physical well being.

The findings of this study indicate stress was associated negatively with satisfaction and physical well being. Stress affects job and organization satisfaction, whereas

satisfaction fully mediates stress and physical well being. Managers who are experiencing high stress will have low job satisfaction thus will affect the physical well being of the managers. In other words, work stress affects physical well being of the managers through satisfaction. More than 40% of the variance of the items of satisfaction and physical well being were accounted for by the factor of satisfaction and physical well being. Satisfaction of the managers are affected by the type of job they are engaging, skills they possess whether it matches with the job they are holding, whether their skill is utilized in the job and organizational climate. If a job does not match with the skill dissatisfaction will occur among managers. In the aspect of physical well being, do not want to get up in the morning, tiredness, lack of energy and difficulty in sleeping, will affect managers physical well being.

The findings of this study indicate stress was associated negatively with satisfaction and physical well being. Stress affects job and organization satisfaction, whereas satisfaction fully mediates stress and physical well being. Managers who are experiencing high stress will have low job satisfaction thus will affect the physical well being of the managers. In other words, work stress affects physical well being of the managers through satisfaction.

There are several limitations in this study. The present study examines the causal relationship of sources of stress, satisfaction and physical well being in the model, and provides a comprehensive view on the three variables relationships, nevertheless, there are others variables may affect the model such as personality, supportive environment and demography. Therefore, future study should enhance the stress model. The present study adopted cross sectional research design, hence the survey was conducted at the same point of time. The results of the study are not able to generalize it in over period of time. Besides enhancing the model, a longitudinal study will provide a better understanding of the relationship among the variables over time.

The results of this study suggested that the human resource or human capital department of an organization should look into source of stress that was experienced by the managers such as demand of work that interfered with their social and family life, favoritism, isolation, lack of encouragement from superiors, unclear promotion prospects in the organization and absence of career advancement. Satisfaction is the mediator for sources of stress and physical well being. Hence, human resource or human capital department of an organization should look into matching the skill of the managers with the position, who are able to extend their skill in the organization, they are able to live as a healthy well being, perhaps increase their performance in an organization, reduce the turnover and the cost of health expenditure by the organization.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, the data collected fits with the sources of stress, satisfaction and physical well being model. Sources of stress encompass workload, recognition, relationship and home/work balance and satisfaction is the mediator for stress and physical well being. Therefore the identification of sources of stress, relationship of sources of stress, satisfaction and physical well being is essential to have healthy physical well being job.

REFERENCES

Aanes, M.M., Mittelmark, M.B., & Hetland, Europe psychologist 2017 .

J. (2011). Interpersonal stress and poor health. *European Psychologist*, 15(1), 3- 11.

Arasli, H., & Tumer, M. (2008). Nepotism, favoritism and cronyism: A study of their effects on job stress and job satisfaction in the banking industry .

Lee, H., Song, R., Cho, Y. S., Lee, G. Z., & Daly, B. (2003). A comprehensive model for predicting burnout in Korean nurses. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 44(5), 534-545.

Al-Abri, N. K., Al-Sharji, R. F., Al-Arimi, M. S., Al-Fahdi, A. K., Al-Zadjal, M. M., & Roy, N. (2021). Role of Organizational Psychology in Dealing with Human Resources and the Performance of the Organizations. *Open Access Library Journal*, 8(10), 1-11.

Prayogo, A., Diza, T., Prasetyaningtyas, S. W., & Maharani, A. (2020). A Qualitative Study Exploring the Effects of Job Analysis and Organizational Culture toward Job Satisfaction in a Coffee Shop. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 8(06), 2687.

Azeem, S. M. (2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment among employees in the Sultanate of Oman. *Psychology*, 1(4), 295-300.

Razvodovsky, Y. E. (2013). Psychosocial distress as a risk factor of ischemic heart disease mortality. *Psychiatria Danubina*, 25(1), 0-75.

Wong, S. C., Zainal, A., Omar, F., & Mahmud, M. M. (2010). Understanding Stress, Job Satisfaction and Physical Well Being of Managers. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 37(2), 129-139.

Bruner, E. J., Kivimäki, M., Siegrist, J., Theorell, T., Luukkonen, R., Riihimäki, H., ... & Leino-Arjas, P. (2004). Is the effect of work stress on cardiovascular mortality confounded by socioeconomic factors in the Valmet study?. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 58(12), 1019-1020.

Ikkyu, I., & Yuliawati, L. (2022). GRATITUDE SEBAGAI MEDIATOR ANTARA MINDFULNESS DAN PENERIMAAN DIRI. *Proyeksi: Jurnal Psikologi*, 17(2), 48-59.

Razvodovsky, Y. E. (2013). Psychosocial distress as a risk factor of ischemic heart disease

mortality. *Psychiatria Danubina*, 25(1), 0-75.

Nasurdin, A. M., Ramayah, T., & Kumaresan, S. (2005). Organizational stressors and job stress among managers: The moderating role of neuroticism. *Singapore Management Review*, 27(2), 63-79.

Kivimäki, M., Leino-Arjas, P., Luukkonen, R., Riihimäi, H., Vahtera, J., & Kirjonen, J. (2002). Work stress and risk of cardiovascular mortality: prospective cohort study of industrial employees. *Bmj*, 325(7369), 857.

Niedhammer, I., Milner, A., Geoffroy-Perez, B., Coutrot, T., LaMontagne, A. D., & Chastang, J. F. (2020). Psychosocial work exposures of the job strain model and cardiovascular mortality in France: results from the STRESSJEM prospective study. *Scandinavian journal of work, environment & health*, 46(5), 542.