To Study the Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Workplace Stress Levels among Regular Employees in Various Organizations in Rohtak District

Dr. Suman Kumari[1], Miss Nidhi Sharma[2]

[1]Extension Lecturer, Department of Psychology, Pt. NRS, GC Rohtak, Haryana, India
[2]Intern of Clinical Psychology, Personality Care Foundation Rohtak, Haryana, India

ABSTRACT

This study explores the correlation between job satisfaction and workplace stress levels among 150 regular employees in various organizations. The workplace Stress Scale (Marlin Company and the American Institute of Stress, 1978) and the Job Satisfaction Survey (Paul E. Spector, 1994) were utilized to gather data. Results indicate a significant inverse relationship between job satisfaction and workplace stress, suggesting that higher stress levels are associated with lower job satisfaction. These findings underscore the importance of stress management programs and interventions in enhancing employee well-being and job satisfaction. By addressing workplace stress, organizations can potentially improve job satisfaction, leading to better overall performance and employee retention.

INTRODUCTION

Workplace stress
Workplace stress, also known as occupational stress, refers to the physical and emotional responses that occur when the demands of a job do not match the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker. This type of stress is characterized by the pressure to meet job requirements and responsibilities that exceed an individual's ability to cope.

Workplace stress can lead to both psychological and physical health problems, including anxiety, depression, irritability, headaches, fatigue, and sleep disturbances. Chronic workplace stress may also contribute to more severe health issues, such as cardiovascular diseases and musculoskeletal disorders. Effective management of workplace stress involves both organizational and individual strategies to create a healthier work environment and improve overall well-being.

AFFECTING FACTORS

1. Workload: Excessive workload can lead to heightened stress levels among employees, resulting in burnout and decreased job satisfaction (Cooper, 2017).

2. Role Ambiguity: Unclear job roles and expectations can create confusion and stress, impacting employee performance and satisfaction (Kahn et al., 1964).

3. Interpersonal Relationships: Poor relationships with colleagues and supervisors can increase stress and create a hostile work environment (Johnson & Hall, 1988).

4. Work-Life Balance: Difficulty in managing work and personal life can lead to stress, affecting overall job satisfaction (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

5. Job Security: Uncertainty about job stability can cause significant stress and anxiety among employees (Ashford, Lee, & Bobko, 1989).

PREVENTIVE FACTORS

1. Stress Management Programs: Implementing stress management workshops and counseling services can help employees cope with stress effectively (Richardson & Rothstein, 2008).

2. Clear Communication: Ensuring clear communication regarding job roles and expectations can reduce role ambiguity and associated stress (Sullivan & Bhagat, 1992).

3. Fostering Positive Relationships: Promoting teamwork and positive interactions among employees can help reduce interpersonal stress (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008).

4. Work-Life Balance Initiatives: Encouraging flexible work hours and remote work options can help employees manage their work-life balance better (Kossek, Lewis, & Hammer, 2010).

5. Job Security Measures: Providing assurances about job stability and career growth can alleviate stress related to job insecurity (Sverke, Hellgren, & Näswall, 2002).

Job Satisfaction
Job satisfaction refers to the level of contentment employees feel regarding their job, which can affect their performance and overall well-being. It is an attitudinal variable reflecting an individual's overall feelings towards their job and can be influenced by various intrinsic and extrinsic factors.

AFFECTING FACTORS

1. **Work Environment:** A positive and supportive work environment significantly influences job satisfaction (Kalleberg, 1977).
2. **Compensation:** Fair and adequate pay, along with benefits, contributes to higher job satisfaction (Locke, 1976).
3. **Job Security:** Assurance of continued employment increases satisfaction levels (Herzberg, 1968).
4. **Work-Life Balance:** The ability to balance work and personal life positively affects job satisfaction (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).
5. **Career Development Opportunities:** Opportunities for advancement and professional growth enhance job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1976).
6. **Work Relationships:** Positive relationships with colleagues and supervisors improve job satisfaction (Judge, Bono, & Locke, 2000).

Preventive Measures:

1. **Stress Management Programs:** Implementing programs to manage stress can help prevent its negative impact on job satisfaction (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).
2. **Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs):** Providing support services to employees can improve their overall job satisfaction (Collins, 1998).
3. **Workplace Wellness Programs:** Promoting physical and mental health through wellness initiatives can enhance job satisfaction (Parks & Steelman, 2008).
4. **Flexible Work Arrangements:** Offering flexible work hours and remote work options can improve job satisfaction (Hill, Hawkins, & Miller, 1996).
5. **Regular Feedback and Recognition:** Providing constructive feedback and recognizing employee achievements can boost job satisfaction (Nelson, 2005).

The relationship between workplace stress and job satisfaction among employees in various organizations is a critical area of study in organizational psychology. High levels of workplace stress can negatively impact employees' job satisfaction, leading to decreased motivation, productivity, and overall well-being.

Conversely, a satisfying work environment can mitigate stress, promoting better mental health and performance. Theoretical frameworks, such as the Job Demand-Control model, suggest that job satisfaction decreases as job demands increase without adequate control or support.

Understanding this relationship helps organizations develop strategies to manage stress and enhance job satisfaction, contributing to improved organizational outcomes.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The relationship between workplace stress and job satisfaction has been a topic of extensive research in organizational psychology. Numerous studies have demonstrated that workplace stress negatively impacts job satisfaction, leading to adverse outcomes for both employees and organizations.

According to Spector (1997), job satisfaction is a significant predictor of an employee's well-being and organizational commitment. High levels of job satisfaction are associated with lower turnover rates, increased productivity, and enhanced organizational citizenship behaviors. Conversely, workplace stress, defined by the American Institute of Stress (1978), is a prevalent issue that affects employees' mental and physical health, leading to decreased job satisfaction and performance.

A study by Kahn and Byosiere (1992) examined the interplay between job stressors, perceived stress, and job satisfaction. They found that job stressors such as workload, role conflict, and ambiguity are directly correlated with increased stress levels, which in turn reduce job satisfaction. This finding aligns with the transactional model of stress and coping proposed by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), which posits that stress arises from the perceived imbalance between demands and the individual's ability to cope.

Beehr and Newman (1978) also highlighted the impact of organizational factors on stress and satisfaction. They argued that supportive leadership, clear communication, and participative decision-making processes could mitigate stress and enhance job satisfaction. Similarly, Karasek's (1979) job demand-control model suggests that employees experience less stress and more job satisfaction when they have greater control over their work environment and tasks.

A more recent study by **Van der Doef and Maes (1999)** supports these findings, indicating that job control and social support are critical factors in reducing workplace stress and enhancing job satisfaction. They emphasized the need for organizations to create supportive work environments that foster employee autonomy and provide adequate resources to manage job demands.

In conclusion, the body of research consistently indicates a negative correlation between workplace stress and job satisfaction. Effective stress management strategies, supportive leadership, and fostering a positive work environment are essential in mitigating stress and enhancing job satisfaction among employees. Organizations that prioritize these aspects are likely to see improved employee well-being, higher productivity, and reduced turnover rates.

Rationale of the Study
In today's fast-paced and competitive business environment, understanding the factors that influence employee well-being and productivity is crucial. Workplace stress has become a pervasive issue that affects employees across various organizations, leading to numerous negative outcomes such as burnout, reduced productivity, and high turnover rates.

Conversely, job satisfaction is a critical determinant of organizational success, influencing employee performance, commitment, and overall morale. Despite extensive research on workplace stress and job satisfaction individually, there is a need to further explore the intricate relationship between these two variables. Understanding how stress levels impact job satisfaction can provide valuable insights for developing effective stress management strategies and enhancing job satisfaction among employees.

This study aims to fill this gap by examining the correlation between workplace stress and job satisfaction among employees in diverse organizational settings. By utilizing well-established measurement tools, the Workplace Stress Scale (1978, Marlin Company and the American Institute of Stress) and the Job Satisfaction Survey (1994, Paul E. Spector), this research seeks to provide empirical evidence on how stress influences job satisfaction.

The findings of this study will contribute to the existing body of knowledge and offer practical implications for organizational leaders and HR professionals. Implementing targeted interventions to reduce workplace stress can potentially improve job satisfaction, leading to a more engaged, productive, and satisfied workforce.

Ultimately, this research aims to promote a healthier work environment and enhance the overall organizational performance.

Statement of the Problem "To Study the Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Workplace Stress Levels among employees in various organizations in Rohtak district"

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The investigator of the present study framed the following objectives:
There is a negative relationship between workplace stress and job satisfaction among employees in various organizations in Rohtak district

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

The investigator of the present study formulated the following hypotheses:
There is a significant negative relationship between workplace stress and job satisfaction among organizational employees

INCLUSION CRITERIA:

1. **Employment Status:** Employees currently employed in various organizations within Rohtak district.
2. **Age:** Employees aged 18 years and above.
3. **Job Tenure:** Employees with at least six months of continuous employment in their current organization.
4. **Consent:** Employees who provide informed consent to participate in the study.
5. **Sector Diversity:** Employees from diverse sectors including corporate offices, educational institutions, healthcare facilities, manufacturing units, and service industries.
6. **Position Levels:** Employees at all hierarchical levels, including junior, middle, and senior positions.

EXCLUSION CRITERIA:

1. **Temporary/Contractual Employees:** Employees who are working on a temporary or contractual basis for less than six months.
2. **Part-Time Employees:** Employees who are working part-time or on a freelance basis.
3. **Non-Consenting Individuals:** Employees who do not provide informed consent to participate in the study.
4. **Employees on Leave:** Employees who are currently on extended leave or sabbatical during the data collection period.
5. **Interns/Trainees:** Individuals who are interns or trainees and not considered regular employees of the organization.
6. **Retirees:** Individuals who have retired from active service and are no longer employed by the organization.

Sample
To Study the Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Workplace Stress Levels among employees in various organizations in Rohtak district, a stratified random sampling method was employed to collect data from a sample of 150 employees. The population included all organizational employees in the district, and the sample size of 150 was allocated proportionately among different sectors to ensure a representative sample. The sectors included corporate offices, educational institutions, healthcare facilities, manufacturing units, and service industries. Within each sector, employees were randomly selected to participate. The data collection involved distributing questionnaires focused on job satisfaction dimensions such as promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, communication, and pay and workplace stress scale . This approach ensured that the sample was representative of the diverse organizational sectors in Rohtak district, enhancing the reliability and validity of the findings. The collected data provided valuable insights into the factors influencing job satisfaction and identified areas that needed improvement.

Table 1: Showing the sample size and the percentage of the population

Sector	Percentage of Population	Sample Size (Employees)
Corporate Offices	30%	45
Educational	20%	30
Healthcare	20%	30
Manufacturing	15%	22
Service Industries	15%	23
Total	**100%**	**150**

TOOL USED

The Workplace Stress Scale by The Marlin Company, North Haven, CT, and the American Institute of Stress (1978). There are 8 items on the work environment stress scale. The frequency and severity of each stressor are indicated by a rating on a five-point scale, from 1 (never) to 5 (always).

Job Satisfaction Survey (1994) by Paul E. Spector. The JSS consists of 36 items that cover nine facets of job satisfaction: pay, promotion opportunities, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work, and communication. Each item is rated on a six-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (disagree very much) to 6 (agree very much), indicating the degree of agreement with the statement. The scores on each facet and the total score can be used to compare the levels of job satisfaction across different groups and to identify the specific aspects of the job that need to be improved.

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED

The data was analyzed using the following statistical techniques:
Pearson's correlation coefficients were calculated using 'SPSS statistics'.

Analysis and Interpretation of the Data MS Excel was used to calculate the scores for each variable, and SPSS was used to analyze the data.

RESULT & DISCUSSION

Table 2 Pearson's correlation between workplace stress and job (total) satisfaction (dimensions of job satisfaction)

	Workplace Stress	Promotion	Supervision	Fringe Benefits	Contingent Reward	Operating Conditi	Coworkers	Nature of Wor	Communication	Pay	Total Satisfaction
Workplace Stress	-	-.053	-.162	-.059	-.149	-.319**	-.188	.005	-.202*	-.090	-.181
Promotion	-.053	-	.498**	.468**	.517**	.420**	.347**	.464**	.417**	.514**	.708**
Supervision	-.162	.498**	-	.460**	.570**	.135	.641**	.610**	.637**	.518**	.802**
Fringe Benefits	-.059	.468**	.460**	-	.635**	.032	.394**	.428**	.557**	.703**	.729**
Contingent Rewards	-.149	.517**	.570**	.635**	-	.273**	.500**	.448**	.672**	.662**	.826**
Operating Conditions	-.319**	.420**	.135	.032	.273**	-	.080	-.009	.044	.099	.284**
Coworkers	-.188	.347**	.641**	.394**	.500**	.080	-	.525	.613**	.431**	.713**
Nature of Work	-.005	.464**	.610**	.428**	.448**	-.009	.525**	-	.633**	.499**	.736**
Communication	-.202*	.417**	.637**	.557**	.672**	.044	.613**	.633**	-	.533**	.815**
Pay	-.090	.514**	.518**	.703**	.662**	.099	.431**	.499**	.533**	-	.777**

**correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
*correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Operating Conditions have a significant negative correlation with workplace stress (r = -0.319, p < 0.01), indicating that higher workplace stress is associated with poorer operating conditions.

Communication has a significant negative correlation with workplace stress (r = -0.202, p < 0.05), suggesting that higher workplace stress is related to poorer communication.

Other dimensions such as Promotion, Supervision, Fringe Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Coworkers, Nature of Work, and Pay show negative correlations with workplace stress, but these correlations are not statistically significant.

Nature of Work shows a very weak positive correlation with workplace stress (r = 0.005), indicating no significant relationship.

The overall **Total Satisfaction** has a negative correlation with workplace stress (r = -0.181), suggesting that higher workplace stress is associated with lower total job satisfaction, though this correlation is not statistically significant.

The table provides insight into how different aspects of job satisfaction relate to workplace stress, with some dimensions showing more significant relationships than others.

Main finding

The main finding from the Pearson's correlation analysis between workplace stress and various dimensions of job satisfaction is that:

- **Operating Conditions** and **Communication** are significantly negatively correlated with workplace stress, indicating that higher levels of workplace stress are associated with poorer operating conditions ($r = -0.319$, $p < 0.01$) and poorer communication ($r = -0.202$, $p < 0.05$).
- Although other dimensions of job satisfaction, such as Promotion, Supervision, Fringe Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Coworkers, and Pay, show negative correlations with workplace stress, these correlations are not statistically significant.
- The overall Total Satisfaction shows a negative correlation with workplace stress ($r = -0.181$), suggesting that higher workplace stress tends to be associated with lower total job satisfaction, though this correlation is not statistically significant.

This analysis highlights that specific aspects of the work environment, particularly operating conditions and communication, play a critical role in how workplace stress affects job satisfaction.

Implication of the Study:

The findings of this study have several important implications for both organizational practices and employee well-being:

1. Since operating conditions are significantly negatively correlated with workplace stress, organizations should prioritize improving these conditions. This could include ensuring safe, comfortable, and well-equipped workspaces, as well as efficient processes and resources to support employees in their roles.
2. The significant negative correlation between communication and workplace stress suggests that improving communication within the organization can help reduce stress levels. Organizations should focus on fostering open, transparent, and effective communication channels between management and employees, as well as among colleagues.
3. Although other dimensions of job satisfaction were not significantly correlated with workplace stress in this study, it is still important for organizations to consider all aspects of job satisfaction. A holistic approach to improving job satisfaction can help create a more positive and supportive work environment.
4. Organizations should implement and promote employee support programs that address workplace stress. This could include stress management workshops, counseling services, and wellness programs designed to help employees cope with stress and maintain their well-being.
5. Training for leaders and supervisors can be beneficial, as they play a crucial role in shaping the work environment. Effective leadership and supervision can help mitigate workplace stress and enhance overall job satisfaction.
6. The study's findings can inform the development of policies aimed at reducing workplace stress and improving job satisfaction. Policies could include flexible work arrangements, opportunities for professional development, and recognition and reward systems.

By addressing these implications, organizations can create a healthier, more supportive work environment that not only reduces workplace stress but also enhances job satisfaction and overall employee productivity and morale.

Future Research Suggestion:

Future research could explore the following directions:

1. Conduct longitudinal studies to examine how changes in workplace stress and job satisfaction evolve over time. This approach can help identify causal relationships and long-term effects of workplace interventions.
2. Expand research to include various industries, organizational sizes, and cultural contexts.
3. Investigate potential mediating and moderating variables that could influence the relationship between workplace stress and job satisfaction. Examples include personality traits, coping mechanisms, social support, and organizational culture.
4. Evaluate the effectiveness of specific interventions aimed at reducing workplace stress and improving job satisfaction. This could involve experimental designs that test different stress reduction techniques, communication improvement strategies, and environmental changes.
5. Incorporate qualitative research methods, such as interviews and focus groups, to gain deeper insights into employees' experiences of workplace stress and job satisfaction. Qualitative data can provide rich, contextual information that complements quantitative findings.

6.   Examine how demographic factors, such as age, gender, tenure, and job level, influence the relationship between workplace stress and job satisfaction. Understanding these differences can help tailor interventions to specific employee groups.
7.   Explore the impact of technology on workplace stress and job satisfaction. As remote work and digital communication become more prevalent, understanding their effects on employee well-being is crucial.
8.   Investigate the role of work-life balance in moderating the effects of workplace stress on job satisfaction. Research can focus on policies and practices that promote a healthy balance between work and personal life.
9.   Study the link between workplace stress, job satisfaction, and physical and mental health outcomes. This can highlight the broader implications of workplace stress on overall employee well-being and productivity.

CONCLUSION

This study highlights the significant negative correlations between workplace stress and both operating conditions and communication, underscoring their critical roles in influencing job satisfaction. While other dimensions of job satisfaction showed negative correlations with workplace stress, they were not statistically significant. These findings suggest that improving operating conditions and enhancing communication are key to reducing workplace stress and boosting job satisfaction. Future research should explore longitudinal effects, diverse environments, mediating variables, and intervention effectiveness to develop comprehensive strategies for fostering healthier, more supportive workplaces that enhance overall employee well-being and productivity.

REFERENCES

[1].   American Institute of Stress. (1978). The Workplace Stress Scale. Marlin Company.
[2].   Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1989). Content, causes, and consequences of job insecurity: A theory-based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management Journal,* 32(4), 803-829.
[3].   Beehr, T. A., & Newman, J. E. (1978). Job stress, employee health, and organizational effectiveness: A facet analysis, model, and literature review. *Personnel Psychology*, 31(4), 665-699.
[4].   Chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 93(5), 1082.
[5].   Cohen, S., Janicki-Deverts, D., & Miller, G. E. (2007). Psychological stress and disease. JAMA, 298(14), 1685-1687.
[6].   Collins, J. (1998). The role of employee assistance programs in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3(2), 127-135.
[7].   Cooper, C. L. (2017). Handbook of Stress and Health: A Guide to Research and Practice. Wiley-Blackwell.
[8].   Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76-88.
[9].   Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76-88.
[10].   Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250-279.
[11].   Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 46(1), 53-62.
[12].   Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., & Miller, B. C. (1996). Work and family in the virtual office: Perceived influences of mobile telework. *Family Relations*, 45(3), 293-301.
[13].   Johnson, J. V., & Hall, E. M. (1988). Job strain, work place social support, and cardiovascular disease: A cross-sectional study of a random sample of the Swedish working population. *American Journal of Public Health,* 78(10), 1336-1342.
[14].   Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., & Locke, E. A. (2000). Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating role of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(2), 237-249.
[15].   Kahn, R. L., & Byosiere, P. (1992). Stress in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 571-650). Consulting Psychologists Press.
[16].   Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. Wiley.
[17].   Kalleberg, A. L. (1977). Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*, 42(1), 124-143.
[18].   Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24(2), 285-308.
[19].   Karasek, R. A., & Theorell, T. (1990). Healthy work: Stress, productivity, and the reconstruction of working life. Basic Books.

[20]. Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, Appraisal, and Coping. Springer Publishing Company.

[21]. Leka, S., Griffiths, A., & Cox, T. (2004). Work organization and stress: Systematic problem approaches for employers, managers, and trade union representatives. WHO.

[22]. Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.

[23]. Nelson, B. (2005). 1001 Ways to Reward Employees. *Workman Publishing*.

[24]. Parks, K. M., & Steelman, L. A. (2008). Organizational wellness programs: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 13(1), 58-68.

[25]. Quick, J. C., Quick, J. D., Nelson, D. L., & Hurrell, J. J. (1997). Preventive stress management in organizations. American Psychological Association.

[26]. Richardson, K. M., & Rothstein, H. R. (2008). Effects of occupational stress management intervention programs: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,* 13(1), 69.

[27]. Spector, P. E. (1997). Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences. Sage Publications, Inc.

[28]. Sullivan, S. E., & Bhagat, R. S. (1992). Organizational stress, job satisfaction and job performance: Where do we go from here? *Journal of Management*, 18(2), 353-374.

[29]. Sverke, M., Hellgren, J., & Näswall, K. (2002). No security: A meta-analysis and review of job insecurity and its consequences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7(3), 242-264.

[30]. Van der Doef, M., & Maes, S. (1999). The job demand-control (-support) model and psychological well-being: A review of 20 years of empirical research. Work & Stress, 13(2), 87-114.