

A Study On Work Pressure And Its Impacts On Job Performance Among College Teachers In Vellore Region Of Tamil Nadu

Mrs. S. Deepa¹, Dr. D.H. Thavamalar²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar

²Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce Annamalai University Annamalai Nagar (Depute to Govt. Arts and Science College, Mutlur)

Abstract

Work pressure, often used interchangeably with job stress, is a multifaceted concept that describes the psychological and physical strain an individual experience in their professional life. College teachers in India face significant occupational pressure due to a combination of factors, including heavy workloads, administrative burdens, lack of resources, and job insecurity. This pressure often leads to high levels of stress, burnout, and dissatisfaction, negatively impacting both their personal well-being and professional performance. The objective of the study was the various sources of work pressure and its Effects on job performance among the Arts and science college teachers in Vellore region of Tamil Nadu. The study based on perception of sample respondents. The purpose of the study, researcher was selected 250 employees adopted simple random sampling techniques at different levels were chosen randomly from various departments and functional areas of college keeping in view their total strength and range of activities. It is found that the work pressure of 'Student Expectations and Parental Involvement' Economic and Job Security Concerns' and 'Administrative and Committee Responsibilities' in the college are High Levels, its positive impact on Job performance are high in 'Improve Task Completion' 'Providing a sense of purpose and accomplishment' and 'Increasing Focus and Efficiency', and its negative impact on Job performance are very high in 'Impact on Physical and Mental Health'. Also the correlation result reveals that work pressure is negative impact on job performance in arts and Science College in Vellore region of Tamil Nadu.

Key words: workloads, stress, negative impact, positive impact

INTRODUCTION

Work pressure, often used interchangeably with job stress, is a multifaceted concept that describes the psychological and physical strain an individual experience in their professional life. While some level of pressure can be a positive motivator, driving people to perform and excel, a persistent and excessive amount can lead to a host of negative outcomes, impacting not just the individual, but the organization as a whole. The causes of work pressure are diverse and often interconnected. They can stem from external factors within the workplace, such as unrealistic deadlines, a heavy workload, or long working hours. Organizational issues like a lack of clear role definitions, poor management support, and job insecurity also play a significant role. Furthermore, interpersonal conflicts with colleagues or superiors, as well as a lack of recognition or reward for hard work, can contribute to a high-pressure environment.

College teachers in India face significant occupational pressure due to a combination of factors, including heavy workloads, administrative burdens, lack of resources, and job insecurity. This pressure often leads to high levels of stress, burnout, and dissatisfaction, negatively impacting both their personal well-being and professional performance. The role of a college teacher in India has expanded far beyond just teaching. Faculty members are often burdened with extensive administrative duties like admissions, examination work, census, and election duties. The pressure to publish in indexed journals, secure research grants, and participate in conferences adds to the academic load. This multi-faceted workload leaves little time for teaching preparation and student interaction, leading to a diminished focus on quality education.

Many college teachers, especially those in private or unaided colleges, are hired on contractual or ad-hoc bases. This precarious employment status often comes with irregular and low pay, no benefits, and a constant fear of job loss. The lack of a stable income and a clear career path contributes significantly to stress and anxiety. Some teachers have even reported working for years without a proper salary, a reality that undermines the dignity of the profession.

Teachers often struggle with a lack of adequate resources, including well-equipped laboratories, modern libraries, and sufficient classrooms. Overcrowded classes and a shortage of non-teaching staff further

compound these problems, forcing faculty to take on additional responsibilities. In some institutions, a significant number of teaching positions remain vacant, placing an even greater burden on the existing faculty.

Workplace politics and a lack of transparency in promotions and evaluations are common stressors. Many teachers feel a sense of powerlessness due to a hierarchical structure and unclear expectations from their administration. This can lead to feelings of demotivation and frustration.

The immense pressure takes a mental and health of college teachers. Studies have revealed that a significant percentage of Indian teachers experience moderate to very high level of stress. This can lead to health Issues, Reduced work Satisfaction and Diminished Performance. High stress levels can manifest as emotional exhaustion, anxiety, and depression. There have been reports of teachers considering or leaving the profession due to burnout. The constant pressure and lack of recognition lead to a decline in job satisfaction and a sense of unfulfillment. Occupational stress can negatively impact a teacher's performance, creativity, and ability to engage with students, ultimately affecting the quality of education provided.

Statement of the problem

The consequences of unmanaged work pressure are far-reaching. On an individual level, it can manifest as physical symptoms like fatigue, headaches, and sleep disturbances, as well as mental and emotional issues such as anxiety, depression, and burnout. For organizations, high work pressure can lead to decreased productivity, increased absenteeism and staff turnover, and a general decline in employee morale. Recognizing and addressing the root causes of work pressure is therefore crucial for creating a healthy and sustainable work environment for everyone. Research consistently highlights the dual nature of work pressure: while moderate levels can act as a motivator, fostering focus and driving achievement, excessive or chronic pressure often leads to detrimental outcomes, including burnout, decreased job satisfaction, and a significant decline in an individual's ability to perform their duties effectively. This review synthesizes key findings from various studies, underscoring the complexities and nuances of this relationship across diverse organizational contexts and professions.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Maslach et al (2001) indicated that high job demands contribute to emotional exhaustion, which in turn negatively impacts task performance and organizational commitment. Similarly, **pector (1997)** found a significant negative correlation between perceived workload and job satisfaction, with implications for reduced engagement and performance quality. **Amabile et al (1996)** argued that time pressure, under specific conditions, can lead to increased cognitive activation and improved decision-making. Moreover, **LePine et al (2004)** explored the concept of "challenge stressors," distinguishing them from "hindrance stressors" by suggesting that challenge stressors, such as high workload and time pressure, can actually lead to increased motivation and performance when individuals possess adequate resources and coping mechanisms.

Bandura (1997) found that individuals with high self-efficacy were more likely to view challenging workloads as opportunities for growth, leading to better performance outcomes. Conversely, those with lower self-efficacy were more prone to experiencing debilitating stress. Organizational support, autonomy, and control over one's work also act as critical moderators. **Karasek and Theorell (1990)** highlighted that when employees have greater control over their work processes and receive adequate support from their superiors, the negative effects of pressure are mitigated, and performance can even improve. **Baer and Oldham (2006)** demonstrated that high time pressure can reduce creativity and lead to more conventional solutions in problem-solving tasks. Conversely, for routine or well-defined tasks, some pressure might help in maintaining focus and completing work efficiently. **Zohar (1999)** suggested that for routine tasks, moderate pressure can enhance speed and accuracy.

Quick and Quick (2004) highlighted the importance of organizational interventions, such as stress management programs and flexible work arrangements, in mitigating the adverse effects of work pressure. Ultimately, achieving an optimal balance between challenge and support is key to ensuring sustained high performance and employee health. **Luthans et al (2007)** concluded that sustainable performance is achieved not by eliminating pressure, but by effectively managing it through a combination of individual resilience, organizational support, and effective coping mechanisms.

Roy et al. (2017) study identified multiple bodily responses and mental states experienced by workers when they encounter their jobs or adjust to unfamiliar workplaces. Research revealed that work pressure

arises due to how personal thinking aligns with environmental factors; once internal resources are assessed alongside challenges in the surroundings, an imbalance within oneself can develop if these cannot be managed effectively, ultimately impacting overall mental equilibrium. **Desty Wenny and Nurhalisah Silva (2024)** intend to investigate and scrutinize how much pressure employees face at their jobs, whether they're stressed due to it, and what impact this has on productivity levels, Employee productivity reaches its peak when most individuals perceive their tasks as manageable rather than overwhelming. The research conducted by **Salahuddin (2023)** aimed at establishing that workload significantly influences both employee productivity and job-related anxiety; similarly, motivational factors profoundly impact both worker efficiency and psychological distress; further, heightened levels of workplace tension have an evident connection with diminished staff effectiveness; finally, chronic stress experienced among workers is demonstrably linked to reduced overall operational capability.

Roy et al (2017) regarded working pressure as various physiological and psychological reactions of a worker experiencing the work or adapting to a new working environment. The study indicated that working pressure was the interaction between individual cognition and external environment; after evaluating self-resources and the challenge of external environment, self-psychological unbalance would appear, when not being able to load, to affect individual psychological balance. **Wenny Desty Febrian, and Silva Nurhalisah (2024)** aim to find out and analyze the effect of workload, work stress, and authoritarian leadership style on employee performance. Optimal employee performance is affected by many employees feel burdened by the heavy workload. **Salahudin and et al (2023)** their study was to determine that workload has a significant effect on employee performance, it has a significant effect on work stress, work motivation has a significant effect on employee performance, work motivation has a significant effect on work stress, and work stress directly has a significant effect on employees' performance.

Significance of the study

The issue of work pressure among college teachers has gained increasing attention in recent years due to its profound impact on both individual educators and the broader academic system. Understanding the significance of how work-related stress affects teaching performance is essential for policymakers, educational institutions, and stakeholders seeking to enhance the quality of higher education. In sum, this study is significant as it addresses a critical yet often overlooked aspect of higher education the human cost of academic labor. By exploring the influence of work pressure on teacher performance, the study aims to provide actionable insights that benefit educators, institutions, policymakers, and students alike. Reducing work pressure and supporting teacher well-being is not only an ethical responsibility but also a strategic investment in the future of education.

Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of the study are:

- To identify the various sources of work pressure of college teacher in the study area.
- To find out impacts of work pressure on job Performance among the college teacher in the study area.

Hypotheses of the Study

Based on the objectives, the hypotheses were framed that there is no impact of work pressure on job performance among the college teacher in Vellore Region of Tamil Nadu.

METHODOLOGY

The target population for data collection is the faculty working in Vellore region of Tamil Nadu. The present study is an attempt to assess the extent of the various sources of work pressure among the college teacher in Vellore region of Tamil Nadu. The work pressure Survey instrument developed variable in current situation of the select organization in their instrument. Next, self-administrate question framed and used to assess the work pressure and its Effects among the college teacher in Vellore region of Tamil Nadu. The questionnaire was developed using a five-point scale for each question and the respondents were requested to assign their rating on the scale ranging from strong agreement to strong disagreement over the issue. The secondary data have been collected from various text books, journals, and special project reports.

Sampling and statistical tools

The study based on perception of sample respondents. The purpose of the study, researcher was selected 250 employees adopted simple random sampling techniques at different levels were chosen randomly

from various departments and functional areas of Organization keeping in view their total strength and range of activities. The collected primary data are subjected to various statistical techniques from descriptive statistics like Simple Percentage, Mean and Standard deviation and Correlation Analysis

Analysis and Interpretation

The attitude was examined with the help of demographic and institutional variables of the respondents. Next, level of work pressure and impact of work pressure In this study, an attempt has been made to find out the relationship between the sources of work pressure and its impact.

Table-1 Distribution of Respondents Based on Demographic Profile

S. No		Frequency	Percent
Age			
1	Up to 30 years	50	20.00
2	20 to 40 years	83	33.20
3	40 to 50 years	69	27.60
4	Above 50 years	48	19.20
5	Total	250	100.00
Gender			
1	Male	131	52.40
2	Female	119	47.60
	Total	250	100.0
Education			
1	Post Graduate	15	6.00
2	Post Graduate with M.Phil	92	36.80
3	Post Graduate with Phd	98	39.20
4	Post graduate SLET/NET	45	18.00
	Total	250	100.0
Marital Status			
1	Married	196	78.40
2	Unmarried	54	21.60
	Total	250	100.0
Family Size			
1	Upto 3 Members	59	23.60
2	4 to 5 Members	147	58.80
3	Above 5 Members	44	17.60
	Total	250	100.0
Family Nature			
1	Nuclear Family	139	55.60
2	Joint Family	111	44.40
	Total	250	100.0
Income			
1	Upto Rs 20000	15	6.00
2	Rs.20000to rs.40000	99	39.60
3	Rs 40000 to Rs.60000	52	20.80
4	Rs.60000 to Rs 80000	67	26.80
5	Above Rs 80000	53	21.20
	Total	250	100.0

The Table 1 shows that out of 250 sample respondents, 20.00 percent of the respondents was the age group below 30 years, 33.20 percent of the respondents was the age group between 30-40 years, 27.60 percent of the respondents was the age group between 40-50 years and 19.20 percent of the respondents was the age above 50 years. It is clear that majority of the workers (54.8 percent) working in the age between 31- 40 years, males constitute the major proportion of 52.40 percent and the females constitute only 47.60 per cent. Qualification of the respondents, 6.00 percent of respondents are having education up to post graduate level, 36.80 percent of the respondents are to post graduate with M.Phil, 39.20 percent of the respondents are to post graduate with Phd, and 18.00 percent of the respondents are 36.80 percent

of the respondents are to post graduate with NET/SET. Marital status of the respondents, that majority of the respondents were married (78.40 percent). Majority of the respondents having 4-5 members in their family. 55.60 percent of respondents belong to Nuclear family and the rest 44.40 percent belong joint family. Monthly income of the respondents, 39.60 percent of the respondent's salary between Rs.20000-40000, and 26.80 percent of the respondent's salary is between Rs.60,000-80,000, 21.20 percent of respondents' salary is above Rs.80000, 20.80 percent of respondents' was between Rs.40,000-60,000 and only six percent of respondents earning is below Rs.20, 000.

Table-1 Institution Characteristics

Cadre			
1	Associate professor	77	30.80
2	Assistant Professor	118	47.20
3	Guest Lecturer	65	26.00
		250	100.00
Experience			
1	below 10	46	18.40
2	10-15	70	28.00
3	15 -20	49	19.60
4	20-25	46	18.40
5	Above 25	39	15.60
	Total	250	100.00
Type of Institution			
1	Government	97	38.80
2	Aided	25	10.00
3	Private	128	51.20
		250	100.00
Administrative Position			
1	Principal	9	3.60
2	Department Head	26	10.40
3	Committee Head	35	14.00
4	Committee Members	56	22.40
5	Only Teaching	124	49.60
		250	100.00

It is observed from the table 2 that Cadre of the employees', 30.80 percent of the respondents was associate professor, 47.20 per cent of the respondents were Assistant professor and 26.00 per cent of the respondents were Guest Lecturer. 28.00 per cent of the sample employees have 10-15 years of experience. 19.60 per cent of the respondents work experience have 15-20 years, 18.40 per cent of the respondents work experience have below 10 years, 18.40 per cent of the respondents' have experience 20-25 years and 18.40 per cent of the respondents had Work Experience above 25 years. Employers types of working institution, 38.80 percent respondents working in government college, 10.00 percent respondents working in Aided college and 51.20 percent respondents working in Private college. Various administration responsibilities of selected faculties, 3.60 percent of the respondents was Principal, 10.40 percent of the respondents was department Head, 14.00 percent of the respondents was various committee Head, 22.40 percent of the respondents was various committee Members and 49.60 percent of the respondents have not taken any responsibility.

Table 3 Level of Work Pressure

S. No	Work pressure	Mean	SD
1	Teaching Load and Preparation	3.43	1.02
2	Research and Publication Demands	3.31	0.99
3	Administrative and Committee Responsibilities	4.38	0.73
4	Student Expectations and Parental Involvement	4.45	0.68
5	Technological Demands	3.21	1.11
6	Economic and Job Security Concerns	4.48	0.98
	Overall	3.88	0.92

The level of work pressure was measured of the selected respondents. For the purpose, to measure the level of work pressure among the respondents, various six various factors with measurement values ranging from 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 against opinion statements 'very low', 'low', 'moderate', 'high' and 'very high' respectively. Therefore, opinion of the entire a respondent group is regarded as 'very low', 'low', 'moderate', 'high' and 'very high', if the mean scores is < 1.50, >= 1.50 and < 2.50, >= 2.50 and < 3.50, >= 3.50 and < 4.50 and <= 4.50 respectively. The Table-3 indicates that the college teacher's perception towards the level of wok pressure among the arts and science college teachers are moderate level in 'Teaching Load and Preparation', 'Research and Publication Demands', and 'Technological Demands'. (Mean =, >= 2.50 and < 3.50, the range for moderate level). Regarding, 'Student Expectations and Parental Involvement' Economic and Job Security Concerns' and 'Administrative and Committee Responsibilities' in the college are at High Levels (Mean =, >= 3.50 and < 4.50, the range for high level).

Table 4 Positive Impacts

S.No	Work Pressure	Mean	SD
1	Increasing Focus and Efficiency	3.52	0.68
2	Enhancing Motivation	2.15	0.96
3	Promoting Skill Development	3.32	0.88
4	Work Pressure Can Boost Job Performances	3.28	0.85
5	Improve Concentration	2.36	0.98
6	Improve Task Completion.	4.43	0.95
7	Promoting Engagement on Task Focus	2.49	0.65
8	Encouraging Task Completed Promotion	3.37	0.86
9	Providing a Sense of Purpose and Accomplishment	3.68	0.87
10	Encouraging the Expression of Individual Talent	2.21	0.99
	Average	3.08	0.867

The Table-4 indicates that the college teachers perception towards the Positive Impact of wok pressure on Job performance among the arts and science college teachers are high level in 'Improve Task Completion' 'Providing a sense of purpose and accomplishment' and 'Increasing Focus and Efficiency' (Mean = 4.43, 3.68 and 3.52 respectively, >= 3.50 and < 4.50, the range for high level), next teachers perception are moderate level in 'Encouraging task completed promotion', 'Promoting Skill Development' and 'Work pressure can boost job performances'. (Mean = 3.37, 3.32 and 3.28 respectively, >= 2.50 and < 3.50, the range for moderate impact). Regarding, 'Promoting engagement on task focus', 'Improve concentration', 'Encouraging the expression of individual talent' and 'Enhancing Motivation' in the organization are at Low levels.

Table – 5 Negative Impact

S.No	Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Impact on Physical and Mental Health	4.58	0.68
2	Impact on Teaching Quality	4.13	0.78
3	Impact on Research Productivity	4.01	0.87
4	Poor Team Dynamics	3.48	1.01
5	Reduced Creativity	3.25	0.94
6	Impact on Institutional Culture and Retention	3.45	1.01
7	Increased Conflicts with Co-Workers	3.37	0.97
8	Less Innovative Teaching Methods	3.27	1.16
9	Decreased Job Satisfaction and Morale	3.67	1.21
10	Impact on Workplace Learning	3.85	1.02
	Average	3.71	0.96

The Table-5 indicates that the arts and college teachers perception towards the negative impact of wok pressure on Job performance in Vellore Region are very high in 'Impact on Physical and Mental Health' (Mean = 4.58, > above 3.50, the range for very high), next are high in 'Impact on Teaching Quality', 'Impact on Research Productivity', 'impact on Workplace Learning', and 'Decreased Job Satisfaction and

Morale '. (Mean = 4.13, 4.01, 3.85 and 3.57 respectively, ≥ 3.50 and < 4.50 , the range for satisfaction). Regarding, 'Poor Team Dynamics', 'Reduced Creativity', 'Impact on Institutional Culture and Retention', 'Increased Conflicts with Co-Workers and 'Less Innovative Teaching Methods' in the organization are at moderate levels.

TABLE- 6 Correlation between sources of work pressure and its impact

		X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	Y1	Y2
X1	Pearson Correlation	1	.407**	.095*	.036	-.226**	.013	-.077	.148**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.030	.415	.000	.768	.079	.001
X2	Pearson Correlation	.407**	1	.106*	.133**	.014	.118**	.221**	.130**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.016	.002	.745	.007	.000	.003
X3	Pearson Correlation	.095*	.106*	1	.196**	.236**	.399**	.300**	-.065
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.030	.016		.000	.000	.000	.000	.140
X4	Pearson Correlation	.036	.133**	.196**	1	.265**	.273**	.219**	-.006
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.415	.002	.000		.000	.000	.000	.899
X5	Pearson Correlation	-.226**	.014	.236**	.265**	1	.405**	.252**	-.166**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.745	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
X6	Pearson Correlation	.013	.118**	.399**	.273**	.405**	1	.595**	-.186**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.768	.007	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
Y1	Pearson Correlation	-.077	.221**	.300**	.219**	.252**	.595**	1	-.170**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.079	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
Y2	Pearson Correlation	.148**	.130**	.252**	.595**	.166**	.186**	.170**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	

(**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level, *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level)

From the table 4 shows that the result of inter-correlation matrix of explanatory variables namely Teaching Load and Preparation (x1), Research and Publication Demands (x2), Administrative and Committee Responsibilities (x3), Student Expectations and Parental Involvement (x4), Technological Demands (x5) and Economic and Job Security Concerns (x6) with dependent variables positive impact (y1) and negative impact (y2) are highly significant and positively correlated. It is concluded that work pressure is positive impact on job performance and job satisfaction in arts and Science College in Vellore region of Tamil Nadu.

CONCLUSION

College teachers in India face significant occupational pressure due to a combination of factors, including heavy workloads, administrative burdens, lack of resources, and job insecurity. This pressure often leads to high levels of stress, burnout, and dissatisfaction, negatively impacting both their personal well-being and professional performance. This study found that the work pressure of 'Student Expectations and Parental Involvement' Economic and Job Security Concerns' and 'Administrative and Committee Responsibilities' in the college are High Levels, its positive impact on Job performance are high in 'Improve Task Completion' 'Providing a sense of purpose and accomplishment' and 'Increasing Focus and Efficiency', and its negative impact on Job performance are very high in 'Impact on Physical and Mental Health'. So, Institutions should establish a more balanced workload by separating academic and administrative responsibilities. Regularize ad-hoc and contractual positions and ensure fair and timely compensation, along with benefits and a clear path for professional growth. Governments and institutions must prioritize investment in academic resources and infrastructure to create a more supportive teaching and learning environment. College authorities should provide mental health support and counselling services to teachers and create a positive and supportive work culture.

REFERENCE

1. Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., & Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5), 1154-1184.

2. Baer, M., & Oldham, G. R. (2006). The curvilinear relation between experienced creative time pressure and creativity: Moderating effects of openness to experience and support for creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4), 963-971.
3. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
4. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.
5. Day, A., Scott, N., & Rivers, K. (2006). Work-life balance: Views of women in management. *Women in Management Review*, 21(3), 200-213.
6. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499-512.
7. Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1988). Coping as a mediator of emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(3), 466-475.
8. Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524.
9. Karasek, R. A., & Theorell, T. (1990). *Healthy work: Stress, productivity, and the reconstruction of working life*. Basic Books.
10. Landsbergis, P. A., Schnall, P. L., Deitz, D. K., Friedman, R., & Pickering, T. (1992). The patterning of psychological attributes and catecholamine excretion in employed adults. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 54(5), 522-536.
11. Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer Publishing Company.
12. LePine, J. A., LePine, M. A., & Jackson, C. L. (2004). Challenge and hindrance stress: Resources and performance in a complex task. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 883-892.
13. Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(2), 269-299.
14. Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological Capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford University Press.
15. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397-422.
16. Quick, J. C., & Quick, J. D. (2004). Preventive stress management in organizations. *American Psychological Association*.
17. Ragu-Nathan, T. S., Tarafdar, M., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Tu, Q. (2008). The consequences of technostress for end users in organizations: Conceptual development and empirical validation. *Information Systems Research*, 19(4), 417-433.
18. Roy, A., van der Weijden, T., and de Vries, N. (2017). Relationships of work characteristics to job satisfaction, turnover intention, and burnout among doctors in the district public-private mixed health system of Bangladesh. *BMC Health Services Research*, 17(1), 421.
19. Salahudin, Syahir Natsir and Harnida Wahyuni Adda (2023), The Effect of Workload and Motivation on Employees' Performance through Job Stress as A Mediating Variable, *Tadulako International Journal of Applied Management*, 5(3), 115-124.
20. Selye, H. (1974). *Stress without distress*. J. B. Lippincott Company.
21. Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences*. SAGE Publications.
22. Wenny Desty Febrian and Silva Nurhalisah, (2024) Determination of Workload, Work Stress, and Authoritarian Leadership Style on Performance, *Dinasti International Journal of Digital Business Management*, 5(2).
23. Zohar, D. (1999). When to do what: The example of effects of time pressure on performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(2), 173-182.