

IMPACT OF JOB STRESS ON EMPLOYEES' PRODUCTIVITY AND COMMITMENT

Ekienabor E. E.

*Business Administration, Igbinedion University, Okada

Stress is a universal element and persons from nearly every occupation have to face stress. Employers today are critically analyzing the stress management issues that contribute to lower job performance of employee originating from dissatisfaction & high turnover ultimately affecting organizational goals and objectives. The aim of the study is to investigate the impact of job stress on employees' productivity and commitment among academic staff of Nigeria Universities. The scope of study is centered on all universities in Nigeria.. Field study was conducted with questionnaire as the primary data collection instrument. Data was analyzed using statistical techniques with SPSS (Version 20) calculated chi-square. The results showed that there is an impact of job stress on the productivity of employees. In addition, there is an impact of job stress on employees' commitment. When higher level of stress exist with no managerial concern for solution consequently lowering the employee performance; staking organizational reputation and loss of skilled employees, these situations call for immediate concern from organization management for employing effective stress management practices to increase employee satisfaction and overall employee performance. It was recommended that remedial measures need to be taken by management to minimize the effects of job stress on permanent basis. For this purpose, management must conduct the research programs to build the managerial and technical skills of employees.

Index Terms- Job Stress, Employees' Productivity, Employees' Commitment,

I. INTRODUCTION

In today's world, stress has become a worldwide phenomenon, which occurs in various forms in every workplace. In today's work life, employees are generally working for longer hours, as the rising levels of responsibilities require them to exert themselves even more strenuously to meet rising expectations about work performance. Stress is a Common element in any kind of job and persons have to face it in almost every aspect of life. Stress has been defined in different ways over the years. According to Robbins and Sanghi (2006) "A dynamic condition in which an individual is confronted with an opportunity, constraints, or demand related to what he or she desires and for which the outcome is perceived to be both uncertain and important." stress is an increasing problem in organizations and often cause adverse effects on performance.

According to Swanepoel et al (1998) work related stress has been a topic that has received increasing attention, in the area of occupational health, over the last three decades. These authors were of the opinion that the world, especially the world of work and business, has become increasingly subjected to fast changing forces like increased competition, the pressure of quality, innovation and an increase in the pace of doing business. The demands on employees grew equally dramatically and this created stress within employees. Apart from stress that arose from the work situation, other sources of stress could relate to personal factors such as relationships with others and use of free time.

Stress can therefore be described as the adverse psychological and physical reactions that occur in an individual as a result of his or her inability to cope with the demands being made on him or her (Moorhead and Griffen, 1998). That is, tension from extra-ordinary demands on an individual. It is noted that, stress is not necessarily bad; it is an opportunity when it offers potential gain. But whatever its nature, it usually begins when individuals are placed in a work environment that is incompatible with their work style and or temperament. It becomes aggravated when individuals find out that they have or can exercise little control over it. "Many organizations in the world are witnessing an alarming increase of the negative effects of stress on employee's productivity. Typical examples are organizations in America, the United Kingdom, the Caribbean, East and Central Africa, West Africa and in other parts of the world. The American Academy of family Physicians reported that, about two-thirds of the visits to family physicians are the results of stress-related symptoms" (Henry and Evans 2008).

Michac (1997) specified causes of stress as follows: poor time management, unclear job descriptions, feelings of inadequacy and insecurity, inability to get things done, lack of communication, bad personal relationships, quality and complexity of tasks. In the same breadth, Dean (2002) viewed stress-related illnesses as the leading cause for low productivity levels in the workplace. Immense pressure at work has led to stress, which made it the number one factor causing illness. Michac (1997) outlined reasons for low productivity as follows; poor training in the company, machine break downs, non-established performance standards, lack of planning

and motivation, change, poor atmosphere and environment, inadequate communication at many levels, non-identification with company goals. Stress and its relation with the business world is that if not handled well it might lead to illness and also increase the time offs taken by employees. As a result both, the organization and employees will be affected by it. But tension in the business world is also good to some extent and can lead employees to be motivated to work hard and increase their efficiency. Stress that makes the employee under pressure to the point that the employee won't be able to deal with the situation affects both the employee and the company in a negative way (CIPD, 2008).

Statement of the Research Problem

Researchers over time have dedicated much time and effort to provide businesses with models and theories concerning the relation between job satisfaction and job performance, as organizations want their employees to be productive as well as to be satisfied. In a job-related context, satisfaction represents the general satisfaction with the job as such, and the performance is defined in terms of level of employees' contribution to organizational goals (Warr, 2002, and Daniels & Harris, 2002). Job satisfaction is a "pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience" (Oxford's dictionary of human resource management, 2001). Previous researches showed scientifically that job satisfaction affects job performance, which means that an increase in job satisfaction increases the job performance. Even though it is an important field of research for both organization and employees, there are no theories presenting a legible link between job stress, job satisfaction and commitment. Consequently, there is the need to evaluate the impact of job stress on employee's productivity and commitment.

Research Objectives

This study aimed to achieve the following objectives:

- i. To investigate the impact job stress has on employees' commitment
- ii. To find out the impact job stress has on the productivity of employees.

Relevant Research Questions

The following research questions will be addressed in this study:

- i. Does job stress have an impact on employees' commitment?
- ii. Does job stress have an impact on the productivity of employees?

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses stated in null form will be subjected to statistical test in this study:

H01: Job stress has no impact on employees' commitment.

H02: Job stress has no impact on the productivity of employees.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Origin, Terminology and Definition of Stress

The term stress was first employed in a biological context by the endocrinologist Hans Selye in the 1930s. He later broadened and popularized the concept to include inappropriate physiological response to any demand. In his usage stress refers to a condition and the stressor to the stimulus causing it. It covers a wide range of phenomenon from mild irritation to drastic dysfunction that may cause severe health breakdown. (Wikipedia website, 2015)

According to Robbins (2004), stress is a dynamic condition in which an individual is confronted with opportunity, constraint or demand related to what he desires and for which the outcome is perceived to be both uncertain and important. From this definition one can say that stress is not necessarily bad, it also has a positive value when it offers potential gain. Moorhead and Griffen (1998) also defined stress as a person's adaptive response to a stimulus that places physical and psychological demands on a person. Similarly, Sherman, Bahlander and Snell (1996), also defined stress as any adjustive demand on an individual caused by physical, emotional or mental factors that requires coping behaviour.

In addition, Taylor Shelley (1995) describes stress as a negative emotional experience accompanied by predictable biochemical, physiological, cognitive and behavioural changes that are directed either toward altering the events or accommodating its effects. Again, Bennett (1994) defines stress as a wide collection of physical and psychological symptoms that results from difficulties experienced by an individual while attempting to adapt to an environment. This means the potential for stress exists when an environmental situation presents a demand threatening to exceed a person's capabilities and resources. From the above definitions and descriptions stress can best be seen as excessive demands that affect a person physically and psychologically. Thus the mental or physical condition that results from perceived threat or danger and the pressure to remove it.

Nature of Stress

One believes that stress is a complex phenomenon because it is not tangible so it cannot be overtly touched. According to Bowring and Harvey (2001), stress occurs with the interaction between an individual and the environment, which produces emotional strain affecting a person's physical and mental condition. Stress is caused by stressors, which are events that create a state of disequilibrium within an individual. These authors also stated that the cost of too much stress on individuals, organizations, and society is high. Many

employees may suffer from anxiety disorders or stress-related illnesses. In terms of days lost on the job, it is estimated that each affected employee loses about 16 working days a year because of stress, anxiety or depression.

According to Ritchie and Martin (1999), for years stress was described and defined in terms of external, usually physical, forces acting on an individual. Later it was suggested that the individual's perception of, and response to, stimuli or events was a very important factor in determining how that individual might react, and whether or not an event will be considered stressful. These authors further contended that most researchers acknowledged that both external and internal factors affect stress. They viewed stress as a response to external or internal processes, which reach levels that strain physical and psychological capacities beyond their limit. According to Blumenthal (2003), for thousands of years, the bodies of cavemen/women were primed to deal with the harshness and rigorous nature of their environment.

Blumenthal (2003) viewed stress as anything that upsets people's ability to maintain critical variables (which can be social, psychological, spiritual or biological in nature) within acceptable limits. The experience of stress involves an event that is demanding or resources as well as the subjective feeling of distress experienced in its face. An event could be experienced as stressful if people appraised (evaluated) it as distressing. Whether an event is experienced as stressful depends on a person's psychosocial orientation with things like culture, spirituality, values, beliefs and past experiences influencing the appraisal. Events that are appraised as being overwhelming, threatening, unsatisfying or confliction are more likely to be experienced as stressful. Stress is not tangible and cannot be touched. This makes it a complex phenomenon. According to Bowin and Harvey (2001), stress occurs with the interaction between an individual and the environment which produces emotional strain affecting a person's physical and mental condition. Stress is caused by stressors, which are events that create a state of disequilibrium within an individual.

Employee Commitment

Employee commitment has been defined in various ways (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Reichers, 1985). Steer (1977) refers employee commitment to congruence between the goals of the individual and the organization whereby the individual identifies with and extends effort on behalf of the general goals of the organization. Meyer and Allen (1994) state that employee commitment is a psychological state that: characterizes the employee's relationships with the organization. b) Have implications for the decision to continue membership in the organization.

Spector's (1986) meta-analysis of 88 studies investigated the relationships of perceived control to other job variables (such as job satisfaction, employee commitment, emotional distress and absenteeism) with autonomy and participation being treated as joint indicators of control. Employee commitment has been described as consisting of two constructs affective and continuance (Allen & Meyer, 1990). As an attitude, differences between commitment and job satisfaction are seen in several ways (Mowday, et al., 1982). Commitment is a more global response to an organization and job satisfaction is more of a response to a specific job or various facets of the job.

Wiener (1982), states that job satisfaction is an attitude toward work-related conditions, facets, or aspects of the job. Therefore, commitment suggests more of an attachment to the employing organization as opposed to specific tasks, environmental factors, and the location where the duties are performed (Mowday, et al., 1982). When discussed on these terms, commitment should be more consistent than job satisfaction over time. "Although day-to-day events in the work place may affect an employee's level of job satisfaction, such transitory events should not cause an employee to reevaluate seriously his or her attachment to the overall organization" (Mowday et al., 1982, p.28). In a study by Andrew Hale Feinstein Assistant Professor of University of Nevada, Las Vegas "Relationships Between Job Satisfaction And Organizational Commitment Among Restaurant Employees" (1998), he proved that the several of the component scores for Job satisfaction; store location had a significant effect on the level of satisfaction with policies; and the level of education significantly affected satisfaction with recognition. Further, satisfaction with policies, compensation, work conditions, and advancement were found to have a significant relationship to organizational commitment.

The Impact of Stress on the Organization

Starting a new job would likely to be very stressful if the person felt inexperienced, unable to cope with workload, uncomfortable around their bosses or colleagues and un-stimulated by their work. On the other hand, a person entering an area of work where they felt competent, supported by their colleagues and stimulated, would be more likely to experience the change as challenging than stressful. According to Luthans (2002) besides the potential stressors that occurred outside the organization, there were also those that were associated with the organization. Although an organization is made up of groups of individuals, there are also more macro level dimensions, unique to an organization that contains potential stressors. DCS gaumail (2003) is of the opinion that at the organizational level, research has found that work-related stresses may be responsible for organizational outcomes such as decline in performance, dissatisfaction, lack of motivation and commitment, and an increase in absenteeism and turnover.

Dessler (2000) alluded that there were two main sources of job stress; environmental and personal. According to this author a variety of external environmental factors could lead to job stress. These included work schedules, place of work, job security, route to and from work and the number and nature of clients. Even noise, including people talking and telephones ringing, contributed to stress. This author, however, noted that individuals reacted differently even if they were at the same job, because personal factors also

influenced stress. The author also noted that stress is not necessarily dysfunctional; some people work well only when under a little stress and find they are more productive when a deadline approaches.

Dessler (2000) was of the opinion that for organizations job stress consequences included reductions in the quantity and quality of job performance, increased absenteeism and turnover, increased grievances and health care costs. A study of 46,000 employees concluded that stress and depression may cause employees to seek medical care for vague physical and psychological problems and can in fact lead to more serious health conditions. The health care costs of the high-stress workers were 46% higher than those of their less stressed coworkers. According to Levin-Epstein (2002) stress on the job took its toll on nonprofits: lost time from work, deflated productivity, low staff morale, turnover and higher health care costs.

Favreau was quoted by Levin-Epstein (2002) said that stress-related problems should be talked at three levels: individual, organizational and social. On the individual level she noted that employees can become more responsible for their own well-being by recognizing unhealthy emotional and work patterns before they reach crisis proportions. At an organizational level, employees need to be aware of the workplace structures that may contribute to burn out and take a creative approach to instituting changes that can prevent and relieve stress. The social environment within which employees operate often contributes to the problem.

Levin-Epstein (2002) also noted the most common indicators of stress as feeling overwhelming and burn out. Emotional and physical exhaustion often accompany such feelings, he further emphasized that employers as implementers of stress-endangering policies and procedures, should help employees manage their stress especially if it affects job performance. Carol and Walton (1997) propagated that the concept of job related stress has been acknowledged and described by many theorists (Maslash 1976; Cooper 1988; Cox 1991).

Bowin and Harvey (2001) summarized factors leading to stress in the work place as follows:

- Little control of the work environment;
- Lack of participation in decision-making;
- Uncontrolled changes in policy;
- Sudden reorganizations and unexpected changes in work schedules;
- Conflict with other people (subordinates, superiors, peers) and other departments;
- Lack of feedback;
- Not enough time to do expected duties; and
- Ambiguity in duties

According to Frost (2003) the frequency with which hardworking, valuable employees have negative experiences in the workplace or hear bad news that leaves their hopes dashed, their goals derailed, or their confidence undermined. The sources of the pain vary, but much of it comes from abusive managers, unreasonable company policies, disruptive coworkers or clients, or from poorly managed change. It is a by-product of organizational life that can have serious negative effects on individuals and their organizations, unless it is identified and handled in healthy and constructive ways. Frost is of the opinion that this kind of pain shows up in people's diminished sense of self worth and lost confidence and hope. It is destructive to performance and morale. The tangible consequences include lost profits resulting from things like diminished productivity or worse mass exodus. Frost is also stated that apart from quitting, which carries its own set of costs to the company, acts of revenge, sabotage, theft, vandalism, withdrawal behaviours, spreading gossip or generally acting cynical or mistrustful can all represent direct or indirect costs to the organization. Frost believed that when organizational leaders recognize emotional pain when it occurs and act to intervene, potentially lethal situations in the workplace could be reversed.

The Impact of Stress on Productivity

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 authors further stated that an individual performance depends on three factors which are; ability to do the work, level of effort and support given to that person. The relationship of these factors, widely acknowledged in management literature, is that Performance (P) is the result of Ability (A) times Effort (E) times Support (S), that is: $(P=A \times E \times S)$. Performance is diminished if any of these factors are reduced or absent. Mathis and Jackson (2000) further emphasize that quality of production must also be considered as part of productivity because one alternative might be to produce more but a lower quality. Simply put by Chase and Aquilano (1995), productivity is measured in terms of outputs per labour hour. However this measurement does not ensure that the firm will make money (for example when extra output is not sold but accumulates as inventory). To test whether productivity has increased, the following questions should be asked: 'has the action taken increased output or has it decreased inventory?' 'Has the action taken decreased operational expense?' This would then lead to a new definition which is: Productivity is all the actions that bring a company closer to its goals.

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 behaviour 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. However, no two people react to the same job in the very same way, because personal factors also influence stress. For example, type A personalities; people who are workaholics and who feel driven to be always on time and meet deadlines, normally place themselves under greater stress than do others (Dessler 2000). This is further reiterated by Bowin and Harvey (2001) who emphasized that people cannot completely separate their work and personal lives; the way people react and handle stress at work is a complex issue. According to Blumenthal (2003) an inverted U-type curve has been used to depict the effect stress has on performance. It can be shown that, as stress increases, so does the performance. However if stress continues to increase beyond an optimal point, performance will peak and start to decline. This shows that stress is necessary to enhance performance but once it reaches a level of acute discomfort, it is harmful and counterproductive. Blumenthal (2003) went on to argue that excess stress is harmful, destructive and detrimental to human well-being and productivity. Stress can have an impact on an individual's wellbeing by causing dysfunction or disruption in multiple areas. This dysfunction extends into the organizational world and leads to decreased productivity. Garrison and Bly (1997) stated that corporations have become acutely aware of the problems caused by stress. The illnesses associated with stress are costly, and they can debilitate a valuable worker. When stress is not handled well, absenteeism, turnover, and medical compensation increase and productivity decreases. Garrison and Bly (1997) further stated that the workplace is special only because so much of our time is spent at work. To achieve a peak of performance, stress should be managed effectively, with the negative effects of stress minimized.

III. METHODOLOGY

The data for the study draws on survey conducted in Igbinedion University, Okada. Out of the one hundred fifty questionnaires distributed to 40 male and 20 female academic staff, fourty was returned. The selection was random for both male and female academic staff.

Sample Description

Of the 40 respondents, 29 (72.5%) were male 11 (27.5%) were female. The age of the participants ranged from 21 to 70, with an average of 50 years. The educational levels of the participants were: HND/MBA is 2 (5%), B.Sc. is 8 (20%), M.Sc. is 25 (62.5%) and PhD (12.5). Also, the Years of Service of respondents: 7 persons representing 17.5% of the respondents have worked in the institution below five (5) years, 23 persons representing 57.5% of the respondents have worked between 6–10 Years and the remaining 10 persons representing 25% of the respondents have worked in the company between 11–15 years.

Measures

Demographic Variables

The analysis included six demographic variables: gender, age, and education, academic rank, working experience in the university, college they work in and marital status. Gender was coded (1 = female; 0 = male), Age and working experience were measured in years. Education consisted of three levels from (1) BA degree to (3) Ph.D degree. Marital status was assessed with a fixed-response item (1 = single; 2=married; 3= divorced; 4= widowed).

Instrument

Primary Data sources were used for checking the level of stress and its impact, the main instrument for primary data collection was the use of questionnaire as well as the qualitative data is also determined through observations, articles and recent research papers.

Method of Data Analysis

In analyzing the data for this study, the SPSS calculated chi-square analysis will be used to analyze the data. Chi-square will be used to score, so as to enable the researcher to show the relationship between the various variables tested in the study. Also to be used in the simple percentage. This will enable the researcher to know the relative importance of the various items use for analysis (Osuala, 2011).

The stated formula for the chi-square is:

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(F_o - F_e)^2}{F_e}$$

F_o	=	Observed frequency
F_e	=	Expected frequency
X^2	=	Chi-square

IV. PRESENTATION AND EMPIRICAL RESULTS

Hypotheses Testing

In the course of this research, some hypotheses were developed. Under this section, the hypotheses developed will be tested. The hypotheses are re-stated for the purpose of clarity.

Hypothesis one

H01: Job stress has no impact on employees' commitment.

To test for the hypotheses, the response to question number 10 on the questionnaire was subjected to chi-square analysis using the SPSS 20.0. The result of the chi-square analysis is presented below;

Table 1: Is there an impact of job stress on employees' commitment?

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	36	90.0	90.0	90.0
No	4	10.0	10.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Source: fieldwork, 2016

Table 2: Chi – Square Test Analysis

	Hypothesis One
Chi-Square	25.600 ^a
Df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5.
The minimum expected cell frequency is 20.0.

Source: SPSS Output

From the chi-square test statistics, it will be observed that chi – square calculated is 25.600

Decision Rule: Reject Null Hypothesis (H_0) if X^2 calculated is higher than X^2 tabulated and accept Null Hypothesis (H_0) if X^2 calculated is lower than X^2 tabulated.

Decision: From the SPSS result as shown above in table 4.1, X^2 calculated is 25.600. At 5% level of Significance and 95% Confidence level, X^2 tabulated at a Degree of Freedom of 1 is given as 3.84 (see Appendix 2).

A look at table 1 above shows that 90% of the respondents are of the opinion that job stress has an impact on employees' commitment. The remaining 10% of the respondents are of the opinion that Job stress does not have an impact on the commitment of an employee. Consequently, both the chi-square calculated and tabulated comparatively as shown in table 2 reveals that chi-square calculated is higher than chi-square tabulated. Therefore, the decision rule is to reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis, which states that there is an impact of job stress on employees' commitment.

Hypothesis Two

H₀₂: There is no impact of job stress on productivity of employees.

To test for the hypotheses, the response to question 14 on the questionnaire was subjected to chi-square analysis using the SPSS. The result of the chi-square analysis is presented below;

Table 3: Is there an impact of job stress on the productivity of employees.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	29	72.5	72.5	72.5
No	11	27.5	27.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Source: fieldwork, 2016

Table 4: Chi – Square Test Analysis

	Hypothesis Two
Chi-Square	12.100 ^a
Df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.001

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5.

The minimum expected cell frequency is 20.0.

Source: SPSS Output

From the chi-square test statistics, it will be observed that chi – square calculated is 12.100.

Decision Rule: Reject Null Hypothesis (H_0) if X^2 calculated is higher than X^2 tabulated and accept Null Hypothesis (H_0) if X^2 calculated is lower than X^2 tabulated.

Decision: From the SPSS result as shown above in table 4.2, X^2 calculated is 12.100. At 5% level of Significance and 95% Confidence level, X^2 tabulated at a Degree of Freedom of 1 is given as 3.84 (see Appendix 2).

A look at table 3 above shows that 72.5% of the respondents are of the opinion that job stress has an impact on the productivity of employees. The remaining 27.5% of the respondents are of the opinion that job stress does not have an impact on the productivity of employees. Thus, both the chi-square calculated and tabulated comparatively as shown in table 4.2, reveals that chi-square calculated is higher than chi-square tabulated. Therefore, the decision rule is to reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis which states that: there is an impact of job stress on the productivity of employees.

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The major findings of the study were that job stress has an impact on the productivity of employees. This in large extent is due to the working environment as employees indicated that they are not too happy with their working environment. In addition, the study found that there is an impact of job stress on employees' commitment. This is because employees feel uncared for by the organization.

Conclusion

Based on empirical findings it is concluded that job stress is a real challenge for employees who are working in different universities in Nigeria. For this purpose, the study is conducted to monitor the effects of job stress on employees' productivity and commitment. The variables are drawn through the literature which causes the job stress and affects the employees' productivity and commitment as well as the satisfaction of employees'. The variables of causing stress at job were lack of financial rewards, inflexibility in work hours, personal issues, low control over the work environment and management system. The results indicated that there was an impact of job stress on employee commitment, thereby causing decrease in the employees' performance. Chi-square was used to measure the effects of job stress on employees' commitment and productivity.

Recommendation

Inferring from the discoveries made during this study, the researcher hereby recommends as follows.

1. The overstressed job decreases employee productivity and perhaps a chief contributor to employees' lack of commitment. Proper strategies should be made regarding working hours, interpersonal relationships and supervision to reduce stress and to better manage the performance of employees.

2. The managers and supervisors should give proper attention to the employees and create an amiable environment that may urge them to be responsible and productive.

It is very important that working environment is being continuously monitored for stress related factors. Further, it is not only important to monitor the factors, but to create a healthy environment in which employees' work in efficient way and there should be a proper reward system which would motivate the employees' to do work in an efficient way...

REFERENCES

- [1] Adenikinju, A., Chete, L. (2002). Productivity, Market Structure and Trade Liberalization in Nigeria. Economic Development Department, Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (AERC). Research paper 126; African Economic Research Consortium: Nairobi, 2002 Nov.
- [2] Anderson, A.H. & Kyprianou, A. (1994). Effective Organizational Behaviour: a skills and activity-based approach. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- [3] August, L. & Waltman, J. (2004). Culture, climate, and contribution: Career satisfaction among female faculty. Research in Higher Education, 45(2), 177-192.
- [4] Bennet, R. (1994). *Organisational Behaviour*. 2nd Ed. London: Pitman Publishing.
- [5] Blumenthal, I. (2003). Services SETA. *Employee Assistance Conference Programme*. 2 (2). p5-21.
- [6] Bowin, R.B. & Harvey D. (2001). *Human Resource Management an Experiential Approach*. 2nd Ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- [7] Carroll, M. & Walton, M. (1997). *Handbook of Counselling in Organisations*. London: Sage Publications.
- [8] Claude S., George, J. & Kris, C. (1992). *Supervision Action*, Australia: McPherson's Group.
- [9] DCS gaumail (2003). *Work Stress Management and Prevention*. [Online]. Available from: <http://dcsgaumail02.dcs.gov.za/exchange>. [Accessed: 12th January 2016]
- [10] Dean, C. (2002). Stress and Work Performance. *HR Future*. 2 (5).
- [11] Desseler, G. (2000). *Human Resource Management*. 8th Ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [12] Frost, P.J. (2003). *Toxic emotions at work*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- [13] Garrison, M. & Bly, M.E. (1997). *Human Relations; Productive Approaches for the Work Place*. Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.
- [14] Henry, O. & Evans, A.J. (2008). Occupational Stress in Organisations. *Journal of Management Research*. 8. (3). p123-135
- [15] Levin-Epstein, M. (2002). Tackle Work Place Stress to Improve Productivity, Reduce Absenteeism. *Staff Leader*. 15 (2).
- [16] Luthans, F. (2002). *Organisational Behaviour*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- [17] Mathis, R.L. & Jackson, J.H. (2000). *Human Resource Management*. Ohio: South Western Collage Publishing.
- [18] Michac, J. (1997). *Stress and Productivity*. Trexima: Slovak Republic.
- [19] Moorhead, H. & Griffen, F. (1998). *Organisational Behaviour*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- [20] Mwadiani M, Akpotu N. E. (2002). *Academic Staff Turnover in Nigerian Universities*: Education Journal, Vol.123.
- [21] Ng'ethe, J. M, Iravo, M. E, & Namusonge, G. (2012). Determinants of Academic Staff Retention in Public Universities in Kenya: Empirical Review. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2 (13), 205-213.
- [22] Pienaar, C, & Bester, C. L. (2008). Retention of Academics in the Early Career Phase. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 6 (2), 32-41.
- [23] Ritchie, S. & Martin, P. (1999). *Motivation Management*. Hampshire: Gower Publishing Limited.
- [24] Robbins and sanghi (2006). *Organizational Behavior*. (11ed.), India: dorling Kindersley.
- [25] Robbins, (2004). *Organization Behavior*. 11th Edition, New Jersey, Pearson Prentice Hall.
- [26] Sherman M., Bahlander, S. & Snell, B. (1996). *Managing Human Resource*. 10th Ed. Cincinnati Ohio: South West College Publishing.
- [27] Swanepoel, B. et al (1998). *South African Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice*. South Africa: Juta & Co. Ltd.
- [28] Taylor, S. (1995). *Managing People at Work*. London: Reed Educational and Professional Publishing Ltd.
- [29] Thompson, P. & McHugh, D. (1995). *Work organisations; A Critical introduction*. 2nd Ed. Hampshire: Macmillan Press Ltd

APENDIX I

Questionnaire**Section A****1. Sex**

- (a) Male ()
 (b) Female ()

2. Age

- 21 - 30 Years ()
 31 - 40 Years ()
 41 - 50 Years ()
 51 Years and Above ()

3. Marital Status

- (a) Married ()
 (b) Single ()
 (c) Widowed ()

4. Qualification

- (a) WAEC/ NCE ()
 (b) OND/NCE ()
 (c) HND/B.Sc ()
 (d) MBA/M.Sc ()

5. Years of Service

- Below 5 Years ()
 6 - 10 Years ()
 11 - 15 Years ()

Section B

6. Have you ever felt stress during your work?

Yes () No ()

7. How often do you feel stressed?

Always () Usually () Sometimes ()
 Rarely () Never () Do not know ()

8. Have you ever given up a job because of having stress?

Yes () No ()

9. To what extent do the following factors influence your level of stress working in the school?

	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To a fairly large extent	To a little extent	To a very little extent
Pressures at work					
Job Instability					
High unpredictability in job pattern in job					
Support at work					
Control & decision latitude					
Work & Family life					
Inadequate monetary reward					
Long working hours					
Safety (when you perceive your work not to be that safe and secure					
Workload (high workload.					
Leadership style					
Heat					
Job ambiguity					
Noise					
Work tools (absence of working tools)					

10. Is there an impact of job stress on employees' commitment?
Yes () No ()
11. Does Job stress affect your commitment as an employee?
Yes () No ()
12. Does work environment bring about stress in your organisation?
Yes () No ()
13. Does Stress have any effect on the productivity of employees?
Yes () No ()
14. Is there an impact of job stress on the productivity of employees?
Yes () No ()
15. Does stress come to you because of decisions of management?
Yes () No ()

APENDIX II

NPAR TESTS

/CHISQUARE=EmployeeCommitment
/EXPECTED=EQUAL
/MISSING ANALYSIS.

Test Statistics

	Hypothesis one
Chi-Square	25.600 ^a
df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 20.0.

NPAR TESTS

/CHISQUARE=EmployeeProductivity
/EXPECTED=EQUAL
/MISSING ANALYSIS.

Test Statistics

	Hypothesis Two
Chi-Square	12.100 ^a
df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.001

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 20.0.

AUTHORS

First Author – Ekienabor Ehijiele E, M.Sc. Business Administration, Igbiniedion University, jekienabor@yahoo.com.

Correspondence Author – Ekienabor Ehijiele E., projectgalore@yahoo.com, jekienabor@yahoo.com, +2348032912296.