



Management Arts

Elixir Mgmt. Arts 58A (2013) 14934-14936

Elixir
ISSN: 2229-712X

Job strain, stress among managers: Related cause of presenteeism

Mahboubeh Jafari

University Putra of Malaysia,

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 14 October 2012;

Received in revised form:

7 May 2013;

Accepted: 15 May 2013;

Keywords

Job stress,
Presenteeism,
Job strain.

ABSTRACT

The study conducts job strain, stress among managers to cause of presenteeism among managers. The data were obtained by using COPSOQ stress scales, Stanford Presenteeism Scale (SPS-6). The questionnaires administered to all 75 managers in 3 companies situated in Iran. The research questions were conducted using the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and T-test. According to the findings the managers experience significantly higher levels of stress, also with female managers experiencing higher levels of job strain than men. Moreover, high levels of stress are related with decreased presenteeism. Meanwhile, a significant difference was obtained in the means between age groups, as the youngest respondents indicating decreased presenteeism.

© 2013 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

Stress is defined as a dynamic condition, which directly and negatively confronts the individual with an constraint and demand that on effectiveness, personal health, and then quality of work (Robbins, 2001). Selye's (1976) referred job stress as a primarily individual's reaction to threatening conditions to the individual in the work environment.

Person → Stress ← Environment

Occupational stress seems to be relevant today than before, not only for individual, but also more for organizations and companies (Boswell, et al & Dilworth, 2006). The organizations dramatically face multiple changes due to globalization of the economy, growing diversity in the workplace and an increased mental workload, hence workers reports an increasing level of mental health problems (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 2002). On the other hands, stress at workplace causes problems with job performance, and contribute to create conflicts between manager and worker (Varca, 1999; Boles, et al and Lynch, 2004). In this point the managers need to appreciate and attend workplace stressors. Hobfoll, (1993) in Conservation of Resources (COR) model proposed that by decreasing stress, individuals look for to obtain and maintain resources. Because of that stress in the workplace is as a reaction to that in which there is the threat of a loss of resources (Hobfoll, 2001). The resources include conditions, objectives, energies and personal characteristics. Therefore, jobs and the work environment commonly produce stress, which if not properly handled, can result in negative and dysfunctional behaviour pressure and strain on workers (Riggio, 2003; Burton, et al and Edington, 2006).

Increasingly in the workplace absenteeism is only the tip of the iceberg when it comes to the impact of work stress. Recently Hemp (2004) in a study show that psychological disorders cause to absent 2% to 3% of people from the work environment, while 40% of those who indicate signs of high level of psychological stress. The phenomenon of presenteeism is one of them in which of attending work when people sick(Aronsson et al., 2005; Meijman and Mulder, 1998) or working with illness for health reasons (Hemp, 2004). Jobs with high level of demands, such as workload, role conflict, position with high responsible and those

low in control (low authority and autonomy) increase stress and, hence, compound risk for ill health (Sanderson and Andrews, 2006). Numerous studies have been related to identify the prevalence of presenteeism that influences on the organizations financial. The total cost of was calculated more than \$ 150 billion per year in the United State by The American Productivity Audit.

About 62% of employees in the United States are concerned with 'getting by' for accomplishing basic tasks, while 26% consider attending at the workplace the most important objective. The presenteeism can be triggered by heighten levels of stress and also have a influence upon productivity in company(Hinkle,1973; Manshor,et al and Chong, 2003).In short, the interaction between work characteristics and health of employment is complex; clarification of the relationship between health, work place, perceptions of work, job performance and then absence is necessary. Base on the studies have been related with identifying the prevalence of presenteeism the purpose of the current study was to determine the following hypotheses seek to examine the stress related causes of amongst Iranian managers.

Methodology

Design and study setting

This cross-sectional study was conducted at in 3 companies situated in Tehran of Iran. Random sampling technique was adopted in the sample selection from all 65 managers in 3 companies situated in Iran. For the aim of the study, the term 'Manager' was defined as any person within companies who is employed in a fee earning capacity, and employed the of Supervisor, Manager, Senior Director.

Measuring instruments

1. Demographic and work information: The self-completed questionnaire contained standard questions on demographics: age, gender, education, marital status, occupation, tenure, personal health habits, absenteeism.
2. Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ) stress scales: All the scales of COPSOQ are scored 0-100 points that was used to determine the level of cognitive stress, behavioural and somatic among the respondents. The COPSOQ median scale has proven to be valid and reliable tool for assessing

psychological variables at the workplace (Kristensen, et al and Borg, 2005). The options of five responses are ranged in 100, 75, 50, 25, and 0. In case of only four response options the scores are 100, 66.7, 33.3, and 0. The average of the scores on the individual items is the total score on a scale for a respondent.

- Reliability assessment: Cronbach's alpha level Coefficient 0.70 was exceeded in the test-retest study. Construct validity was tested using a priori hypothesized correlations of the work-related physical and psychosocial items (four distinctive main constructs of the COPSOQ "demands", "influence and possibilities for development", "interpersonal relations and leadership" and "strain).

Stanford Presenteeism Scale (SPS-6): The Stanford Presenteeism Scale is a tool that measures the impact of health problems on individual performance and productivity at the workplace (Koopman et al., 2002). The scale is composed of 32 items (SPS-32) that measure the cognitive, emotional and behavioural ability of employees to concentrate and complete their work, despite the presence of one or several health problems. The Cronbach's alpha level Coefficient 0.82 was calculated.

Data Analysis

Analysis was conducted using SPSS Version 17. Frequencies calculated in order to obtain descriptive statistics for the following characteristics of all study variables. Using the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and T-test two-tailed tests were tested the research hypotheses. The following table 1 summarized the demographic characteristics of respondents.

Table 1: Baseline sociodemographic characteristics, employment characteristics

Characteristic	category	frequency
Gender	Men	42
	Women	23
Age	20-30	5
	31-40	34
	41-50	20
	50+	6
Education level	< matric	2
	Diploma	15
	Degree	35
	Post graduate	13
Years in company	>1	2
	1-3	13
	3-5	24
	5-10	19
	10+	7

The COPSOQ scale, Behavioral, Somatic, and Cognitive Stress were conducted, in which 1-4 indicating Behavioral stress, 5-8 indicating Somatic stress and 9-12 for testing of Cognitive Stress in respondents. The table 2 shows the mean total COPSOQ scores with demographic characteristics of respondents. According these data female managers have higher mean levels of stress than male managers, in addition youngest age group has the highest level of stress.

The Stanford Presenteeism Scale (SPS-6) range from 6-30 which the low scores indicate low level of Presenteeism caused individual's performance, while the high SPS-6 scores shows a indicate high level of Presenteeism in respondents that despite health problems, they concentrate on their work and accomplish it (Koopman et al., 2002).

Table 2: Mean total COPSOQ scale base on sociodemographic characteristics, employment characteristics

Characteristic	category	frequency	Mean Behavioral stress	Mean Somatic stress	Mean Cognitive Stress
Gender	Men	42	23.2	17.9	31.4
	Women	23	29.7	33.2	36.2
Age	20-30	5	22.4	36.2	34.3
	31-40	34	26.2	18.3	28.3
	41-50	20	32.6	23.7	31.2
	50+	6	19.2	21.3	21.6
Education level	matric	2	21.1	21.6	24.7
	Diploma	15	32.4	30.4	35.0
	Degree	35	31.2	34.3	32.5
	Post graduate	13	36.2	25.6	29.0
Years in company	>1	2	28.3	31.2	45.3
	1-3	13	29.7	23.5	25.8
	3-5	24	37.6	31.2	35.7
	5-10	19	21.5	26.7	27.5
	10+	7	16.6	17.9	35.9

Table 3: statistical analysis COPSOQ scale

Characteristic	Subscale	Test	Sig.
Gender	Behavioral stress	Mann Whitney-U	0.543
	Somatic stress	Mann Whitney-U	0.023
	Cognitive Stress	T-test	0,034
Age	Behavioral stress	Kruskal Wallis	0.581
	Somatic stress	ANOVA	0.021
	Cognitive Stress	ANOVA	0.549
Education level	Behavioral stress	Kruskal Wallis	0.785
	Somatic stress	ANOVA	0.063
	Cognitive Stress	Kruskal Wallis	0.852
Years in company	Behavioral stress	ANOVA	0.343
	Somatic stress	ANOVA	0.316
	Cognitive Stress	ANOVA	0.241

Table 4: Stanford Presenteeism Scale (SPS-6)

Characteristic	category	Mean presenteeism
Gender	Men	21.3
	Women	24.5
Age	20-30	21.6
	31-40	25.7
	41-50	25.3
	50+	24.9
Education level	matric	20.5
	Diploma	18.9
	Degree	22.3
	Post graduate	24.8
Years in company	>1	18.9
	1-3	23.4
	3-5	23.7
	5-10	24.6
	10+	23.8

The following table 4 is given a total score of statistical analysis. Based on the table 4, the 20 -30 year group has the lowest Presenteeism (SPS-6) score; also the women have the higher presenteeism levels than men.

Table5: statistical analysis Stanford Presenteeism Scale (SPS-6) based on sociodemographic characteristics, employment.

Characteristic	variable	Test	Sig.
Gender	presenteeism	T-test	0.543
Age	presenteeism	ANOVA	0.037
Education level	presenteeism	ANOVA	0.314
Years in company	presenteeism	ANOVA	0.126

Discussion

According to the mean total COPSOQ scores in the table 2 and statistical analysis of the table 3 indicated a significant difference ($p = 0.021$) in the mean between groups related to the somatic stress levels, in the .95 confidence level. In relation to gender variable, the table 2 showed that compared to the men Iranian women managers indicate a higher level of stress in the workplace on the three stress scales.

The statistical analysis Stanford Presenteeism Scale (SPS-6) generally indicates that Iranian managers have high levels of the Presenteeism and also in the table 5 showed that the managers despite attending to the workplace with health problems they indicate the high level productivity in their work. According to the findings, the null hypothesis is rejected, on the other hand, high level of stress are related with decreased Presenteeism phenomena in Iranian managers

References

Aronsson, G. and Gustafsson, K. (2005), "Sickness presenteeism: prevalence, attendance-pressure factors, and an outline of a model for research", *Journal of Occupational Environment Medicine*, Vol. 47, pp. 958-66.

Aronsson, G., Gustafsson, K. and Dallner, M. (2000), "Sick but yet at work. An empirical study of sickness presenteeism", *Journal of Epidemiological Community Health*, Vol. 54, pp. 502-9.

Boles, M., Pelletier, B. and Lynch, W. (2004), "The relationship between health risks and work productivity", *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, Vol. 46, pp. 737-45.

Boswell, G.H., Kahana, E., & Dilworth-Anderson, P. 2006. "Spirituality and healthy lifestyle behaviors: Stress counter-

balancing effects on the well-being of older adults". *Journal of Religion & Health*, Vol. 45(4), 587-602.

Burton, W.N., Chen, C.-Y., Conti, D.J., Schultz, A.B. and Edington, D.W. (2006), "The association between health risk change and presenteeism", *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, Vol. 48, pp. 252-63.

Nijhuis, F.J.N. (2001), "Testing reciprocal relationships between job characteristics and psychological wellbeing: a cross-lagged structural equation model", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 74, pp. 29-46.

Hemp, P. (2004), "Presenteeism: at work – but out of it", *Harvard Business Online*, October. Hinkle, L.E. (1973). "The concept of "stress" in the biological and social sciences", *Science, Medicine and Men*, 1, 43-49.

Hobfoll, S.E. (2001), "The Influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: advancing conservation of resources theory", *Applied Psychology*, Vol. 50, pp. 337-70.

Hobfoll, S.E. and Freedy, J. (1993), "Conservation of resources: a general stress theory applied to burnout", in Schaufeli, W.B., Maslach, C. and Marek, T. (Eds), *Professional Burnout: Recent Developments in Theory and Research*, Taylor & Francis, Washington, DC, pp. 115-29.

Koopman, C., Pelletier, K.R., Murray, J.F., Sharada, C.E., Berger, M.L., Turpin, R.S. (2002) Stanford Presenteeism Scale: Health Status and Employee Productivity. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 44, 14-20.

Kristensen, T.S., Hannerz, H., Hogh, A., and Borg, V. (2005) Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire- a tool for the assessment and improvement of the psychological work environment of the psychosocial work environment. *Scand J Work Environ Health*, 31(6), 438-449.

Meijman, T.F. and Mulder, G. (1998), "Psychological aspects of workload", in Drenth, P.J., Thierry, H. and de Wolff, C.J. (Eds), *Handbook of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 2nd ed., Erlbaum, Hove, pp. 5-33. *Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 10, pp. 53-72.

Manshor, A.T., Fontaine, R. and Chong, S.C. 2003. "Occupational Stress among Managers: A Malaysian Survey." *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(6), 622-628.

Robbins, S.P. (2001) *Organisational Behavior*. 9th edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Sanderson, K. and Andrews, G. (2006) *Common mental disorders in the workplace: Recent findings from descriptive and social epidemiology*. *The Canadian Journal of psychiatry*, 63-75.

Seyle, H. 1946. "The general adaptation syndrome and the disease of adaptation." *J. Clin. Endocrinol.*, 6: 117-230

Varca, P.E. (1999). *Work Stress and Customer Service Delivery*. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 13 (3), 229-241.