Impact of Workplace Stress on Employee Performance in Healthcare Sector of Gandaki Province, Nepal

Jas Bahadur Gurung*
Nyayika Bastola**

Abstract

The study aims to investigate the impact of workplace stress on employee performance in healthcare sector of Gandaki Province. Using the sampling frame of 1162 employees of seven public hospitals in Gandaki Province, 167 respondents were randomly selected. Data has been collected using a well-structured questionnaire. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation and regression analysis. The study revealed that status of employee performance is moderate in hospitals of Gandaki province, this actively demonstrates that employees are providing good quality service and are able to accomplish the task they are assigned. The findings of multiple regression portray that, pay and reward, supervisor support, role ambiguity and work life balance significantly influence in service quality and job accomplishment. However, workload was found to have weakly negative impact on employee performance.

Keywords: *Pay and reward, supervisor support, workload, role ambiguity, work life balance, service quality, job accomplishment*

Background

Healthcare professionals are generally, more prone to stress and professional burn-out, as they are exposed to life and death experiences in a regular basis and are also accountable for human lives, whereby their lack of action or indecisiveness can have serious effect on patient's health and in worse case scenarios, their lives as well. The traditional interpretations debate stress as, one of the growing dilemmas, organization have been dealing with, which can even deteriorate employee performance. Despite the fact that, stress is a common issue in organizations, workplace cannot be designed in such a way that there is no presence of stressors (Murphy, 1984).

Over the past decades, definition of stress has been modified by different scholars. Initially, it was considered as the pressure individuals experience from the environment, then was considered as strain within the person. Now, is described as psychological state of individual that cannot cope with the demands of situations (Michie, 2002). Contradictory to the common belief, Selye (1974) argues that, stress is not just the nervous tension nor merely the result of damage. Stressors are of two types; eustress is pleasant stress and distress is negative stress. Michie (2002) described different factors causing workplace stress such as, long working hours, role conflict, supervisor support, organizational mergers, relocation, under promotion etc. Ribeiro, Marziale, Martins, Galdino and Ribeiro (2018) urged that as hospital environment is exposed to long working hours, shift work, life and death experiences, in a regular basis this factor triggers stress at work. Hawksley (2007) explained, stressed healthcare workers have poor work life balance which affects their performance and organizational efficiency. Similarly, Jahedi and Reyshahri (2015) also described that lack of work-life balance in healthcare sector leads to upsetting effects on the quality of service and negatively effects physical and mental health of employees. International Labour Office (ILO, 2012) argued that stress lowers performance of employees. Adhikari, Sapkota and Supakankunti (2019) elaborated, better management practices of hospital are strongly connected with the organizational performance.

**Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management, Prithvi Narayan Campus, Tribhuvan University, Nepal, Email: gurung.jmk@gmail.com*
***Freelance Researcher, Kathmandu, Nepal, Email: nyayikabastola@gmail.com*

Nepal constitutes seven provinces as per the new political division and Gandaki Province is one of them which has a large number of public hospitals with many medical and non-medical staffs. Thus, the prime concern of this study is to measure the performance and workplace stress of employees working in public hospitals of Gandaki Province.

Theoretical Framework and Review of Literature

Theories of Employee Performance and Workplace Stress
Several theories of employee work performance have been developed especially in developed economies. Rudman (2003) advocated the various theories as performance review methods of employees at workplace. Straight ranking is a method in which employees are ranked simply according to the managers' valuation of their overall performance. In Paired comparison employee is compared with other groups of employeeson overall performance or certain aspect of job. Standards-based reviews focuses on employees' traits despite of focusing on actual performance. Behavioral observation explains that in order to identify employee behaviors that are crucial for effective performance, the data of job analysis needs to be used. Results-oriented reviews is based on two ideas viz. a) there is better chance of achieving something when people have clear idea of what they are trying to achieve, and b) the progress made by employees in work can only be measured in terms of the improvements that employees are trying to make. Similarly, management by objectives, popularized by Peter Drucker in the 1950s, assumes that when there is target, employees perform better and the performance becomes even better when they have participated in setting those targets. The focus of MBO is less on judging employees' traits and is more focused on opportunities for objective discussion of why and how the set targets were achieved or not achieved.

Similarly, different scholars stated different kinds of theories of stress as well. Lazarus and the transactional model of stress defines stress as a product of the transaction that is between the people and the environment. Three types of personal appraisals as suggested by Lazarus and Folkman (1984) described that two people in the same environment may not experience the same level of stress. It is due to the difference in psychological features as well as the individuals experience. Edward's (1998) person environment fit theory explains that ideal fit between the person and environment is required for effective human functioning. Lewin (1935) conceptualized the person and environment interaction (P× E) as a crucial theory which aids in understanding individuals cognitive, affective and behavioral reactions. Likewise, conservation of resource theory (COR) as propounded by Hobfoll (1988) elaborates that, even a minor conflict with other individual at work place can drain the energy of people which eventually leads to resource loss. Karasek's (1979) job demands–control–support model of work design explains that when the job demands, level of control and decision making is higher at workplace it might induce high risk of stress.

Review of Literature

A numerous empirical study has found regarding workplace stress and employee performance as it becomes a crucial issue in organizations. Rosse and Rosse (1981)found that role conflicts among nursing personnel were significantly related to job stress.Hawksley (2007) noted that stressed healthcare workers have poor work life balance and work-related stress affects their performance. Kazmi, Amjad and Khan (2008) urged that, poor work relationships, lack of support at work and poor planning negatively affects productivity of employees. Imtiaz and Ahmad (2009) documented that behavior of supervisor is the cause of employee's low performance and high stress. Bashir and Ramay (2010) explained, bankers are under stress due to role ambiguity, work overload, lack of feedbacks, keeping up with technologies change.

Aktar, Sachu and Ali (2012) concluded that, extrinsic rewards like basic pay is highly significant factor that affects employee performance. Ahmed and Ramzan (2013)revealed that there is a negative correlation between job stress and job performance. Namukasa (2013) argued that better service quality is a crucial factor for improving organizational performance. Edirisooriya (2014) and Ibrar and Khan (2015) revealed that there is positive relationship between extrinsic, intrinsic reward and employee performance. Jahedi and Reyshahri (2015)

explained that quality of work life of healthcare workers needs to be studied precisely as their job is complex. Zafar, Ali, Hameed, Ilyas and Younas (2015) found that there is a positive moderate relationship between workplace stress and employee performance. Aslam (2015) revealed that, work life balance has significant and positive effect on employee performance. Masood (2016) found that workload, role conflict, inadequate salary are the major influencing factors of stress among the employees that lowers their performance.

Manandhar (2016) reported that well designed job leads to higher level of employee job satisfaction and performance. Rajbhandari and Intravisit (2017) revealed that hospitals need to make effort regarding personalization of service to maximize quality of care. Rayamajhi (2017) found significant relationship between job stress and mental health of government officers. Soegot and Narimawati (2017) revealed that there arenegative effects of stress on employee performance. Mawanza (2017) documented that employees poor work relationships, lack of support at workplace, and poor planning negatively affects employee's productivity.

Contrary to the above findings, Hafeez (2018) found employees of hospital are facing the positive aspect of stress called eustress or good stress. Sinniah et al. (2018)urged that the variables that influence job performance in government hospital staffs were workload, workplace stress, time pressure, work-life conflicts.Yongkang, Weixi, Yalin, Yipeng and Liu (2018) indicated that role ambiguity positively influences job stress. Fonkeng (2018) explained that extreme amount of stress negatively affects employee's performance. Chen, Peng, Fuang and Sin (2019) elaborated that workplace stress is a challenge and burden to improve patient safety culture which demands implementation of strategies for managing stress among nurses. Diamantidis and Chatzoglou (2019)revealed that job environment and support from management strongly impacts job performance, while factors adaptability and intrinsic motivation directly affects job performance. AL-Nawafah (2019)revealed that occupational stressors impact on employees' health and also affects employee's performance.

In the context of Nepal,Kayastha, Murthy and Adhikary (2013) revealed that executive officers of Nepal were found to be suffering from workplace stress. Adhikari, Sapkota and Supakankunti (2019) found that, better management practices of hospital are strongly connected with the hospital performance. Gurung, Gharti and Karki (2020) revealed that job stress is caused by job related factors rather than individual attributes. Dawadee (2020) documented that workload, supervisor support, working environment, and work life balance have positive impact on employee's performancehowever, role ambiguity has negative impact.

The above empirical literatures present the lack of consistency in the results of the several studies on pay and rewards, supervisor support, workload, role ambiguity, work life balance, working environment, technological changeand employee performance. However, the objective of this study is to identify the impact of workplace stress on employee performance in the healthcare sector of Gandaki Province. More precisely, it only investigates the effects of pay and reward, supervisor support, workload, role ambiguity, and work life balance on employee performance in terms of service quality and job accomplishment in healthcare sector of Gandaki Province.The findings of the study will help to improve quality care and employee performance in hospitals. Moreover, this study will act as a basis for further investigation in the area of healthcare.

Methodological Aspects

In this study descriptive and casual research design has been adopted. There are altogether 14 public hospitals in Gandaki Province, from which seven hospitals were selected as sampling units for the study. The employees working in seven hospital consists of 1162 which constitute the sampling frame of the study. Using simple random sampling, 167 employees have been selected as the respondents for the study. Thus, the total number of respondents for the study consists of 167 respondents which is presented in Table 1.

Table1
List of Sample Hospitals and Sample Observations The table presents the name of public hospitals of Gandaki Province with number of employees as sampling frame, sample observations and percentage of sample.

S.N.	Name of Hospitals	Sampling Frame	Sample Observations	Percentage of sample
1.	Pokhara Academy of Health Science, Ramghat	700	47	6.7
2.	G.P Koirala National Centre for Respiratory Disease, Shuklagandaki.	80	22	27.5
3.	Himalaya Eye Hospital, Gharipatan	80	11	13.75
4.	Sishuwa Hospital, Sisuwa.	32	10	31.25
5.	Lamjung District Community Hospital (LDCH), Besisahar.	80	31	38.75
6.	Myagdi District Hospital, Beni	105	22	20.95
7.	Gorkha District Hospital, Gorkha	85	24	28.23
	Total	1162	167	

Source: Field Survey 2020

The study is solely based on primary data, which include quantitative data for the research purpose. A well-structured set of questionnaires has been designed to measure the degree of agreement and disagreement on each statement in the five-point Likert scale items ranging from (1-Strongly disagree to 5-Strongly agree). It has been used to measure the work-related stressors; namely pay and rewards, supervisor support, workload, role ambiguity, work-life balance and employee performance viz service quality and job accomplishment. These statements were carefully chosen with slight modifications from several studies of Dawadee (2020), Solayappan, Jayakrishnan and Velmani (2011) and Abu-Hussein, Abu-Salih and Al Saket (2016). The questionnaire has been divided into two parts: the first part comprises demographic information of respondents and the second part comprises statements that are used to find out the responses regarding workplace stress and employee performance. Also, the pilot testing was undertaken in which 24 respondents were randomly selected then with the feedbacks received, minor changes were made and finalized the questionnaire accordingly.Then after, a total of 210 questionnaires were distributed to the employees of different hospitals in Gandaki Province. Data collection took a six weeks period starting from second week of November through third week of December 2020. Only 167 responses were received where the response rate is 79.52 percent.

After collecting required data, the reliability analysis has been conducted to confirm the internal consistency of the Likert scale items of the questionnaire using Cronbach alpha which is presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Reliability Test of Scale Items
This table presents the variable code, explanations of the variables under study, number of scale items, and coefficients of Cronbach's Alpha for the variables.

Code	Variables	Items	Cronbach's Alpha
SQ	Service quality	5	0.828
JA	Job accomplishment	5	0.834
PAR	Pay and rewards	5	0.873
SS	Supervisory support	5	0.885
WL	Work load	5	0.709
RA	Role ambiguity	5	0.849
WLB	Work life balance	5	0.866

Source: Field Survey 2020 and Author's Calculation Using SPSS

The value of Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of all the variables lies between 0.6 to 0.9, so it shows an excellent fit (Burns & Burns, 2008).

Model

The model estimated in this study analyzed the impact of workplace stress on employee's performance in the healthcare sector of Gandaki Province. The relationship between variables are as follows:

Employee performance = f(pay and rewards, supervisor support, workload, role ambiguity, work life balance) ……..(I)

The functional relationship has been restated into linear regression equation (ii) and (iii) as:

SQ = β0 + β1 PR + β2 SS + β3 WL + β4 RA + β5 WLB + ei ……(ii)
JA= β0 + β1 PR + β2 SS + β3 WL + β4 RA + β5 WLB + ei…… (iii)

Where, SQ = Service quality, JA = Job accomplishment, PR = Pay and reward, SS = Supervisor support, WL= Work load, RA = Role ambiguity, WLB= Work life balance and eiis the error term at time i. β0is constant and β1, β2, β3, β4 and β5 are the beta coefficients of the explanatory variables to be estimated.

Operational Definition ofVariables

Service Quality
Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1985) developed and implemented the service quality model and described that service quality is simply a comparison of consumers expectations regarding a service which is compared with the actual performance. Gronroos (1982) described that total quality of a service is defined by three components which are; corporate image, technical quality, and functional quality. Lewis and Booms (1983) argued that delivering quality service means addressing the customer expectations on a consistent basis. Service quality is considered as one of the dependent variables in the study.

Job Accomplishment

Smith, Mossialos and Papanicolas (2008) elaborated that health system job accomplishment are simply defined as targets. The essence of targets is that when the goals are clearly defined as targets, employees and organizations will make more efforts to accomplish those goals. Job accomplishment is another dependent variable in the study.

Pay and Rewards

Pay and rewards are the financial and non-financial benefits that are provided by the organization. Ibrar and Khan (2015) elaborated that reward system are tools used to increase employee performance. Shah et al. (2011) found positive relation between monetary reward and performance. Hameed, Ramzan, Zubair, Ali and Arslan (2014) urged that salary, rewards, indirect compensation have positive influence on employee performance. Gohari, Kamkar, Hosseinipour and Zohoori (2013) found that employees perform better when they feel that the hard work is rewarded. Ngwa, Adeleke, Agbaeze, Ghasi and Imhanrenialena (2019) found that rewards have significant positive impact on employee performance.

H1: There is a positive relationship between pay and reward and employee performance.

Supervisor Support

Supervisor support is the contribution leaders make in order to support their employees. Tantawy, Abbas and Ibrahim (2016) concluded that staff support have positive impacts on service quality. Imtiaz and Ahmad (2009) found, the behavior of supervisor is the cause of employee's low performance and high stress. Zafar, Ali, Hameed, Ilyas and Younas (2015) revealed that there is positive moderate relationship between job stress and employee performance.

H2: There is a positive relationship between supervisor support and employee performance.

Workload

Vijayan (2017) defined that workload is the result of time pressure, lack of appropriate help, inadequate number of resources. KC (2000) found that, workload has negative impacts on employee performance which leads to decline in service quality.Bruggen (2015) concluded that the relationship between workload and performance is an inverted U-shape which implies that it increases till certain point than it decreases.

H3: There is a negative relationship between workload and employee performance.

Role Ambiguity

Tang and Chang (2010) elaborated that unclear information for employee about the kind of responsibility and job one needs to perform in organization is known as role ambiguity. Ismail and Teck-Hong (2011) found that work related stressnegatively affects employee's performance. Luria, Yagil and Gal (2014) found negative impact of role ambiguity and role conflict in terms of stressemployee performance.

H4: There is a negative relationship between role ambiguity and employee performance.

Work-life Balance

Ali, Kundi, Qureshi and Akhtar (2014) defined the term work-life balance as the way of proper management between the work and family life. Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel and Lee (2001) found that quality of work life has crucial impacts on employees' behavioral reactions like job satisfaction, job efforts, job performance and intention to leave the organization. Sigroha, Gidhar, and Sangwan (2011) found that successful work-life balance has positive impacts on individuals as well as organizations. Jahedi and Reyshahri (2015) found positive relationship between quality of work-life and job involvement.

H5: There is a positive relationship between work-life balance and employee performance.

This study has some limitations. The study is limited to medical and administrative staffs of public hospitals of Gandaki province. Therefore, the result may not be generalizable to other organizations. The total number of samples observations is only 167. The reliability of the findings of the study depends upon the accuracy of the information provided by the respondents. Open-ended questions are excluded in the questionnaire. It is not obvious that only the factors considered above contribute to assess employee performance, as there can be other factors as well, which leaves a gap for further research.

Results and Discussion

In this section descriptive, correlation and regression analysis has been performed. The results of the study are presented in a systematic order and the outcomes have been interpreted with discussions.

Descriptive Statistics of Variables

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics of dependent and independent variables.

Table 3
Descriptive statistics
The table shows the descriptive statistics of dependent and independent variables of the study. The dependent variables are service quality (SQ) and job accomplishment (JA) and independent variables are pay and rewards (PR), supervisor support (SS), workload (WL), role ambiguity (RL) and work life balance (WLB).

Variables	Mean	S.D	Min	Max	n
SQ	3.69	0.80	1	5	167
JA	3.80	0.75	1	5	167
PAR	3.11	0.96	1	5	167
SS	3.62	0.83	1	5	167
WL	3.51	0.72	1	5	167
RA	4.11	0.70	1	5	167
WLB	3.59	0.87	1	5	167

Source: Field survey 2020

Table 3 shows the employee's opinion for all the variables ranges from minimum one to maximum five. The average mean score of service quality is 3.69 and standard deviation is 0.80 while Tantawy, Abbas and Ibrahim (2016) found the average mean and standard deviation of 4.30 and 0.978 respectively. Similarly, the average mean score of job accomplishment is 3.80 with standard deviation 0.75. Abu-Hussein, Abu-Salih, Al Saket (2016) found that the average mean score of function accomplishment is 4.07 and standard deviation is 0.568. Likewise, average mean scores of pay and reward is 3.11 and the standard deviation is 0.96. Edirisooriya (2014) documented that mean score of pay was 4.050 with standard deviation of 0.767.The mean score of supervisor support is 3.62 with standard deviation 0.83. Similarly, Dawadee (2020) found the mean score of supervisor support 3.93 with standard deviation 0.461. Also, the average mean score of work load is 3.51 with standard deviation 0.72, while Murali, Basit and Hassan (2017) found the average mean score of 3.93 and standard deviation of 0.59 respectively. Likewise, the mean score of role ambiguity is 4.11 and standard deviation is 0.70 while it is below average (i.e., 2.32 and 0.67) in the study of Tang and Chang (2010). Furthermore, the average mean score of work life balance is 3.59 with standard deviation of 0.87. In the study conducted by Dissanayaka and Ali (2013) the mean score and standard deviation were 22.64 and 4.94 respectively. The overall observation of descriptive statistics shows that mean score of all variables is above average.

Relationship between Dependent and Independent Variables

The relationship between dependent and independent variables has been examined using Pearson correlation coefficient matrix. The correlation between variables refers to what extent the variables are related to each other.

Table 4
Bivariate Pearson's Correlation Coefficient Matrix
The table presents the bivariate Pearson's Correlation coefficient between dependent variable and independent variables. The correlation coefficients are based on 167 observations. The dependent variables are service quality (SQ) and job accomplishment (JA) and independent variables are pay and rewards (PR), supervisor support (SS), workload (WL), role ambiguity (RL) and work life balance (WLB).

Variables	SQ	JA	PAR	SS	WL	RA	WLB
SQ	1						
JA	.649**	1					
PAR	.487**	.432**	1				
SS	.541**	.664**	.563**	1			
WL	.308**	.268**	.387**	.307**	1		
RA	.467**	.576**	.163*	.502**	.317**	1	
WLB	.233**	0.15	0.071	0.025	.361**	.264**	1

*Note.** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level, and * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.*
Source: Field survey 2020

Table 4 shows that service quality has positive and significant relationship with pay and rewards,supervisor support, workload, role ambiguity and work life balance. This indicates that with the increase in these factors, service quality also increases. This finding is consistent with the findings of Hameed, Ramzan, Zubair, Ali, and Arslan (2014), Tantawy, Abbas and Ibrahim (2016), Sigroha, Gidhar, and Sangwan (2011). However, this finding contradicts the finding of KC (2000) and Ismail and Teck-Hong (2011). The findings also portray that individually, the variables pay and reward, supervisor support, workload, role ambiguity and work life balance have positive relation with job accomplishment. This actively demonstrates that with the increase in these variables, job accomplishment also increases. This result opposes the findings of Abu-Hussein, Abu-Salih and Al Saket (2016).

Impact of Work Place Stress on Employee Performance

The workplace stress variables are independent variables like pay and reward, supervisor support, workload, role ambiguity and work-life balance. While the employee performance, the dependent variables are service quality and job accomplishment in the study.

The impact of workplace stress variables on service quality has been presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Estimated Regression Results of Service Quality on Independent Variables

The result is based on seven public hospitals of Gandaki Province with 167 observationsusing linear regression model. The model is SQ = β0 + β1 PR+ β2 SS + β3 WL + β4 RA + β5 WLB + ei. The dependent variables are service quality (SQ) and job accomplishment (JA) and independent variables are pay and rewards (PR), supervisor support (SS), workload (WL), role ambiguity (RL) and work life balance (WLB).

Model	Intercept	Regression coefficientsof					Adj. R_bar2	SEE	F-value
		PR	SS	WL	RA	WLB			
1	2.424	0.407					0.233	0.708	52.33
	(13.218) ***	(7.234) ***							
2	1.799		0.522				0.289	0.682	69.55
	(7.731) ***		(8.340) ***						
3	2.485			0.343			0.090	0.772	17.64
	(8.480) ***			(4.200) ***					
4	1.481				0.537		0.210	0.718	46.73
	(4.516) ***				(6.836) ***				
5	2.917					0.215	0.049	0.789	9.61
	(11.360) ***					(3.101) ***			
6	1.630	0.224	0.377				0.334	0.660	43.33
	(7.080) ***	(3.521) ***	(5.140) ***						
7	2.016	0.362		0.158			0.245	0.703	28.47
	(7.247) ***	(5.973) ***		(1.939) *					

8	1.051			0.198	0.472		0.237	0.706	27.27
	(2.880) ***			(2.517) ***	(5.788) ***				
9	0.978	0.209	0.381			0.189	0.372	0.641	34.40
	(3.300) ***	(3.38) ***	(5.355) ***			(3.352) ***			
10	0.407	0.258	0.228	-0.081	0.307	0.131	0.412	0.620	24.67
	(1.193)	(4.039) ***	(2.810) ***	(-0.271)	(3.617) ***	(2.158) ***			

Note.1) Figures in parenthesis aret-values. 2) The asterisk (***)and (*) sign indicates that the results are significant at 1and 10 percentlevel. 3) Service quality is dependentvariable.
Source: Field Survey 2020

Table 5 shows that in simple regression, the beta coefficient of variables, pay and reward, supervisor support, workload, role ambiguity and work life balance is positive and significant with service quality. It implies that with the increase in these factors, service quality increases. This finding is in line with that of Edirisooriya (2014), Ibrar and Khan (2015), Hameed, Ramzan, Zubair, Ali and Arslan (2014), Dawadee (2020), Aslam (2015), Sigroha, Gidhar, and Sangwan (2011). However, the results contradict with KC (2000) and Ismail and Teck-Hong (2011).Model 6 shows that pay and reward and supervisor support have a significant impact on service quality. The predictive power of the model is 33.4 percent. This result demonstrates that higher the pay and reward and supervisor support, higher will be the service quality. This finding generalizes the findings of Shah et al. (2011).In the same way, in Model 7 portrays that, the variables pay and reward and workload are positive and significant with service quality. This indicates that higher the pay and reward and workload, higher will be the service quality. Model 9 demonstrates that pay and reward, supervisor support and work life balance have positive and significant impact on service quality. Model 10 shows the full model of multiple regression. The variables such as pay and reward, supervisor support, role ambiguity and work life balance have positive and significant impact on service quality. However, workload has weakly negative impact on service quality. The overall predictive power of the model is 41.2 percent.

The impact of independent variables on job accomplishment has been presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Estimated Regression Results of Job Accomplishment on Independent Variables

The result is based on seven public hospitals of Gandaki Province with 170 observation of 2020 survey using linear regression model. The model is JA = β0 + β1 PAR + β2 SS + β3 WL + β4 RA + β5 WLB + ei. The dependent variables are service quality (SQ) and job accomplishment (JA) and independent variables are pay and rewards (PR), supervisor support (SS), workload (WL), role ambiguity (RL) and work life balance (WLB).

Model	Intercept	Regression coefficientsof					Adj. R_bar2	SEE	F-value
		PR	SS	WL	RA	WLB			
1	2.769	0.337					0.182	0.683	38.578
	(15.629) ***	(6.211) ***							
2	1.643		0.599				0.438	0.566	132.772
	(8.512) ***		(11.523) ***						
3	2.832			0.278			0.066	0.729	12.987
	(10.227) ***			(3.604) ***					
4	1.266				0.619		0.327	0.619	83.254
	(4.475) ***				(9.124) ***				
5	3.345					0.129	0.017	0.748	3.848
	(13.735) ***					(1.962) *			
6	2.441	0.301		0.123			0.189	0.680	20.695
	(9.074) ***	(5.142) ***		(1.573) *					

7	1.052			0.099	0.586				
							0.332	0.617	42.911
	(3.299) ***			(1.431) ***	(8.227) ***				
8	1.210	0.058	0.558			0.111			
							0.453	0.558	47.680
	(4.689) ***	(1.076)	(8.937) ***			(2.257) **			
9	0.565	0.121	0.378	-0.051	0.366	0.048	0.523	0.521	
									38.064
	(1.975) **	(2.261) **	(5.550) ***	(-0.776)	(5.130) ***	(0.946)			

Note.1) Figures in parenthesis aret-values. 2)The asterisk (***), (**) and (*) sign indicates that the results are significant at 1, 5 and 10 percentlevel.3)Job accomplishment is dependentvariable.
Source: Field Survey 2020

Table 6 demonstrates that beta coefficient of pay and reward is positive and significant which means, with the increase in pay and reward, job accomplishment also increases. The finding is similar to that of Gohari, Kamkar, Hosseinipour and Zohoori (2013), Ngwa, Adeleke, Agbaeze, Ghasi and Imhanrenialena (2019). Likewise, the beta coefficient of supervisor support, workload, role ambiguity and work life balance are also positive and significant with job accomplishment, which implies that, with the increase in these factors, job accomplishment also increases. This result is in line with that of Tantawy, Abbas and Ibrahim (2016), Imtiaz and Ahmad (2009), Sigroha, Gidhar, and Sangwan (2011) and Jahedi and Reyshahri (2015).

Model 8 shows thatthe variable workload and role ambiguity have positive and significant influence on job accomplishment. The predictive power of the model is 33.2. The current finding opposes with the study of Abu-Hussein, Abu-Salih and Al Saket (2016), Ismail and Teck-Hong (2011), KC (2000). Model 9 portrays that the beta coefficient of variable pay and reward, supervisor support and work life balance have positive and significant impact on job accomplishment. The predictive power of the model is 45.3. Finally, the model specification 10 represents the full form of the regression model which shows that there is positive significant effect of pay and reward, supervisor support and role ambiguity on job accomplishment while the workload has weakly negative relation with job accomplishment. The model, however, is significant at 0.01 level and the predictive power of the model is 52.3 percent.

The computation of histogram depicts that the data appear to be normal. Multiple regression models reveals that there is no problem of multicollinearity since variance inflationary factor (VIF) of all explanatory variables is far below than 10 and tolerance (TOL) is ≤ 1.0. Therefore, there is no evidence of multicollinearity in the regression models. Scatter plots of standardized residuals in all the regression models depicted that there is no pattern observed in the plots. Data points are scattered around the reference line i.e., y = 0 indicating data used in the study appear to be homoscedastic. Thus, the regression models used in this study fulfill all the regression assumptions so that the validity of the results is more likely to ensure that these results could have a significant policy implication of concerned authorities of Nepalese heath sector sectors.

Conclusion

The major conclusion of this study is that the status of workplace stress and employee performance in hospitals of Gandaki Provinceis satisfactory. This study also revealed that employee performance in terms of service quality and job accomplishment is moderate which means, hospitals are able to provide quality service and employees are also able to accomplish their assigned task. The study further concludes that, pay and reward, supervisor support, role ambiguity, work life balance highly impacts employee performance. The study shows a clear picture of how different stressors at workplace affects employee's performance. Thus, implications to the employees working in healthcare sector is that with proper understanding of workplace stress factors, the performance can be enhanced.

As the study was conducted only in hospitals of Gandaki Province, for the generalization of this result, it can be replicated in other sectors of the country taking different variables like working environment, career development, organizational culture, and so forth.

References

- *Abu-Hussein, A. M., Abu-Salih, M. S., & Al Saket, L. Z. (2016). Impact of Job Stress on Job Performance among the Employees of Jordan. Research Journal of Social Sciences, 9(2), 1-9.*
- *Adhikari, S.R., Sapkota, V.P., & Supakankunti, S. (2019). Measuring performance of hospitals in Nepal: Using management approach. International Journal of Healthcare Management, 12(4), 292-301.*
- *Ahmed, A., & Ramzan, M. (2013). Effects of job stress on employee's job performance: A study on banking sector of Pakistan. IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 11(6), 61-68. Retrieved from www.iosrjournals.org*
- *Aktar, S., Sachu, M.K., & Ali, M.E. (2012). The impact of rewards on employee performance in commercial banks of Bangladesh: An empirical study. Journal of Business and Management, 6(2), 9-15. DOI: 10.9790/487X-0620915*
- *Ali, A.C., Kundi, G. M., Qureshi, Q. A., & Akhtar, R. (2014). Relationship between work-life balance & organizational commitment. Research on Humanities and Social Sciences, 4(5), 1-7.*
- *AL-Nawafah, S.S. (2019). The impact of occupational stress of government employee's performance case study of Amman greater municipality. International Business Management, 13(5), 189-199.*
- *Aslam, M. (2015). Influence of work life balance on employee's performance: Moderated by transactional leadership. Journal of Resources Development and Management, 10, 98-103.*
- *Bashir, U., & Ramay, I.M. (2010). Impacts of stress on employee's job performance: A study on banking sector of Pakistan. International Journal of Marketing Studies, 2(1), 122-126.*
- *Bruggen, A. (2015). An empirical investigation of the relationship between workload and performance. Management Decision, 53(10), 2377-2389.*
- *Burns, R. B., & Burns, R. A. (2008). Business research methods and statistics using SPSS. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.*
- *Chen, I. C., Lee Peng, N., Hui Fuang, N., & Lok Sin, K. (2019). Impacts of job-related stress and patient safety culture on patient safety outcomes among nurses in Taiwan. International Journal of Healthcare Management, 1-9. Retrieved fromhttps://doi.org/10.1080/20479700.2019.1603419.*
- *Dawadee, P. (2020). Impact of occupational stress on employee's performance in Nepalese commercial bank (Unpublished master's thesis). Uniglobe College. Kathmandu.*
- *Diamantidis, A.D., & Chatzoglou, P. (2018). Factors affecting employee performance: An empirical approach. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 68(1), 171-193. Retrieved fromhttps://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-01-2018-0012*
- *Dissanayaka, N. M. N. P., & Hussain Ali, M. A. M. (2013). Impact of work life balance on employee's performance: an empirical study on seven apparel organizations in Sri Lanka. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium SEUSL: 6-7. 60-64.*
- *Edirisooriya, W. A. (2014). Impact of rewards on employee performance: With special reference to ElectriCo. In Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Management and Economics, 26(1),311-318.*
- *Edwards, J. R. (1998). Cybernetic theory of stress, coping, and well-being. Theories of organizational stress, 122-152.*

- *Fonkeng, C. (2018). Effects of job stress on employee performance in an enterprise: A microfinance institution in Cameroon (Unpublished master's thesis). Centria University of Applied Science. Cameroon.*
- *Gohori, P., Kamkar, A., Hosseinipoor, S. J., & Zohoori, M. (2013). Relationship between rewards and employee performance: A mediating role of job satisfaction. Interdisciplinary Journal ofContemporary Research in Business, 5(3),571-597.*
- *Grönroos, C. (1982). An applied service marketing theory. European Journal of Marketing, 16(7), 30-41.*
- *Gurung, G., Gharti, K., & Karki, S. (2020). Job-related stress among nurses in selected hospitals of Pokhara, Nepal. Journal of Health and Allied Sciences, 10(1), 19-23.*
- *Hafeez, S. (2018). The impact of job stress on performance of employees: A study of social security hospital of District Okara & Sahiwal. Journal of Neuropsychology & Stress Management,3, 4-12.*
- *Hameed, A., Ramzan, M., & Zubair, H. M. K. (2014). Impact of compensation on employee performance: Empirical evidence from banking sector of Pakistan. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 5(2),302-309.*
- *Hawksley, B. (2007). Work-related stress, work/life balance and personal life coaching. British Journal of Community Nursing, 12(1), 34-36. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.12968/bjcn.2007.12.1.22690*
- *Hobfoll, S.E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50(3), 337-421.*
- *Ibrar, M., & Khan, O. (2015). The impact of reward on employee performance. A case study of Malakand private school. International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences, 52, 95-103.*
- *Imtiaz, S. & Ahmad, S. (2009). Impact of stress on employee productivity, performance and turnover: An important managerial issue. International Review of Business Research Papers, 5(4), 468-477.*
- *International Labor Office. (2012) Stress prevention at work checkpoints: Practical improvements for stress prevention in the workplace. Retrieved from www.ilo.org/publns*
- *Ismail, M. I., & Teck-Hong, T. (2011). Identifying work-related stress among employees in the Malaysian financial sector. World Journal of Management, 3(2), 229-243.*
- *Jahedi, Z. S., & Reyshahri, A. P. (2016). The relationship between quality of working life and job involvement of employees in Chamran hospital. Journal of Sociological Research, 6(2), 181-93.*
- *Karasek Jr, R.A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24(2),285-308.*
- *Kayastha, R., Adhikary, R.P., & Krishnamurthy, V. (2012). Occupational stress among managers: A Nepalese Survey. Academic Research International, 2(3),585-590.*
- *Kazmi, R., Amjad, S., & Khan, D. (2008). Occupational stress and its effect on job performance. A case study of medical house officers of district Abbottabad. Journal of Ayub Medical College, 20(3), 135-139.*
- *KC, D. S., & Terwiesch, C. (2009). Impact of workload on service time and patient safety: An econometric analysis of hospital operations. Management Science, 55(9),1486-1498.*
- *Lazarus, R.S. and Folkman, S. (1984) Stress, Appraisal and Coping. Springer*
- *Lewin, K. (1935). Dynamic theory of personality. New York: McGraw-Hill*
- *Lewis, R. C., & Booms, B. H. (1983). The marketing aspects of service quality. Emerging Perspectives on Services Marketing, 65(4), 99-107.*
- *Luria, G., Yagil, D., & Gal, I. (2014). Quality and productivity: Role conflict in the service context. The Service Industries Journal, 34(12), 955-973.*
- *Manandhar, S. (2016). Achieving work life balance and its impact on job satisfaction and career success: A comparative study. PYC Nepal Journal of Management, 9(1), 71-77.*
- *Masood, R.Z. (2016). Stress at work and job performance in selected public sector undertakings. International Journal of Science Technology and Management, 5(8), 446-452.*
- *Mawanza, W. (2017). The effects of stress on employee productivity: A perspective of Zimbabwe's socio-economic dynamics of 2016. Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies, 9(2), 22-32.*
- *Michie, S. (2002). Causes and management of stress at work. Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 59(1), 67-72. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/oem.59.1.67*

- *Mossialos, E., Papanicolas, I., & Smith, P.C. (2008). Performance measurement for health system improvement: experiences, challenges and prospects. Copenhagen: World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe*
- *Murali, S. B., Basit, A., & Hassan, Z. (2017). Impact of job stress on employee performance. International Journal of Accountancy and Business Management, 5(2), 13-33.*
- *Murphy, M. (1984). Occupational stress management: A review and appraisal. Journal of Occupationa1 Psychology, 57(1), 1-15.*
- *Namukasa, J. (2013). The influence of airline service quality on passenger satisfaction and loyalty. The TQM Journal, 25 (5), 520-532.*
- *Ngwa, W. T., Adeleke, B. S., Agbaeze, E. K., Ghasi, N. C., & Imhanrenialena, B. O. (2019). Effect of reward system on employee performance among selected manufacturing firms in the Litoral region of Cameroon. Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 18(3), 1-16.*
- *Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. Journal of Marketing, 49(4), 41- 50.*
- *Rajbhandari, A., & Intravisit, A. (2017). Measuring patients' perceived hospital service quality: A case study of Nepal's private hospitals. International Research EJournal on Business and Economics, 3(1) 1-23.*
- *Rayamajhi, K. B. (2016). Role stress and mental health of government officer of Nepal. Journal of Advanced Academic Research, 3(2), 40-45.*
- *Ribeiro, P.R., Marziale, M.H.P., Martins, J.T., Galdino, M.J.Q., & Ribeiro, P.H.V. (2018). Occupational stress among health workers of a university hospital. Rev Gaúcha Enferm,39, 1-6. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1590/1983- 1447.2018.65127*
- *Rosse, J. G., & Rosse, P. H. (1981). Role conflict and ambiguity: an empirical investigation of nursing personnel. Evaluation & the health professions, 4(4), 385-405.*
- *Rudman, R. (2003). Human Resources Management in New Zealand. Auckland: Pearson Education New Zealand Limited.*
- *Selye, H. (1974). Stress without distress. New York: J.B. Lippincott.*
- *Shah, S. S. H., Jabran, A., Ahsan, R. J., Sidra, W., Wasiq, E., Maira, F., & Sherazi, S. K. (2012). Impact of stress on employee's performance: a study on teachers of private colleges of Rawalpindi. Asian Journal of Business Management, 4(2), 101-104.*
- *Sigroha, A., Gidhar, Y., & Sangwan, S. (2011). Impact of work life balance on working women: An overview. Gyan Management, 5(2), 59-67.*
- *Sinniah, S., Mohamed, R. K. M. H., Kadiresan, V., Nadarajan, P. K., Keang, A. A. L. A., Awee, A., & Lazim, C. S. L. M. (2018). An investigation of the job performance of administrative staff in government hospitals, Malaysia. International Journal of Business and Management, 13(10), 38-46.*
- *Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D. J. (2001). A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. Social Indicators Research, 55(3), 241-302.*
- *Soegoto, S.E., & Narimawati, U. (2017). The contribution of stress management and good employee performance towards the success of a company. The Open Psychology Journal, 10(1), 154-160.*
- *Solayappan, A., Jayakrishnan, J., & Velmani, S. (2011). Quality measurement for hospital services. IPEDR, 12(2), 246-50.*
- *Tang, Y.T., & Chang, C.H. (2010). Impact of role ambiguity and role conflict on employee creativity. African Journal of Business Management, 4(6), 869-881.*
- *Tantawy, A., Abbas, T. M., & Ibrahim, M. Y. (2016). Measuring the relationship between job stress and service quality in quick-service restaurants. Egyptian Journal of Tourism Studies, 15(2), 1-23.*
- *Vijayan, M. (2017). The impact of job stress on employee's job performance in Aavin, Coimbatore. Journal of Organization & Human Behavior, 6(3), 21-29.*
- *Yongkang, Z., Weixi, Z., Yalin, H., Yipeng, X., & Liu, T. (2014). The relationship among role conflict, role ambiguity, role overload and job stress of Chinese middle-level cadres. Chinese Studies, 3(1), 8-11.*
- *Zafar, Q., Ali, A., Hameed, T., Ilyas, T., & Younas, H.I. (2015). The influence of job stress on employee's performance in Pakistan. American Journal of Social Science Research, 1(4), 221-225. Retrieved from http://www.aiscience.org/journal/ajssr*