

Work-Related Stress And Job Performance Of Administrative Staff

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15337024

Ronalyn Q. Malunes

Admin Staff/Part-time Faculty, John B. Lacson Colleges Foundation (Bacolod), Inc.
<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-7408-7654>

Salvador S. Sigaya, Jr.

Faculty, College of Business Management and Accountancy, STI West Negros University, Philippines
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-7036-7998>

Abstract:

The purpose of this study was to find out the work-related stress and job performance of employees. Using a descriptive research design, the study involved seventy-eight (78) employees as respondents. A self-made questionnaire, which was validated and reliability tested, served as the primary tool for collecting data. The research focused on how work-related stress—arising from factors such as workload, work environment, and interpersonal relationships—affects the job performance of employees. Findings revealed that most employees experienced a moderate level of stress in their workplace. However, even though stress was present, it did not significantly affect how employees performed their jobs. A comparative analysis showed no significant relationship between the levels of work-related stress and job performance, suggesting that stress alone does not directly determine employee output or efficiency. This could be due to various reasons, including individual coping strategies, workplace support systems, or a strong sense of job commitment. This paper emphasizes the importance of understanding the nature of work-related stress and its potential effects—not just in terms of performance, but also employee well-being. The insights gained from this study may guide organizations in developing better stress management practices and support programs to help employees thrive at work.

Keywords: Administrative Staff, Job Performance, Stress, Work-related Stress

Introduction:

Nature of the Problem

Work-related stress and job performance determine workers' work quality and how effective an organization is. Excessive stress can ruin job performance, leading to low productivity, decision-making, and work quality. Sonnentag and Fritz (2021) further indicate that prolonged work-related stress may result in burnout, demotivation, and decreased job performance. Highly stressed employees have difficulties getting jobs done, making decisions, and being effective in the workplace (Cooper & Quick, 2022). Like other organizations, schools are also not immune to this, especially among employees with many tasks, tight deadlines, and high expectations. Dealing with stress is crucial to performing the job well and keeping the workplace running (Giorgi et al., 2023).

"Most of the employees in our organization seem to be stressed. This issue seems to be a result of multiple job demands, inadequate planning of the workflow, and the lack of proper stress relief mechanisms. If not addressed, long-term work-related stress can lead to burnout and decreased working efficiency (Routley et al., 2019)". Major causes of work-related stress include workload, work environment, and interpersonal relations. Workers' fatigue is caused by too much workload, unrealistic deadlines, and lack of delegation of work. A poor work environment, including high noise levels, poor facilities, or a risky environment, increases stress. Interpersonal disagreements, communication breakdowns, and poor support by others also negatively impact job performance.

Current State of Knowledge

Work-related stress significantly affects employee well-being, impacting both mental and physical health (World Health Organization, 2023). While mild stress can enhance daily functioning, excessive stress leads to health issues, and learning coping mechanisms is key to mitigating its effects. Occupational stress is increasingly recognized as a global problem, harming employee health and organizational performance (Victoria State Government Department of Health, 2024). Common causes include long work hours, unclear job expectations, and job insecurity. Chronic stress has been linked to burnout, anxiety, and lower work-life balance, with 52% of workers affected (American Institute of Stress, 2024). Stress also manifests physical and psychosocial stressors, such as poor working conditions and excessive job demands, contributing to mental health issues, substance abuse, and cardiovascular diseases (Corporate Wellness Magazine, 2024). Long-term stress results in absenteeism, turnover, and low morale, underscoring the need for effective stress management (Talkspace, 2022).

Work-related stress significantly impacts employee performance and organizational outcomes. According to Schooley (2024), 44% of employees globally reported high stress levels at work, with North America experiencing an even higher rate of 52%. Stress contributes to low morale, decreased productivity, poor performance, unhealthy organizational culture, increased absenteeism, and more workplace accidents. Additionally, stressed employees struggle with meeting deadlines and poor communication, leading to conflicts and ineffective teamwork. Research in the hospitality industry by Jangao (2024) highlights that personality traits like extroversion and conscientiousness correlate with higher job performance, emphasizing the importance of personality in performance evaluation. Weber (2024) notes that the rise in Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) to address underperformance suggests a need for more supportive performance management strategies. Talkspace (2022) further links excessive stress to burnout, job dissatisfaction, and higher turnover rates, stressing the importance of stress reduction programs to enhance performance and organizational stability.

Work-related stress is a prevalent issue across various sectors, impacting both employee well-being and performance. Sari et al. (2021) identify irregular hours and strained relationships with colleagues or supervisors as key stressors, recommending flexible hours, employee meetings, and stress management training to alleviate stress and improve productivity. Opene (2023) highlights that job insecurity, pressure, and lack of organizational care contribute to high stress levels, leading to dissatisfaction and potential turnover. Rachman (2021) suggests that stress from poor working conditions and heavy workloads in government offices can hinder task completion, while effective management can reverse these effects. Chineye et al. (2021) emphasize that poor stress management can lead to absenteeism and low productivity, with some workers resorting to unhealthy coping mechanisms. Shah, B. (2023) and Sardouk and Ali (2022) underline that stress reduces organizational performance, increases turnover, and causes medical issues, but a stress-free environment and effective management can enhance motivation and performance. Sucharitha and Basha (2020) and Chineye et al. (2021) further stress the importance of managing job insecurity and time pressure to maintain productivity. Finally, Australia (2025) reports that university staff experience rising burnout and disengagement due to organizational stressors, affecting their performance.

Job-related stress is a significant issue among Filipino workers, with various factors contributing to performance decline. Ajes et al. (2023) identified excessive job demands as the primary cause of stress and poor performance at Company ABC, while workplace relationships and the environment had less impact. Sarabia and Collantes (2020) found that high job demands also caused stress among teachers, although stress management seminars helped improve their teaching effectiveness. Dantis (2024) highlighted that nurses in critical care units faced high stress due to workload and workplace conflicts but showed resilience through problem-focused coping. Obrero and Serviñas (2024) showed that stress from curriculum and instruction management led to poor teacher performance, while professional development programs helped alleviate these issues. Chico et al. (2023) found that improved stress management in schools boosted staff performance, and Dantis (2024) emphasized that nurses with strong coping skills were better equipped to maintain performance under stress, underlining the importance of stress management training.

Theoretical Underpinnings

This study is grounded in the Job Demand-Resource (JD-R) Model, developed by Bakker and Demerouti (2007), which posits that every job has unique demands and resources. Job demands, such as heavy workloads and time constraints, can lead to stress, while job resources, including organizational, social, and psychological support, help employees achieve their goals, reduce stress, and foster personal development. High job demands can result in burnout and disengagement, negatively impacting job performance, whereas sufficient job resources enhance motivation and performance while alleviating stress.

The JD-R Model is particularly relevant in academic institutions, where administrative staff face multiple demands from various stakeholders. By focusing on the balance between job demands and resources, the model provides a comprehensive framework for understanding their impact on employee performance and well-being. This study applies the JD-R Model to assess the stressors experienced by administrative staff in a university in Central Visayas, aiming to identify interventions that can improve job performance and overall employee satisfaction. The insights gained from this research may lead to strategies for enhancing staff well-being and performance in the academic setting.

Objectives

This study aimed to determine the level of work-related stress and job performance of administrative staff in a university in Central Visayas for the school year 2023-2024. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions: 1) the level of work-related stress of employees according to workload, work environment, and interpersonal relationship; 2) the significant difference in the level of work-related stress of employees when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variable; 3) the significant difference in the level of job performance of employees when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variable; and 4) the significant relationship between the levels of work-related stress and the job performance of employees.

Methodology:

This chapter presents the research design, locale of the study, respondents, data gathering instrument, validity and reliability of the instrument, data gathering procedure, analytical schemes, and statistical tools.

Research Design

This study aimed to determine the level of work-related stress and job performance of employees in a University in Central Visayas for the school year 2023-2024. The areas of work-related stress of employees are workload, work environment, and interpersonal relationships, while on-the-job performance will be based on the KRA of the employees. Considering the nature of the data involved, the descriptive research design was used in this study. Descriptive research is valuable in providing facts on which scientific judgment may be based, providing essential knowledge about the nature of objects and persons and for closer observation into the practices, behavior, methods, and procedures, and playing a large part in the development of instruments for the measurement of many gathering instruments like questionnaires, tests, interviews, checklists, score cards, rating scales, and observation schedules, and formulating of policies in the local, national, or international level (Calmorin, 2016). Further, a descriptive research design was employed since it is non-experimental research. It gave freedom to the researcher to measure and assess their statistical relationship with little effort to control extraneous variables. Data was gathered, categorized, tabulated, treated, analyzed, and interpreted to develop findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Study Respondents

The study's respondents were 80 administrative staff employees from different university offices. Purposive sampling is a form of non-probability sampling in which researchers rely on their judgment when choosing population members to participate in their study. This sampling method requires researchers to have prior knowledge about the purpose of their studies so that they can correctly select and approach eligible participants. Researchers use purposive sampling when they want to access a particular subset of people, as all study participants are chosen because they fit a specific profile (Foley, 2018).

Instrument

A self-made questionnaire was used to collect the needed data on the influence of work-related stress on employees' performance. The questionnaire was divided into two parts. Part I of the research instrument contained the respondents' profiles, which included age, sex, civil status and length of service. Part II of the research questionnaire shall contain questions on administrative staff's work-related stress in the following areas: workload, work environment, and interpersonal relationships. The scores obtained for the level of work-related stress of administrative staff were rated on a scale of 1-5, with five (5) interpreted as Always, four (4) as Often, three (3) as Sometimes, two (2) as Rarely, and one (1) as Almost Never. The research instrument was subjected to validity (4.93-excellent) and reliability (0.958-excellent). All of them were interpreted as worthy and good; respectively.

Data Gathering Procedure

Quantitative data in this study was obtained through a survey questionnaire. According to Good (Vega, 2015), a questionnaire is a list of planned, written questions related to a particular topic with a space to indicate the response to each question. In this study, the researcher asked permission from the proper authorities. When permission was granted, the researcher proceeded personally to administer the instruments to target respondents, and Google Forms were also circulated to other participants. Web-based surveys may be done using Google Forms, a cloud-based information management tool (Raju & Harinarayana, 2016). Moreover, the raw data were transformed into numerical code guided by a coding manual to determine the level of skills and degree of difficulties. The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) software and Microsoft Excel were used to compute encoded data. Also, statistical tables were constructed per consideration based on the problems stated in this investigation.

Data Analysis and Statistical Tools

Relative to the nature of this study, the researchers employed descriptive and comparative analytical schemes.

Objective No. 1 used a descriptive-analytical scheme and mean to determine the level of work-related stress of employees according to the following areas: Workload, Work environment, and Interpersonal Relationship.

Objective No. 2 utilized a comparative analytical scheme and Mann-Whitney U test to determine a significant difference in the level of work-related stress of employees when grouped and compared according to the variables.

Objective No. 3 utilized a comparative analytical scheme and Mann-Whitney U test to determine the significant difference in the level of job performance of employees when grouped and compared according to the variable?

Objective No. 4 utilized a comparative analytical scheme and Mann-Whitney U test to determine the significant relationship between the levels of work-related stress and the employees' job performance.

Ethical Consideration

Principles that direct study designs and procedures are ethical considerations. When gathering information from individuals, researchers and scientists must always abide by a set of rules (P. Bhandari, 2022). Voluntary participation, Informed consent, confidentiality, and plagiarism will be strictly considered. Study participants will not be forced or pressured; they can withdraw at any time without giving any reason to withdraw. The study participants will be thoroughly informed about the purpose and nature of the study, including the benefits, risks, and consequences. The study participants will be assured of the confidentiality of all information relevant to their personal information or any form of identifying information relating to their person.

Results and Discussion

This chapter presents the data collection, analysis, and interpretation process conducted to fulfill the objectives of this study. Using specific and appropriate procedures was essential in obtaining precise and tailored data and solutions for each problem.

Table 1
Level of Work-related Stress of Employees in the Area of Workload

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As an administrative staff employee, I experience stress when:</i>		
1. I feel overwhelmed by the amount of work I need to complete daily.	3.06	Moderate
2. I often have to work overtime to meet deadlines.	2.53	Moderate
3. My responsibilities exceed what I can manage effectively.	2.69	Moderate
4. I frequently encounter tight deadlines.	2.65	Moderate
5. I am unable to complete my tasks within the allotted time.	2.56	Moderate
6. I find it difficult to take breaks due to the demands of my workload.	2.51	Moderate
7. I often bring work home to finish pending tasks.	2.14	Low
8. I feel pressured to meet unrealistic expectations at work.	2.33	Low
9. My workload adversely affects the quality of my performance.	2.32	Low
10. I lack sufficient resources to complete my tasks efficiently.	2.19	Low
Overall Mean	2.50	Moderate

Table 1 presents the level of work-related stress among employees in the area of workload. The overall mean score is 2.50, interpreted as moderate. Item No. 7, "I often bring work home to finish pending tasks," had the lowest mean score of 2.14, interpreted as low. Meanwhile, Item No. 1, "I feel overwhelmed by the amount of work I need to complete daily," received the highest mean score of 3.06, interpreted as a moderate level.

This indicates that workers face high stress levels because of their workload, which might result in burnout and lower productivity if left unchecked. In order to reduce this, management can introduce methods to manage workload better, such as reallocating tasks, offering time management training, and improving support mechanisms like stress reduction workshops.

The result is supported by Malapad et al. (2024), stating that moderate stress levels were associated with excessive daily workloads and additional responsibilities, which could negatively impact job performance and overall well-being. Furthermore, workloads are linked to increased risks of anxiety disorders, depression, and somatization among healthcare workers, emphasizing the importance of managing work demands to maintain mental health (Wang et al., 2023).

Table 2
Level of Work-Related Stress of Employees in the Area of Interpersonal Relationship

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As an administrative staff employee, I experience stress when:</i>		
1. My co-employee(s) do not get along with me.	1.74	Low

2. When disagreements among my team members impair my ability to accomplish my job	1.94	Low
3. I do not feel supported by my coworkers during challenging tasks.	1.92	Low
4. Miscommunication frequently leads to misunderstandings in my workplace.	2.37	Low
5. I do not feel comfortable seeking help from my colleagues when needed.	1.94	Low
6. My workplace does not promote a collaborative team environment.	1.71	Low
7. Negative relationships at work contribute.	1.93	Low
8. I do not feel valued and respected by my peers.	1.79	Low
9. Workplace gossip or politics negatively impacts my job performance.	1.94	Low
10. My co-employee(s) do not get along with me.	1.82	Low
Overall Mean	1.91	Low

Table 2 presents the level of work-related stress among employees in the area of interpersonal relationships.

The overall mean score is 1.91, interpreted as low. Item No. 6, "My workplace does not promote a collaborative team environment," had the lowest mean score of 1.71, also interpreted as low. Meanwhile, Item No. 4, "Miscommunication frequently leads to misunderstandings in my workplace," received the highest mean score of 2.37, likewise interpreted as low.

The fact that miscommunication is being identified as the most important issue, even though rated low, implies that even small cases can make a significant difference in the workplace. This calls for the organization to focus on enhancing communication channels and clarity to avoid misunderstandings. Conducting frequent team meetings, promoting open communication, and conducting training on effective communication can assist in improving collaboration and minimizing errors due to miscommunication.

The result is supported by Tan (2024), who explains that good communication minimizes errors in operations, lowers workers' stress levels, and establishes trust and cooperation, which are vital to organizational effectiveness. It can also imply that the company has invested in equipment or training to communicate more effectively and avoid common obstacles such as unclear messages, lack of context, or hierarchical disconnects.

Table 3

Level of Work-Related Stress of Employees in the Area of Work Environment

Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As an administrative staff employee, I experience stress when:</i>		
1. The physical work environment is not comfortable or conducive to productivity.	2.12	Low
2. Noise levels in my workplace make it difficult to concentrate.	2.14	Low
3. I do not feel safe and secure in my work environment.	1.80	Low
4. The lighting and ventilation in my workplace are inadequate.	1.79	Low
5. My workspace is not free from distractions that hinder productivity.	2.00	Low
6. The cleanliness and organization of the workplace are not maintained, increasing my stress levels.	1.83	Low
7. I lack access to the tools and technology needed to perform my tasks effectively.	1.94	Low
8. The general atmosphere of my workplace negatively affects my mental health.	1.82	Low
9. Poor infrastructure or facilities hinder my job performance.	1.91	Low
10. My work environment does not promote a sense of well-being.	1.88	Low
Overall Mean	1.92	Low

Table 3 presents the level of work-related stress among employees in the area of the work environment.

The overall mean score is 1.92, interpreted as low. Item No. 4, "The lighting and ventilation in my workplace are inadequate," received the lowest mean score of 1.79, also interpreted as low.

However, the item with the highest mean score is Item No. 2, "Noise levels in my workplace make it difficult to concentrate," with a mean score of 2.14, interpreted as low.

This indicates that although noise is not a primary concern, it remains the most relevant problem in terms of the work atmosphere. This indicates that even minimal noise disruptions can affect worker concentration and productivity. Solving this problem may include applying noise-reducing strategies, such as soundproofing or offering quiet areas, enabling workers to concentrate more effectively.

The result is supported by Luscombe (2024), who reveals that proper acoustical design involving soundproofing and sound-dampening materials can effectively mitigate the adverse effects of background noise, which, when excessive or poorly managed, is proven to be able to interfere with cognitive processes and concentration. In addition, as Song

(2020) notes, enabling a physical environment can reflect well-designed ergonomic layouts, proper lighting, and temperature management—elements critical to improving employee well-being and productivity.

Table 4

Level of Job Performance of Employees When Grouped According to Variables

Variable	Category	Mean	Interpretation
Age	Younger (below 39 years old)	4.72	Excellent
	Older (39 years old & above)	4.75	Excellent
Sex	Male	4.75	Excellent
	Female	4.72	Excellent
Civil Status	Single	4.70	Excellent
	Married	4.76	Excellent
Length of Service	Shorter (below 9 years)	4.69	Excellent
	Longer (9 years & above)	4.78	Excellent

Table 4 shows the level of Job Performance of Employees Grouped by Variables.

The table shows that younger and older employees perform exceptionally well and rated their job performance "excellent." This suggests that age does not significantly impact job performance, as both age groups demonstrate high levels of efficiency. Research supports this finding, indicating minimal differences in productivity between older and younger workers. Some studies suggest that older employees may be more productive in certain tasks due to their experience and advanced decision-making abilities (Viviani et al., 2021).

Similarly, male and female employees exhibited excellent job performance, indicating that sex is not a determining factor in their performance levels. However, this contradicts the findings of Shesharao (2023), whose research highlighted distinct disparities in job performance between males and females, with males reportedly excelling more than females. Such differences, however, may be attributed to stereotypes or biases rather than actual variations in ability.

Regarding civil status, both single and married employees demonstrated high levels of job performance. This contradicts the findings of Çemberci et al. (2022), which suggested that marital status influences certain aspects of work engagement. Their research found that married individuals tend to have greater concentration in their work, potentially leading to improved job performance.

Finally, when grouped by length of service, both newer and more tenured employees exhibited high levels of job performance, with no significant differences observed. This indicates that the duration of employment does not substantially influence job performance, aligning with the findings of Ertekin and Avunduk (2021).

Table 5

Difference in the Level of Work-Related Stress of Employees in the Area of Workload When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger (below 39 years old)	39	36.71	651.500	0.275	0.05	Not Significant
	Older (39 years old & above)	39	42.29				
Sex	Male	29	35.57	596.500	0.237		Not Significant
	Female	49	41.83				
Civil Status	Single	31	39.69	722.500	0.951		Not Significant
	Married	47	39.37				

Length of Service	Shorter (below 9 years)	37	33.41	533.000	0.034	Significant
	Longer (9 years & above)	41	45.00			

Table 5 presents the differences in the level of work-related stress experienced by employees in the area of workload when grouped and compared according to the identified variables.

The result of the study shows that on age, the younger category got a mean rank score of 36.71. In comparison, the older category got a mean rank score of 42.29, with a p -value of 0.275 and a significant level of 0.05, interpreted as not significant. On sex, the male category got a mean rank score of 35.57, while the female category got a mean rank score of 41.83, with a p -value of 0.237 and a significant level of 0.05 interpreted as not significant. Moreover, the single category got a mean rank score of 39.69 on civil status. In contrast, the married category got a mean rank score of 39.37, with a p -value of 0.951 and a significant level of 0.05, interpreted as not significant. Lastly, on length of service, the shorter category got a mean rank score of 33.41. In contrast, the longer category got a mean rank score of 45.00, a p -value of 0.034, and a significant level of 0.05, which is interpreted as significant.

The results indicate that age, sex, and civil status do not significantly influence the level of work-related stress of employees in the area of workload when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables. As such, the null hypothesis, "There is no significant relationship on administrative staff's work-related stress level when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables, is accepted.

Moreover, the length of service, which result is significant, reveals that there is a significant difference in the level of work-related stress of employees in the area of workload when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables; thus, the null hypothesis, "There is no significant relationship on the level of work-related stress of administrative staff when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables is rejected.

These findings suggest that the duration of an employee's tenure within an organization affects their workload-related stress. This difference may be attributed to several factors, such as changes in work tasks, familiarity with job responsibilities, or evolving long-term expectations. Research indicates that workload is a primary source of work-related stress, and excessive workload can lead to increased stress levels, negatively impacting health and productivity (Statistics Canada, 2023).

Table 6

Difference in the Level of Work-Related Stress of Employees in the Area of Interpersonal Relationships When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p -value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger (below 39 years old)	39	36.33	637.000	0.216	0.05	Not Significant
	Older (39 years old & above)	39	42.67				
Sex	Male	29	37.19	643.500	0.488		Not Significant
	Female	49	40.87				
Civil Status	Single	31	38.87	709.000	0.842		Not Significant
	Married	47	39.91				
Length of Service	Shorter (below 9 years)	37	33.82	548.500	0.035		Significant

Longer (9
years &
above) 41 44.62

Table 6 shows the difference in the level of work-related stress of employees in the area of interpersonal relationships when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables.

The result of the study shows that on age, the younger category got a mean rank score of 36.33. In comparison, the older category got a mean rank score of 42.67, a p -value of 0.216, and a significant level of 0.05, which is interpreted as not significant. On sex, the male category got a mean rank score of 37.19, while the female category got a mean rank score of 40.87, with a p -value of 0.488 and a significant level of 0.05 interpreted as not significant. Moreover, the single category got a mean rank score of 38.87 on civil status. In comparison, the married category got a mean rank score of 39.91, with a p -value of 0.842 and a significant level of 0.05, interpreted as not significant. Lastly, on length of service, the shorter category got a mean rank score of 33.82. In comparison, the longer category got a mean rank score of 44.62, a p -value of 0.035, and a significant level interpreted as significant.

The results indicate that age, sex, and civil status do not significantly influence the level of work-related stress of employees in the area of interpersonal relationships when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables. As such, the null hypothesis, "There is no significant relationship on the level of work-related stress of administrative staff when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables, is accepted.

Moreover, the length of service, which result is significant, reveals that it influences workload-related stress levels; thus, the null hypothesis, "There is no significant relationship on the level of work-related stress of administrative staff when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables, is rejected.

This finding suggests that employees' time working within an organization affects their stress levels when dealing with colleagues and workplace interactions.

This variation may be attributed to various reasons, such as varying levels of support from friends, duties at work, or understanding co-workers better over time. Research indicates that conflicts with others at work are a significant source of stress, frequently leading to exhaustion and negative feelings towards work (Bruce et al., 2024); (Jasiński & Derbis, 2022). For more recent staff, stress can be caused by not knowing colleagues and roles, while longer-serving staff can be stressed due to established dynamics or conflicts that have hardened over time. Employers must be sensitive to these differences to apply targeted interventions that effectively address interpersonal stressors based on length of service.

Table 7

Difference in the Level of Work-Related Stress of Employees in the Area of Work Environment When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger (below 39 years old)	39	37.85	696.000	0.518	0.05	Not Significant
	Older (39 years old & above)	39	41.15				
Sex	Male	29	37.57	654.500	0.562		Not Significant
	Female	49	40.64				
Civil Status	Single	31	42.84	625.000	0.289		Not Significant
	Married	47	37.30				
Length of Service	Shorter (below 9 years)	37	35.38	606.000	0.126		Not Significant

Longer (9
years &
above) 41 43.22

Table 7 presents the data on the difference in the level of work-related stress of employees in the area of work environment when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables.

The result of the study shows that on age, the younger category got a mean rank score of 37.85, while the older category got a mean rank score of 41.15; it has a p -value of 0.518 and a significant level of 0.05, interpreted as not significant. On sex, the male category got a mean rank score of 37.57, while the female category got a mean rank score of 40.64, with a p -value of 0.562 and a significant level of 0.05 interpreted as not significant. Moreover, the single category got a mean rank score of 42.84 on civil status. In contrast, the married category got a mean rank score of 37.30, with a p -value of 0.289 and a significant level of 0.05 interpreted as not significant. Lastly, on length of service, the shorter category got a mean rank score of 35.38. In comparison, the longer category got a mean rank score of 43.22, with a p -value of 0.126 and a significant level of 0.05, interpreted as not significant.

The results indicate that age, sex, civil status, and length of service do not significantly influence the level of work-related stress of employees in the area of work environment when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables. As such, the null hypothesis, "There is no significant relationship between administrative staff's work-related stress when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables, is accepted.

This means that demographic factors under consideration do not greatly impact employees' perceptions of work-related stress. Therefore, aspects such as management style, workload, and relationships might be more important in determining the amount of work-related stress.

Recent studies highlight that work stress is often caused by factors like heavy workloads, poor communication, and toxic workplace cultures rather than demographic characteristics (The American Institute of Stress, 2022); (Thompson, 2021).

Table 8

Difference in the Job Performance of Employees When Grouped and Compared According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger (below 39 years old)	39	38.54	723.000	0.708	0.05	Not Significant
	Older (39 years old & above)	39	40.46				
Sex	Male	29	40.67	676.500	0.725		Not Significant
	Female	49	38.81				
Civil Status	Single	31	35.76	612.500	0.236		Not Significant
	Married	47	41.97				
Length of Service	Shorter (below 9 years)	37	35.45	608.500	0.133		Not Significant
	Longer (9 years & above)	41	43.16				

Table 8 shows the difference in the job performance of employees when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables.

The result of the study shows that on age, the younger category got a mean rank score of 38.54. In comparison, the older category got a mean rank score of 40.46, a p -value of 0.708 and a significant level of 0.05, which is interpreted as not significant. On sex, the male category got a mean rank score of 40.67, while the female category got a mean rank score of 38.81, with a p -value of 0.725 and a significant level of 0.05, interpreted as not significant. Moreover, the single category got a mean rank score of 35.76 on civil status. In contrast, the married category got a mean rank score of 41.97, with a p -value of 0.236 and a significant level of 0.05 interpreted as not significant. Lastly, on length of service, the shorter category got a mean rank score of 35.45. In comparison, the longer category got a mean rank score of 43.16 with a p -value of 0.133 and a significant level, interpreted as not significant.

The results indicate that age, sex, civil status, and length of service do not significantly influence the job performance of employees when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables. As such, the null hypothesis, "There is no significant relationship on the level of job performance of administrative staff when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables, is accepted.

As revealed in the table, variables such as age, sex, civil status, and length of service did not influence the level of work-related stress of employees in the area of work environment. Thus, no significant difference emerged. The result implies that demographic variables have relatively little role in how employees experience work-related stress. It implies that factors such as workload, organizational attitude, and social relationships with co-workers might have more roles to play in instigating work-related stress levels, as in the studies of Sime et al. (2022) and Abrams (2022).

Table 9

Relationship Between the Levels of Work-related Stress and Job Performance of Employees

Variable	rho	p -value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Work-Related Stress	0.182	0.111	0.05	Not Significant
Job Performance				

Table 9 shows the relationship between the levels of work-related stress and the job performance of employees. The result of the study reveals that work-related stress job performance got a rho score of 0.182, with a p -value of 0.111 and a significant level of 0.05 interpreted as not significant.

The result of the study suggests that there is no significant relationship between the levels of work-related stress and the job performance of employees are not significant. Thus, the hypothesis that says "There is no significant relationship on the level of work-related stress of administrative staff when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables" and the hypothesis that says "There is no significant relationship on the level of job performance of administrative staff when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables" are both accepted.

The results suggest that stress might not directly affect employee performance. This finding suggests that other variables, such as individual coping style, organizational support systems, or the nature of the job, moderate or buffer the effect of stress on performance. For example, some employees could work better under stressful conditions because of individual resilience or organizational support to mitigate stress, such as good leadership or provision of mental health services.

Tănăsescu and Ramona-Diana's (2019) study states that there is no statistical correlation between job performance and work-related stress. In their study, work stress does not serve as a stimulating force, nor does it affect employees' psychology in such a manner as to affect their performance. This viewpoint assumes that employees are rational and are not affected by stress in terms of being unable to carry out tasks efficiently.

Conclusions

The study found that the respondents were evenly split between younger and older employees, with most being female, married, and having tenures of nine years or more. Employees experienced moderate stress related to workload and low stress in interpersonal relationships and the work environment. Stress levels varied by age, sex, civil status, and length of service, with older employees, males, single individuals, and those with longer tenures reporting higher stress levels. Job performance was rated as excellent across all groups, with no significant differences found based on age, sex, civil status, or length of service. No significant relationship was found between work-related stress and job performance. Based on these findings, the study recommends implementing workload management strategies, improving the work environment, enhancing communication to address miscommunication, and establishing wellness programs. Future research is also encouraged to explore additional factors like leadership styles and organizational culture.

Acknowledgment

First and foremost, I give all the glory and praise to our mighty God. His unfailing love, divine guidance, and endless grace have carried me through this journey. Despite the many challenges I encountered, I was able to survive and complete my MBA because of His strength and presence in my life. The researcher would also like to express her heartfelt thanks and deepest gratitude to the following individuals who have played a significant role in the progress and completion of this study. To everyone who had walked with me on this path—whether through encouragement, support, resources, or simply by believing in me—thank you from the bottom of my heart. This milestone is not just mine but ours.

References

- Abrams, Z. (2022). *High stress levels during pandemic are making even everyday choices difficult*. <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2022/06/news-pandemic-stress-decision-making>
- Ajes, J. A., Kikugawa, J. P., & Rodillo, B. L. (2023). Factors Contributing to Work Related Stress and Their Effects to the Employees' Performance in Company ABC. *Ani: Letran Calamba Research Report*, 19(1), 1-1. <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=19673>
- Bruce, P. J., Hrymak, V., Bruce, C., & Byrne, J. (2024). The role of interpersonal conflict as a cause of work-related stress in construction managers in Ireland. *Construction Innovation*, 25(1), 61-77. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CI-06-2023-0147>
- Çemberci, M., Civelek, M. E., Ertemel, A. V., & Cömert, P. N. (2022). The relationship of work engagement with job experience, marital status and having children among flexible workers after the Covid-19 pandemic. *PLOS ONE*, 17(11), e0276784. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0276784>
- Chen, B., Wang, L., Li, B., & Liu, W. (2022). Work stress, mental health, and employee performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1006580>
- Chico, A. L., Asilom, A., Bulicatin, Q. J., & Nalam, C. A. (2023). Workplace Stress Management and Job Performance among Employees of New Visayas Elementary School. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, VII(VII), 236-244. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2023.70717>
- Chineye, E., Abu, O. P., & Ekpenyung, O. (2021). *Work-related Stress Management and Employee Performance: Nigerian Experience*. 5.
- Clarke, S. (2025). *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/ocp>
- Dantis, J. M., Calibara, M. F., Bulawit, A., Garcia, H. K., Gulapa, M. D., Ervite, A. M., Foronda, A., Diaz, J., Congzon, M., & Loilo, E. (2024). Work-Related Stressors and Coping Strategies of Nurses in a Selected Tertiary Hospital in a City in the Philippines. *European Modern Studies Journal*, 8(1), Article 1. [https://doi.org/10.59573/emsj.8\(1\).2024.9](https://doi.org/10.59573/emsj.8(1).2024.9)
- De Dreu, C. K. W., & Weingart, L. R. (2020). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1212-1222.
- Ertekin, A. B., & Avunduk, Y. (2021). The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Job Performance: A Study on Sports Industry. *Journal of Educational Issues*, 7(2), 133. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jei.v7i2.18949>
- Han, S. (2024). Digitalization and job stress: Exploring the mediating roles of job and personal aversion risk with gender as a moderator. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1370711>
- Holt, M. (2024, October 2). *Diversity and Inclusion Survey Questions on Marital Status*. <https://divrity.team/blog59-marital-status-edi-questions.html>
- Jasiński, A. M., & Derbis, R. (2022). Work Stressors and Intention to Leave the Current Workplace and Profession: The Mediating Role of Negative Affect at Work. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(21), 13992. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192113992>
- Katirae, N., Berti, N., Das, A., Zennaro, I., Aldighetti, R., Dimovski, V., Peljhan, D., Dobbs, D., Glock, C., Pacheco, G., Neumann, P., Ogawa, A., & Battini, D. (2024). A new roadmap for an age-inclusive workforce management practice and an international policies comparison. *Open Research Europe*, 4, 85. <https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.17159.2>
- Kahn, J., McGonagle, K., & Kessler, R. C. (2021). Work-life balance in the workplace: New perspectives on the work-family interface. *Journal of Family Issues*, 42(7), 1591-1614.
- Kelloway, E. K., & Barling, J. (2019). Leadership development as an intervention in occupational health psychology: Current status and future directions. *Work & Stress*, 33(4), 356-376.
- Luscombe, J. (2024, January 18). 12 Ways Noise Affects Employee Wellbeing—Resonics Blog. *Resonics*. <https://resonics.co.uk/our-blog/12-ways-noise-affects-employee-wellbeing-health-productivity/>
- Malapad, M., Camarador, R., Cruz, L. D., & Lobo, J. (2024). Stress in the workplace: Examining the stress level, stressors and management styles among secondary physical education teachers. *Journal of Physical Education*, 35(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.4025/jphyseduc.v35i1.3554>
- Martins, J. (2025, February 4). *Workload Management: Guide to Managing Workload Effectively [2025]* • Asana. <https://asana.com/resources/effectively-manage-team-workload>

- Nodoushan, R. J., Madadzadeh, F., Anoosheh, V. S., Boghri, F., & Chenani, K. T. (2021). Mental workload and occupational burnout among the faculty members and administrative staff of Yazd Public Health School. *Journal of Education and Health Promotion*, 10, 293. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_1076_20
- Obrero, P. I. T., & Serviñas, L. (2024). Teachers' Occupational Stress and Performance. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRIS)*, 1(6), Article 6. <https://risejournals.org/index.php/imjrise/article/view/492>
- Opene, F. U. (2023). *Effect of Job Stress on Employees' Performance: A Case Study of Pencom* (SSRN Scholarly Paper 4561268). Social Science Research Network. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4561268>
- Parker, S. K., Axtell, C., & Turner, N. (2020). Designing a safer workplace: Importance of job autonomy, work environment, and workload. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 25(2), 153-165.
- Peter, K. A., Voiron, C., Kunz, S., Schwarze, T., Gurtner, C., Zeyer, A., Blasimann, A., Golz, C., Gurtner, A., Renggli, F., & Hahn, S. (2024). Reducing work-related stress among health professionals by using a training-based intervention programme for leaders in a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1), 23502. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-73939-y>
- Plaza, C. (2022, July 5). *Effective Communication in the Workplace*. <https://extension.psu.edu/effective-communication-in-the-workplace>
- Rachman, M. M. (2021). The Impact of Work Stress and the Work Environment in the Organization: How Job Satisfaction Affects Employee Performance? *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 9(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jhrss.2021.92021>
- Rose, V. (2020, November 6). *Communication Skills Training | Pollack Peacebuilding*. <https://pollackpeacebuilding.com/blog/communication-skills-training-2/>
- Salomão Filho, A., Tillmanns, T., & Corrigan, T. (2023). Ageing Organizations: Reviewing the Literature and Making a Few Recommendations for Human Resource Management. *Merits*, 3(4), Article 4. <https://doi.org/10.3390/merits3040038>
- Sarabia, A., & Collantes, L. (2020). Work-Related Stress and Teaching Performance of Teachers in Selected School in the Philippines. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education*, 4(1). <https://online-journal.unja.ac.id/index.php/irje/index>
- Sardouk, S., & Ali, H. (2022). *Job Stress impact on Job Motivation and Performance*. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1640580/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Sari, D. L., Storyna, H., Intan, R., Sinaga, P., Gunawan, F. E., Asrol, M., & Redi, A. A. N. P. (2021). The effect of job stress to employee performance: Case study of manufacturing industry in Indonesia. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 794(1), 012085. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/794/1/012085>
- Shesharao, R. S. (2023). Gender Differences in Job Performance and Job Satisfaction Among Government Employees. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 11(3).
- Sime, Y., Hailesilassie, H., & Alenko, A. (2022). Work-related stress and associated factors among employees of Hawassa industrial park, southern Ethiopia: An institutional based cross-sectional study. *BMC Psychiatry*, 22(1), 387. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-022-04032-9>
- Sonnentag, S., Mojza, E. J., Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2019). Recovery experiences scale: Development and validation of a scale to measure recovery experiences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(3), 276-289.
- Song, H. (2020, May 18). *Impact of noise and soundscape on cognitive performance and productivity in offices*. UCL Institute for Environmental Design and Engineering. <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/environmental-design/news/2020/may/impact-noise-and-soundscape-cognitive-performance-and-productivity-offices>
- Statistics Canada. (2023, June 19). *The Daily—Work-related stress most often caused by heavy workloads and work-life balance*. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/230619/dq230619c-eng.htm>
- Sucharitha, M. M., & Basha, Md. S. A. (2020). A Study on impact of stress on employee's productivity and job performance: Implications for stress measurement and management. *Ilkogretim Online - Elementary Education Online*. <https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2020.04.188>
- Tan, L. (2024, July 16). *Miscommunication at Work*. <https://www.litespace.io/blog/miscommunication-at-work>
- Tang, W.-G., & Vandenbergh, C. (2021). Role Overload and Work Performance: The Role of Psychological Strain and Leader-Member Exchange. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 691207. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.691207>
- The American Institute of Stress. (2022). *WORKPLACE STRESS*. *The American Institute of Stress*. <https://www.stress.org/workplace-stress/>
- Thompson, M. (2021, April 15). *The Top 10 Causes of Stress at Work*. WeThrive. <https://wethrive.net/blog/the-top-10-causes-of-stress-at-work/>
- Viviani, C. A., Bravo, G., Lavallière, M., Arezes, P. M., Martínez, M., Dianat, I., Bragança, S., & Castellucci, H. I. (2021). Productivity in older versus younger workers: A systematic literature review. *WORK*, 68(3), 577-618. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-203396>
- Wang, K., Yang, B., Wu, C., & Zheng, L. (2023). The moderation of satisfaction with working conditions in the association between workload and mental health among healthcare workers collecting test samples in the post-COVID-19 era. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 11, 1106299. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1106299>