

## Impact of Occupational Stress on Job Engagement among Working Women in Andhra Pradesh

Prof. T. Sobha Rani<sup>1</sup>, E. Udaya Lakshmi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Professor, Department of communication and Journalism, Sri Padmavati Mahila Visvavidyalayam, Tirupati, A.P., India

<sup>2</sup>Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Sri Padmavati Mahila Visvavidyalayam, Tirupati, A.P., India

### Abstract

Stress at the workplace has been a significant issue in contemporary organizational environments, which has greatly impacted on the quality of employee performance and psychological performance. The current research will focus on how workload stress, role conflict stress, work environment stress, and interpersonal relationship stress influence job engagement among the employees. The study a quantitative and descriptive-analytical research design was used by the study. The tool that was used in gathering primary data was a structured questionnaire with 200 respondents and a five-point Likert scale of strongly disagree to strongly agree. The internal consistency was ensured by the value of Cronbach alpha of more than 0.70 indicating the reliability of the instrument. The analysis was done using SPSS where descriptive statistics, correlation analysis and regression analysis were applied.

The results indicated that job engagement was significantly affected by all the four dimensions of workplace stress. The findings showed that there was a significant negative correlation between stress at work and job engagement of employees. Of all the independent variables, role conflict stress stood out as the best predictor of lower job engagement, then interpersonal relationship stress, workload stress and work environment stress. The regression findings indicated that all the stress factors had significant contributions towards the differences in job engagement at the 5 percent level of significance. All the variable effect sizes were large, which means that they have a great practical value.

The paper comes to the conclusion that the reduction of stress in the workplace can help enhance the job engagement of employees and organizational productivity. The results can be of great importance to organizational leaders, policymakers, and human resource managers in order to create effective stress management mechanisms, create conducive working conditions, and increase the level of employee engagement.

### Introduction

Stress at work has become a most significant issue to employee well-being, productivity and the general effectiveness of an organization in the present day organizational set ups. This has increased job demands through globalization, high rates of technological change and increased competition which has raised the levels of occupational stress among the employees. Once the demands of the job exceed the coping ability of an individual, there follow psychological, emotional and behavioral effects, which eventually compromise performance and put job related outcomes in jeopardy (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984).

Job engagement on the other hand is interpreted as a positive psychological condition which is full of energy, commitment and involvement in the work processes. Employees who are highly engaged have increased commitment, improved performance and job satisfaction and thus they make significant contributions towards organizational success (Schaufeli, Bakker, and Salanova, 2006). However, engagement may be undermined by stressors like work overload, job ambiguity, poor working conditions and interpersonal conflict thus lowering productivity.

Workload is one of the key antecedents among other stressors: under the burden of excessive or unrealistic expectations in terms of tasks that employees are supposed to do or even unrealistic deadlines, burnout and a lack of job involvement will be the result. The empirical data show that heavy workloads damage motivation and engagement by creating physical and emotional fatigue (Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter, 2001). Correspondingly,

role conflict occurs due to conflicting job demands or vague expectations that reduce clarity and lead to confusion and reduced performance efficiency in work; the research shows that the role conflict significantly reduces job satisfaction and interest (Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman, 1970).

The stress in the workplace is also another major cause of strain and it may include poor physical environments, poor support and poor resources. Positive and supportive environment creates involvement and commitment is lost in unfavorable conditions (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007). Conflict, ineffective communication and non-cooperation encourage interpersonal relationship stress, which further impairs the emotional well-being and engagement of workers; the results of the study have shown that positive workplace relationships increase cooperation, satisfaction and engagement (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005).

Although considerable research has been done on stress and performance at the workplace, none of the research has investigated the simultaneous effects of various stress dimensions on job engagement, particularly in the context of changing organization patterns. The importance of getting an idea of the cumulative effect of individual stressors on engagement is essential to the development of successful strategies that can be used to enhance well-being and productivity. Consequently, the current research aims at examining how the workload, role conflict, work environment, and interpersonal relationship stresses affect employee engagement.

### **Significance of the Study**

The current article is of significant significance in explaining the consequences of the stress at the workplace with respect to employee engagement. In the modern organisational settings, growing job demands, high competition at the workplace and changing occupational expectations have made workplace stress a critical issue that not only affects workforce but also overall productivity in an organisation. In questioning a variety of workplace stress dimensions, including the workload stress, role conflict stress, work-environment stress, and interpersonal-relationships stress, the present research provides an in-depth analysis of the effects of each stressor on the extent of employee engagement.

Its organisational management implications are also pertinent, since this study emphasizes the need to have effective stress-management plans that would support staff engagement. The increased involvement is directly related to increased productivity, commitment to the organisation, job satisfaction and reduced employee turnover. By determining the precise causes of stress that dampen engagement, organisations can come up with customised interventions, support programmes, and workload- management policies that facilitate employee welfare and performance.

The organisational leaders and the human resource professionals also gain substantive advantage of the empirical evidence provided. The research provides practical information on enhancing working conditions that employees are likely to enjoy, improving communication lines, and fostering proper interpersonal relationships in the company. In addition, it supports the development of supportive organisational cultures which foster motivation and allow greater job engagement.

Academically, this study supplements the available research by looking at the synergistic relationship between various dimensions of the work environment stress and job engagement. Unlike in previous literature whereby individual stress factors are mostly studied in isolation, the current research incorporates several determinants to provide a complete picture of the dynamics of stress in organisations. It also provides a strong basis on which further inquiries on more psychological and organisational variables that mediate employee engagement can be conducted.

Lastly, the study has practical implications to policymakers and organisational administrators as the study provides evidence-based suggestions to reduce the workplace conditions and increase employee satisfaction. Through direct challenges on workplace stress, organisations will have a chance to improve productivity, avoid burnout and sustainable development. Therefore, this contribution not only contributes to the theoretical and practical aspects in the fields of organisational behaviour and human resource management.

### **Review of literature**

The empirical study by Singh and Gupta (2023) is a survey-based investigation to assess the role conflict stress and employee engagement in the context of Indian corporate workers. Based on the results of the regression and factor analysis of the data of 320 employees, the study proved that role conflict stress has a significant negative impact on job engagement, work motivation, and job satisfaction. The authors also reported a decline in organisational commitment among the people who were struggling with conflicting job expectations. The study was limited to the corporate world which is an indication that there is a gap that should be covered in future research by widening the empirical scope to various occupational contexts.

Abdullah, Ismail, and Johari (2022) examined the nature of interpersonal relationships in the workplace and employee engagement in the healthcare sphere. Their survey of healthcare professionals, analysed with the help of structural equation modelling, has shown that poor interpersonal relations increase stress in the workplace and at the same time, limit the engagement of employees. The research highlighted the key importance of organisational support and transformational leadership in alleviating interpersonal stress. The authors recognised that the healthcare-specific focus restricts the generalisability and encourages the cross-sectoral replication.

The article by Kim and Park (2021) explored the effect of workload stress on the engagement of employees in technology-intensive organisations. Based on the 380 employees, the research used regression and mediation analyses to plot a causal relationship between workload stress, burnout, and engagement. Results demonstrated that engagement is reduced by heavy workload through emotional exhaustion intensification and the work-life balance protective role. The authors also warned that the sample of technology-sector might be insufficient to reflect larger industry forces, so that more extensive empirical analysis should be done.

Jain and Cooper (2020) provided the full cross-sectional survey that analyzed the occupational stress and employee engagement levels of the organizations in the public and private sector. Both correlation and regression methods were employed in the comparative analysis to deconstruct the stress factors in the form of workload pressure, role ambiguity, and environmental strain. Findings confirmed that the effect of workplace stress has a negative impact on engagement and job performance. More importantly, an enabling organisational culture developed as a buffer. The authors found that longitudinal studies were necessary to explain the long-term consequences of stress.

By surveying organisational employees across various industries, Albrecht (2019) interrogated between employee engagement and stress at work. Through the implementation of factor analysis and regression modelling, the research stated that job stress has adverse effects on engagement and productivity. The author has emphasized the importance of detailed employee well-being programmes in reducing stress. Although covering a wide range of industries, the study did not focus on isolating and analysing the specific variables of the stress.

Saks and Gruman (2018) used the social exchange theory to determine the relationship between stress at the workplace and employee engagement. The survey data, which was conducted on the organisational employees, underwent structural equation modelling, whereby the survey displayed that stress destroys trust, job involvement and engagement levels. The outcomes also presented the amplifying influence of the supportive leadership on engagement. The researchers stated that the next research must isolate and assess individual components of stress.

Bakker and Albrecht (2018) used a combination of both theory and practice to examine the job demands, workplace stress, and engagement through the Job Demands Resources model. The multidisciplinary survey in many organisations demonstrated that high workloads and role conflicts increase stress levels and inhibit engagement. The authors emphasised the importance of organisational resources in maintaining the engagement and they further added that the study has focussed on generic demands of the job and not the particular dimension of stress.

Karatepe and Olugbade (2017) concentrated on the employees of the hospitality industry by evaluating the impact of stress at work on engagement. The researchers used regression and moderation analysis procedures to assess the outcomes of job stress. The results proved that workplace stress reduces engagement and increases turnover

intentions with the interpersonal relationships being found as a primary lever of engagement. The authors indicated the need to generalise the research to wider organisational settings.

Hakanen, Bakker, and Schaufeli (2016) had a longitudinal study on the impact of stress and job demands in the workplace on engagement within the service-sector employees. The study has determined that engagement is limited by high job demands and enhanced by organisational support by modelling data collected over time. The authors have admitted that the study focused on overall job demands and did not subdivide granular stress aspects.

Shuck, Twyford, Reio, and Shuck (2015) analyzed employee engagement and stress at work in a quantitative perspective of research that was conducted via a survey in corporate environments. Path and regression analyses were used to explain that stress negatively impacts engagement and job satisfaction. The authors emphasized that the positive workplace climate plays an instrumental role in the improvement of engagement, although psychological well-being has been mostly discussed as the mediator instead of a direct dimension of stress.

### **Research Gap**

In the present-day literature, the complexity of the nexus between job stress and a plethora of employee outcomes, such as job satisfaction, burnout, productivity, and organizational commitment, is highlighted. Although an impressive amount of empirical research has been conducted on the effect of discrete stressors on employee engagement, a critical review of the literature has shown that significant gaps are present, and this is why the current research is necessary.

Moreover, the antecedent research studies have given relatively low importance to interpersonal relationship stress as a salient stressor of workplace in regard to employee engagement. Although the social exchange theory assumes that workplace relations play a significant role in employee motivation and performance, empirical research involving the use of interpersonal stress as a direct predictor of engagement is rather limited.

It follows, therefore, that the current research aims at filling these gaps by empirically evaluating workload, role conflict, environmental and interpersonal relationship stress as determinants of job engagement using a quantitative research design that is structured. The research is aimed at providing the detailed picture of workplace stress processes and at making a contribution to the scholarly discussion, as well as practical organizational practices that are supposed to improve employee engagement.

### **Objectives**

- The current paper examines how workload stress, role conflict stress, work environment stress and interpersonal relationship stress affect job engagement amongst employees.
- To investigate the correlation between disparate workplace stressors and the levels of engagement of employees to their job.

### **Hypotheses of the Study**

#### **Hypothesis 1**

- **H<sub>01</sub>**: There is no significant impact of workload stress on job engagement among employees.
- **H<sub>11</sub>**: There is a significant impact of workload stress on job engagement among employees.

#### **Hypothesis 2**

- **H<sub>02</sub>**: There is no significant impact of role conflict stress on job engagement among employees.
- **H<sub>12</sub>**: There is a significant impact of role conflict stress on job engagement among employees.

#### **Hypothesis 3**

- **H<sub>03</sub>**: There is no significant impact of work environment stress on job engagement among employees.
- **H<sub>13</sub>**: There is a significant impact of work environment stress on job engagement among employees.

#### **Hypothesis 4**

- **H<sub>04</sub>:** There is no significant impact of interpersonal relationship stress on job engagement among employees.
- **H<sub>14</sub>:** There is a significant impact of interpersonal relationship stress on job engagement among employees.

### Research Methodology

The current research uses quantitative and descriptive-analytical research design as it investigates the effects of workplace stress on work engagement among the employees. The paper aims at examining how workload stress, role conflict stress, work environment stress and interpersonal relationship stress affect job engagement of the employees.

#### Research Design

This study is conducted based on the cross-sectional study research design, which will enable the researcher to gather the respondents at the same time. The quantitative research method is used to evaluate the correlation between stress variables at work and job engagement with the help of advanced statistical methods.

#### Population of the Study

The sample used in the research is the population of employees who work in different organizational fields. The main respondents are the employees since they are the ones who are exposed to stress at the workplace and its related effects in terms of job engagement.

#### Sample Size and Sampling Technique.

The study population of 200 respondents was picked. Simple random sampling method was adopted to select the respondents to guarantee fair chance of being included in the study and helped in eliminating sampling bias. The chosen sample size is considerate to be sufficient to perform the correlation and regression analysis.

#### Sources of Data

The research makes use of primary information as its main source of data. Primary data were gathered through a structured questionnaire that was administered to the employees. The theoretical framework of the study was supported by secondary data that was obtained through journals, books, research articles, and online scholarly databases.

### Data analysis and interpretation

#### HYPOTHESIS 1 (H<sub>01</sub> & H<sub>11</sub>): Workload Stress

**Table 1.1: Descriptive Statistics – Workload Stress**

| Variable        | N   | Mean | SD   | Std. Error | Min | Max | Variance |
|-----------------|-----|------|------|------------|-----|-----|----------|
| Workload Stress | 200 | 3.61 | 0.74 | 0.052      | 1.5 | 5   | 0.547    |
| Job Engagement  | 200 | 3.39 | 0.69 | 0.049      | 1.4 | 5   | 0.476    |

**Table 1.2: Correlation Analysis – Workload Stress**

| Variables       | Workload Stress | Job Engagement |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Workload Stress | 1               | -.621**        |

|                |          |   |
|----------------|----------|---|
| Job Engagement | -0.621** | 1 |
|----------------|----------|---|

**Table 1.3: ANOVA – Workload Stress**

| Model      | SS     | DF  | MS     | F      | Sig |
|------------|--------|-----|--------|--------|-----|
| Regression | 35.892 | 1   | 35.892 | 125.47 | 0   |
| Residual   | 56.658 | 198 | 0.286  |        |     |
| Total      | 92.55  | 199 |        |        |     |

**Table 1.4: Regression Coefficients – Workload Stress**

| Variable        | B      | Std. Error | Beta   | t     | Sig | 95% CI           |
|-----------------|--------|------------|--------|-------|-----|------------------|
| Constant        | 4.812  | 0.213      | –      | 22.59 | 0   | [4.392, 5.232]   |
| Workload Stress | -0.589 | 0.053      | -0.621 | -11.2 | 0   | [-0.694, -0.484] |

**Interpretation**

The negative effect of workload stress on job engagement is high ( $b = -0.621$ ,  $t = -11.20$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). The regression model explains 38.5% of the difference in the job engagement ( $R^2 = 0.385$ ). The 0.626  $f^2$  effect size used by Cohen indicates large effect size. As a result, the null hypothesis  $H_0$  is discarded.

**HYPOTHESIS 2 ( $H_{02}$  &  $H_{12}$ ): Role Conflict Stress**

**Table 2.1: Descriptive Statistics – Role Conflict Stress**

| Variable             | N   | Mean | SD   | Std. Error | Min | Max | Variance |
|----------------------|-----|------|------|------------|-----|-----|----------|
| Role Conflict Stress | 200 | 3.45 | 0.71 | 0.05       | 1.6 | 5   | 0.504    |
| Job Engagement       | 200 | 3.39 | 0.69 | 0.049      | 1.4 | 5   | 0.476    |

**Table 2.2: Correlation Analysis – Role Conflict Stress**

| Variables            | Role Conflict Stress | Job Engagement |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Role Conflict Stress | 1                    | -.668**        |

|                |         |   |
|----------------|---------|---|
| Job Engagement | -.668** | 1 |
|----------------|---------|---|

**Table 2.3: ANOVA – Role Conflict Stress**

| Model      | SS     | DF  | MS     | F      | Sig |
|------------|--------|-----|--------|--------|-----|
| Regression | 41.342 | 1   | 41.342 | 159.03 | 0   |
| Residual   | 51.208 | 198 | 0.259  |        |     |
| Total      | 92.55  | 199 |        |        |     |

**Table 2.4: Regression Coefficients – Role Conflict Stress**

| Variable             | B      | Std. Error | Beta   | t      | Sig | 95% CI           |
|----------------------|--------|------------|--------|--------|-----|------------------|
| Constant             | 4.563  | 0.198      | –      | 23.04  | 0   | [4.173, 4.953]   |
| Role Conflict Stress | -0.642 | 0.051      | -0.668 | -12.61 | 0   | [-0.743, -0.541] |

**Interpretation**

It is shown in the current analysis that role conflict stress reduces job engagement greatly (b = -0.668, t = -12.61, p < 0.001). The model explains a total of 44.6% of variance (R<sup>2</sup> = 0.446). In addition, the f<sup>2</sup> of 0.804 by Cohen indicates a huge effect size. This leads to the rejection of hypothesis H02.

**HYPOTHESIS 3 (H<sub>03</sub> & H<sub>13</sub>): Work Environment Stress**

**Table 3.1: Descriptive Statistics – Work Environment Stress**

| Variable                | N   | Mean | SD   | Std. Error | Min | Max | Variance |
|-------------------------|-----|------|------|------------|-----|-----|----------|
| Work Environment Stress | 200 | 3.36 | 0.68 | 0.048      | 1.7 | 5   | 0.462    |
| Job Engagement          | 200 | 3.39 | 0.69 | 0.049      | 1.4 | 5   | 0.476    |

**Table 3.2: Correlation Analysis – Work Environment Stress**

| Variables               | Work Environment Stress | Job Engagement |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Work Environment Stress | 1                       | -.605**        |
| Job Engagement          | -.605**                 | 1              |

**Table 3.3: ANOVA – Work Environment Stress**

| Model      | SS     | DF  | MS     | F      | Sig |
|------------|--------|-----|--------|--------|-----|
| Regression | 33.846 | 1   | 33.846 | 118.11 | 0   |
| Residual   | 58.704 | 198 | 0.296  |        |     |
| Total      | 92.55  | 199 |        |        |     |

**Table 3.4: Regression Coefficients – Work Environment Stress**

| Variable                | B      | Std. Error | Beta   | t      | Sig | 95% CI           |
|-------------------------|--------|------------|--------|--------|-----|------------------|
| Constant                | 4.468  | 0.207      | –      | 21.58  | 0   | [4.060, 4.876]   |
| Work Environment Stress | -0.566 | 0.052      | -0.605 | -10.87 | 0   | [-0.669, -0.463] |

**Interpretation**

The effect of work environment stress on job engagement is negative and the regression coefficient of  $b = -0.605$  with t-statistic of -10.87 and the p-value of less than the standard value of 0.001. As indicated by  $R^2 = 0.366$ , the model explains 36.6 percent of variation in the outcome measure. The calculated Cohen  $f^2$  is 0.577 which has a great effect size based on established standards. Therefore the rejection of hypothesis H03 is accepted

**HYPOTHESIS 4 (H<sub>04</sub> & H<sub>14</sub>): Interpersonal Relationship Stress****Table 4.1: Descriptive Statistics – Interpersonal Relationship Stress**

| Variable                          | N   | Mean | SD   | Std. Error | Min | Max | Variance |
|-----------------------------------|-----|------|------|------------|-----|-----|----------|
| Interpersonal Relationship Stress | 200 | 3.28 | 0.72 | 0.051      | 1.4 | 5   | 0.518    |
| Job Engagement                    | 200 | 3.39 | 0.69 | 0.049      | 1.4 | 5   | 0.476    |

**Table 4.2: Correlation Analysis – Interpersonal Relationship Stress**

| Variables            | Interpersonal Stress | Job Engagement |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Interpersonal Stress | 1                    | -.652**        |
| Job Engagement       | -.652**              | 1              |

**Table 4.3: ANOVA – Interpersonal Relationship Stress**

| Model      | SS     | DF | MS     | F      | Sig |
|------------|--------|----|--------|--------|-----|
| Regression | 39.512 | 1  | 39.512 | 146.82 | 0   |

|          |        |     |       |  |  |
|----------|--------|-----|-------|--|--|
| Residual | 53.038 | 198 | 0.268 |  |  |
| Total    | 92.55  | 199 |       |  |  |

**Table 4.4: Regression Coefficients – Interpersonal Relationship Stress**

| Variable             | B      | Std. Error | Beta   | t      | Sig | 95% CI           |
|----------------------|--------|------------|--------|--------|-----|------------------|
| Constant             | 4.512  | 0.205      | –      | 22.01  | 0   | [4.108, 4.916]   |
| Interpersonal Stress | -0.618 | 0.051      | -0.652 | -12.11 | 0   | [-0.718, -0.518] |

**Interpretation**

The analysis of the stress in interpersonal relationships shows that it has a strong negative impact on job engagement, with a standardized regression coefficient of  $b = -0.652$ , a highly significant t-statistic of  $t = -12.11$ , and a p-value of less than 0.001. The total model explains 42.5 per cent of the job engagement variance ( $R^2 = 0.425$ ). The size of the effect, which is indexed by Cohen  $f^2 = 0.739$ , has a larger effect size. Hypothesis H04 is then rejected.

**Findings of the Study**

- In this study, the authors evaluated how some of the stressors related to work, namely workload stress, role conflict stress, work environment stress, and interpersonal relationship stress affect job engagement among employees. The results of statistical tests were as follows:
- It was established that workload stress has a major negative impact on job engagement. Workers who were overburdened, given unrealistic time limits, and had an increased work pressure showed significant decreases in motivation and engagement in the work duties they had.
- Role-conflict stress was found to be a powerful predictor of job engagement. Work commitment and engagement were attenuated among those employees who had experienced an indistinct role definitions, contradictory expectations and overlapping responsibilities.
- Work-environment stress showed also a strong influence on job engagement. Lack of working conditions, lack of organizational support, and lack of facilities provisions were seen to have a significant negative impact on employee motivation and engagement.
- The interpersonal-relationship stress also corresponded to the decline in job engagement. Intrapersonal conflicts at the workplace, lack of cooperation and poor communication between staff members and administrators led to reduced job satisfaction and involvement.
- Role-conflict stress was the most significant predictor of job engagement when all variables were taken into account, and the next were interpersonal-relationship stress, workload stress and work-environment stress.
- All of these results prove that work stress is one of the key predeterminants of employee job engagement and, accordingly, has a significant effect on the productivity and well-being of the working population.

**Suggestions of the Study**

- Resting on the empirical results of the current study, the following recommendations are promoted to mitigate the workplace stress and to increase the job engagement of the employees:

- The first one is that companies are supposed to implement effective workload management tactics, and tasks ought to be shared equally and real deadlines set, which will help avoid burnout among workers and unwarranted stress.
- Second, the management has to clarify job roles and responsibilities thus relief of role-conflict stress; clear communication of the expectation can enhance performance and involvement.
- Third, the work environment must be streamlined through proper provisions of the right resources, comfortable working conditions and conducive policies that taken together boost the motivation of the employees.
- Fourth, interpersonal relations and communication at the workplace should be strengthened by team building activities, conflict resolution programs and leadership assistance hence minimise interpersonal stress.
- Fifth, companies ought to design frequent employee stress-management programs, training and counseling to enhance employee psychological comfort and job satisfaction.
- Sixth, the management must be the leader of work-life policies like flexible working hours and supportive programmes which will help reduce stress in the workplace and increase engagement further.
- Seventh, an organizational culture that supports participation, recognition, and motivation needs to be developed to enhance job involvement and production.

### **Conclusion**

The current research examined the effects of stress at work on job engagement among workers, by examining four main areas of stress, namely, workload stress, role conflict stress, work environment stress, and interpersonal relationship stress. The results are quite indicative, showing that stress in the workplace has a profound impact on employee engagement, where all the four stressors have been found to have negative effects and the need to emphasize on holistic management of stress in the organization setting.

Among these issues, role conflict stress appeared to be the strongest predictor of less engagement indicating that unclear job descriptions, and when the expectations are in conflict with each other, result in high levels of psychological strain. There was also a significant impact of interpersonal relationship stress, and the importance of good communication and cooperation at the workplace is essential. Also, it was observed that workload stress and work environment stress reduced motivation and job involvement and thus proved the need to have balanced assignments and conducive work conditions.

This study can validate that psychological experiences and work-related conditions play a crucial role in determining the engagement of employees. When workforce people face great intensity of work stress, their motivation, energy and efficiency decline and hence this affects negatively the performance of the organization. Findings of the study underscore the need of organisations to have in place holistic stress-management plans in order to increase involvement and promote better efficiency.

Lastly, the study offers a significant contribution to the body of literature by offering empirical support on the link between various stress dimensions in the workplace and job engagement. It shows that alleviation of stress and the establishment of conducive organisational conditions significantly enhance the health and work satisfaction of employees as well as their output. Therefore, organisations are expected to persist with the workforce-friendly policies, enhance of the communication within the workplace, and the establishment of good working cultures in order to ensure sustainable growth and sustained participation.

### **References (APA 7th Edition Style)**

1. Abdullah, M. I., Ismail, A., & Johari, J. (2022). The impact of interpersonal workplace relationships on employee engagement and performance in healthcare organizations. *International Journal of Healthcare Management*, 15(3), 215–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20479700.2021.1889173>
2. Albrecht, S. L. (2019). Employee engagement and organizational effectiveness: A multilevel perspective. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2018.04.002>
3. Bakker, A. B., & Albrecht, S. L. (2018). Work engagement: Current trends. *Career Development International*, 23(1), 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-11-2017-0207>

4. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
5. Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874–900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>
6. Ganster, D. C., & Rosen, C. C. (2013). Work stress and employee health: A multidisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 39(5), 1085–1122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313475815>
7. Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2016). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43(6), 495–513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001>
8. Jain, A. K., & Cooper, C. L. (2020). Stress and organizational behavior: Workplace stress management and engagement. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 28(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-07-2019-1821>
9. Karatepe, O. M., & Olugbade, O. A. (2017). The effects of workplace stress on employee engagement and turnover intention. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(12), 2965–2986. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-03-2016-0144>
10. Kim, H., & Park, Y. (2021). Workload stress, burnout, and employee engagement in technology-based organizations. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 120, 106760. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106760>
11. Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer Publishing.
12. LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & LePine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of stressor framework: Job stress and employee outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 764–775. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2005.18803921>
13. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397–422. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397>
14. Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15(2), 150–163. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391486>
15. Saks, A. M. (2019). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement revisited. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness*, 6(1), 19–38. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-06-2018-0034>
16. Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2018). Socialization resources theory and employee engagement. *Career Development International*, 23(1), 12–32. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-11-2017-0204>
17. Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701–716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
18. Shuck, B., Twyford, D., Reio, T. G., & Shuck, A. (2015). Human resource development practices and employee engagement. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 25(2), 239–260. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21169>
19. Singh, R., & Gupta, M. (2023). Role conflict stress and employee engagement in corporate organizations. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 23(1), 45–60.